

DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

RATAN TATA LIBRARY, (DULS)
(Delhi School of Economics)

Cl. No. Y 15.1-3.N4
Ac. No. 4573

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 10 Paise per day on general books and 25 Paise as per day on text books. will be charged for the first two days and 50 Paise from the third day the book is kept overrime.

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY
OF THE
BRITISH COLONIAL EMPIRE

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C. 4

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS CAPE TOWN

Geoffrey Cumberlege, Publisher to the University

The Royal Institute of International Affairs is an unofficial and non-political body, founded in 1920 to encourage and facilitate the scientific study of international questions.

The Institute, as such, is precluded by its Royal Charter from expressing an opinion on any aspect of international affairs. Opinions expressed in this book are, therefore, purely individual.

DEMOGRAPHIC SURVEY OF THE BRITISH COLONIAL EMPIRE

BY

R. R. KUCZYNSKI

VOLUME II

Issued under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs

GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO
1949

NOTE

THE author died on 25 November 1947 while engaged in seeing the final proofs of this volume through the press. The proof reading and indexing was then undertaken by his daughter, Dr. Brigitte Long, who was for several years research assistant to her father.

The manuscript of volumes III and IV of the work was almost completed by Dr. Kuczynski before his death, and is now being prepared for publication by Dr. Brigitte Long. Volume III will deal with America, the Atlantic, and Oceania; volume IV with Europe and Asia and will also contain a synopsis of all the birth and death registration laws now in force.

CONTENTS

SECOND PART

SOUTH AFRICA HIGH COMMISSION TERRITORIES

CHAPTER VI. BASUTOLAND, BECHUANALAND, AND SWAZILAND

I. CENSUS-TAKING 1–16

II. TOTAL POPULATION 16–26
1. Basutoland 16–24
2. Bechuanaland 24–5
3. Swaziland 25–6

III. COMPOSITION OF THE NATIVE POPULATION . . . 27–34
1. Basutoland 27–31
2. Bechuanaland 31–3
3. Swaziland 34

IV. COMPOSITION OF THE NON-NATIVE POPULATION . . . 34–43
1. Basutoland 35–40
2. Bechuanaland 40–1
3. Swaziland 41–3

V. NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION . . . 43–5

VI. NON-NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION . . . 45–57
1. Basutoland and Bechuanaland 45–52
2. Swaziland 52–7

VII. NATIVE FERTILITY, MORTALITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH . 58–87
1. Basutoland 58–72
Fertility 58–66
General Mortality 66–71
Child Mortality 71
Population Growth 72
2. Bechuanaland 72–81
Fertility 72–3
General Mortality 73–80
Infant Mortality 80
Population Growth 81
3. Swaziland 81–7
Fertility 81–2
General Mortality 82–6
Infant Mortality 86–7
Population Growth 87

VIII. NON-NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH STATISTICS . . . 87–8

SOURCES QUOTED 89–93

THIRD PART

EAST AFRICA

CHAPTER VII. INTRODUCTION

I. CENSUS-TAKING 95–7

II. TOTAL POPULATION 97–102
1. Native Population 97–9
2. Non-Native Population 99–101
3. Population Density 102

III. Composition of the Native Population . . . 102

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population . . . 102–9

V. Birth and Death Registration 110–14

VI. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth . 114–25
Introduction 114–17
Fertility 117–18
General Mortality 118–19
Infant Mortality 119–20
Population Growth 120–5

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics . . . 125

Chapter VIII. KENYA

I. Census-Taking 126–44
1. Censuses Taken so far 126–7
2. The Problem of Native Censuses 128–33
3. Tax Records 133–9
4. Kipandi Records 139–43
5. Sample Count 143–4

II. Total Population 144–51
1. Native Population 144–6
2. Non-Native Population 146–9
3. Population Density 149–51

III. Composition of the Native Population . . . 151–6

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population . . . 156–70
Race 156–9
Birthplace 159–63
Years of Residence 163
Nationality 163–4
Sex 164–8
Age 168
Conjugal Condition 168–70
European Officials 170

V. Birth and Death Registration 170–87

VI. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth . 187–227
Fertility 187–90
General Mortality 190–212
Infant Mortality 212–15
Adult Mortality 215
Population Growth 215–27

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics . . . 227–9

Chapter IX. UGANDA

I. Census-Taking 230–5

II. Total Population 235–53
1. Native Population 235–50
1878–1944 235–40
Migration 240–50
2. Non-Native Population 250–1
3. Population Density 252–3

III. Composition of the Native Population . . . 253–8

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population . . . 259–65

V. Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 265–72

VI. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 272–6

VII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth . 276–322
Fertility 276–84
Still-births 284–8
General Mortality 288–303
Infant Mortality 304–6
Adult Mortality 306–13
Population Growth 313–22

VIII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics . . . 322–4

Chapter X. TANGANYIKA TERRITORY

I. Census-Taking 325–39
1. Native Counts 325–35
2. Non-Native Censuses 335–9

II. Total Population 339–48

III. Composition of the Native Population . . . 348–52

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population . . . 352–62

V. Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 363–74

VI. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 375–8

VII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth . 378–99
Fertility 378–81
General Mortality 381–92
Infant Mortality 392–5
Population Growth 395–9

VIII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics . . . 399–401

Chapter XI. NORTHERN RHODESIA

I. Census-Taking 402–14
1. Native Population 402–9
2. Non-native Population 410–14

II. Total Population 414–24

III. Migration to and from the Protectorate . . . 424–74
1. Immigration 424–8
2. Emigration 428–31
3. Migration of Labourers into Northern Rhodesia . . 431–7
4. Migration of Labourers from Northern Rhodesia . . 437–74

IV. Composition of the Native Population . . . 474–5

V. Composition of the Non-Native Population . . . 475–82

VI. Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 482–8

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration . . . 488–93

VIII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth . 493–521
Fertility 493–501
General Mortality 501–7
Infant Mortality 507–9
Adult Mortality 509–13
Mortality of Absentees 513–15
Population Growth 515–17

IX. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics . . . 517–21

PRINTED IN
GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
OXFORD
BY
CHARLES BATEY
PRINTER
TO THE
UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER XII. NYASALAND

I. CENSUS-TAKING 522–32
1. 1911–1931 522–9
2. 1945 529–32
II. TOTAL POPULATION 532–6
III. MIGRATION TO AND FROM THE PROTECTORATE . . . 537
1. Immigration 537–43
2. Emigration 543
3. Migration of Labourers into Nyasaland . . . 543–9
4. Migration of Labourers from Nyasaland . . . 549–81
Migration up to 1935 550–61
Findings of the Committee on Emigrant Labour . . 561–7
Migration 1936–1944 567–79
The count of 1945 579–81
IV. COMPOSITION OF THE NATIVE POPULATION . . . 581–92
1. 1921–1941 581–9
2. 1945 589–92
V. COMPOSITION OF THE NON-NATIVE POPULATION . . . 592–9
1. 1921–1943 592–6
2. 1945 596–599
VI. NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION . . . 600–8
VII. NON-NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION . . . 609–10
VIII. NATIVE FERTILITY, MORTALITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH . 611–38
Fertility 611–18
General Mortality 618–26
Infant Mortality 626–9
Population Growth 629–38
IX. NON-NATIVE BIRTH AND DEATH STATISTICS . . . 638–9

CHAPTER XIII. SOMALILAND

I. CENSUS-TAKING 640–1
II. TOTAL POPULATION 641
III. COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION 641–3
IV. BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION 643–7
V. FERTILITY, MORTALITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH . . 648–9

CHAPTER XIV. ZANZIBAR

I. CENSUS-TAKING 650–1
II. TOTAL POPULATION 651–3
III. COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION 653–5
IV. BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION 656–70
V. FERTILITY, MORTALITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH . . 670–85
Fertility 670–3
Still-births 673–4
General Mortality 674–7
Infant Mortality 677–9
Adult Mortality 679–80
Population Growth 680–5

SOURCES QUOTED 686–706

FOURTH PART
MAURITIUS AND SEYCHELLES

CHAPTER XV. MAURITIUS AND DEPENDENCIES

A. MAURITIUS

I. CENSUS-TAKING 707–43
1. 1763–1810 707–12
2. 1811–1837 713–32
3. 1838–1944 732–43

II. TOTAL POPULATION 743–88
1. 1598–1710 743–6
2. 1712–1810 746–62
3. 1811–1834 762–73
4. 1835–1946 773–88

III. IMMIGRATION 788–99

IV. COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION 799–839
1. Race 799–809
2. Birthplace 809–13
3. Nationality 813–14
4. Sex 814–15
5. Age 815–27
6. Conjugal Condition 827–39

V. BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION 839–50
1. 1736–1810 839–41
2. 1810–1834 841–3
3. 1837–1946 843–50

VI. BIRTH AND DEATH STATISTICS 850–68

VII. FERTILITY, MORTALITY, AND POPULATION GROWTH . . 869–85
1. Fertility 869–73
2. Mortality 873–84
Smallpox 873–4
Cholera 874–5
Influenza 875
Plague 875–6
Malaria 876–9
Slaves 879
Free Persons 879–80
Total Population 880
General Population 880–1
Indian Population 881–2
Port Louis 882–3
Infant Mortality 883–4
3. Population Growth 884–5

B. DEPENDENCIES

I. CENSUSES 885–6

II. TOTAL POPULATION 886–93
1. Rodrigues 886–8
2. Minor Dependencies 888–93

III. COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION 894–7

IV. Birth and Death Registration 897–8
V. Birth and Death Statistics 898–900
1. Rodrigues 898–9
2. Minor Dependencies 899–900

Chapter XVI. SEYCHELLES

I. Census-Taking 901–2
II. Total Population 902–22
1. 1742–1810 902–7
2. 1811–1834 907–13
3. 1835–1946 913–22
III. Composition of the Population 922–6
IV. Birth and Death Registration 927–32
V. Birth and Death Statistics 932–5
VI. Fertility and Mortality 935–6
Sources Quoted 937–46
INDEX 947

SECOND PART

SOUTH AFRICA HIGH COMMISSION TERRITORIES[1]

CHAPTER VI

BASUTOLAND, BECHUANALAND, AND SWAZILAND

I. CENSUS-TAKING

1. *Up to 1936*

SINCE the beginning of this century censuses have been taken in Basutoland and Swaziland in 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936.[2] In Bechuanaland the population was ascertained in the earlier years through estimates or informal counts, but a census was carried out in 1936. The enumerations in Basutoland and Bechuanaland were made in accordance with Proclamations of 6 April 1904[3] which were amended by Proclamations in 1936.[4] The censuses in Swaziland were taken in accordance with 'The Census Ordinance 1904' of the Transvaal[5] which was applied *mutatis mutandis* to

[1] Each Territory is governed by a Resident Commissioner under the direction of the High Commissioner for Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland (formerly styled the High Commissioner for South Africa). The differences in the Acts governing census-taking and birth and death registration are due in part to differences in the earlier history of the Territories. Basutoland became British territory in 1868; it was annexed to the Cape Colony in 1871 but was placed again under the direct authority of the Crown in 1884. Bechuanaland became a Protectorate in 1885; a Proclamation by the High Commissioner for South Africa declared that the laws in force in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope on 10 June 1891 shall be in force in the Protectorate *mutatis mutandis*, and so far as not inapplicable. Swaziland, where a Provisional Government was established in 1890, came in 1894 under the administration of the South African Republic; after the conquest of the Transvaal the Governor of the Transvaal in 1903 obtained administrative and legislative power over Swaziland and proclaimed in 1904 that the laws in force in the Transvaal on 1 Oct. 1904 'shall *mutatis mutandis* and as far as they may be applicable be in force in' Swaziland. In 1907 the High Commissioner assumed control and established the present form of administration.

[2] In the nineteenth century censuses were taken only in Basutoland, in 1875 and 1891.

[3] Basutoland, No. 9 of 1904, reprinted in Basutoland, *Orders in Council*, &c., *1868–1913*, pp. 58–60; Bechuanaland, No. 10 of 1904, *Bechuanaland Proclamations 1898–1914*. The censuses of 1921 were taken on 3 May in accordance with High Commissioner's Notices Nos. 32 and 33 (6 Apr.), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa*, 15 Apr. 1921, p. 8. The censuses of 1936 were taken on 5 May in accordance with High Commissioner's Notices Nos. 198 and 199 of 1935 (7 Dec.), *Basutoland Proclamations and Notices, 1935*, p. 276, Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1935*, p. 218.

[4] Basutoland, No. 24 of 1936 (2 Apr.), 'Proclamation Amending the Basutoland Census Proclamation No. 9 of 1904', *Basutoland Proclamations and Notices, 1936*, p. 11; Bechuanaland, No. 21 of 1936 (18 Mar.), 'Proclamation Amending the Bechuanaland Protectorate Census Proclamation No. 10 of 1904', Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1936*, p. 18.

[5] No. 9 of 1904 (8 Feb.), 'Ordinance to Provide for the Taking of a Census from Time to Time', reprinted in *Ordinances of the Transvaal, 1904*, pp. 38–43, and in *Statute Law of the Transvaal 1839–1910*, vol. ii, pp. 1245–8. The census of 1921 was taken on 3 May in accordance with Proclamation No. 2 (Administration) of 1921 (6 Apr.), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa*, 15 Apr. 1921, p. 8. The census of 1936 was taken on 5 May in accordance with the High Commissioner's Proclamation No. 2 (Administration) of 1935 (7 Dec.), *Swaziland Orders in Council, &c., 1935*, p. 149.

Swaziland and which was amended by the 'Census Amendment Proclamation 1921'.[1]

The Proclamation for Basutoland, as amended in 1936, reads as follows:

Whereas it is expedient to provide for the taking of a Census from time to time within the territory of Basutoland:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the powers in me vested, I do hereby declare, proclaim and make known as follows:—

1. It shall be lawful for the Resident Commissioner to cause a Census to be taken within the territory of Basutoland at such time as shall be appointed by the High Commissioner by notice in the *Gazette*, and to appoint fit and proper persons to be called Census Officers for the purpose of conducting the Census within such Districts as he may assign to them.

2. The Resident Commissioner may for the purposes of this Proclamation and subject to its provisions from time to time make rules prescribing:—

(*a*) The duties of Census officers.

(*b*) The particulars and information to be furnished in relation to any matter in respect of which statistics may be collected under this Proclamation.

(*c*) The manner and form in which, the times and places at which, and the persons by whom and to whom, such particulars and information shall be furnished.

The regulations may provide that any person who, without reasonable cause, makes default in complying therewith shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding ten pounds or, in default of payment to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month.

3. Any person occupying any land, house, enclosure or other place shall allow any Census Officer such access thereto as he may require for the purpose of the Census and as may be reasonable, and shall allow him to paint, mark or affix on or to the property in the occupation of such person such letters, marks or numbers as may be necessary for the purposes of the Census.

4. Every Census Officer may ask all such questions of all persons within the District assigned to him as by rule made under this Proclamation he may be directed to ask.

5. (1) Subject to such rules as the Resident Commissioner may make in this behalf any Census Officer may leave or cause to be left a schedule in the form prescribed at any dwelling-house within the District assigned to him for the purpose of its being filled up by the occupier of such house or of any specified part thereof.

(2) When any such schedule has been so left the occupier of the house or part to which it relates shall fill it up to the best of his knowledge and belief so far as regards the inmates of such house or part as the case may be at the time of the taking of Census and shall sign his name thereto, and when so required shall deliver the schedule so filled up and signed to the Census Officer.

6. (1) Subject to any rules made under this Proclamation any Census Officer may deliver or cause to be delivered to

(*a*) Every person in charge of a lunatic asylum, hospital, workhouse, prison, police station, reformatory, lock-up or of any public, charitable, religious or educational institution; or to

(*b*) every keeper, secretary or manager of any hotel, boarding-house, lodging-house or club;

a schedule in the prescribed form, to be filled up in relation to the persons who at the time of the taking of Census are under his charge or inmates of his house.

(2) The person to whom the schedule is so delivered shall fill up or cause the same to be filled up to the best of his knowledge and belief so far as regards the inmates of such lunatic asylum, work-house, prison, police station, reformatory, lock-up or

[1] No. 13 of 1921 (6 Apr.), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa*, 15 Apr. 1921, p. 7.

public, charitable, religious or educational institution, or such hotel, boarding-house, lodging-house or club at the time aforesaid, and shall sign his name thereto, and when so required shall deliver the schedule so filled up and signed to the Census Officer.

7. The Resident Commissioner shall obtain by such ways and means as shall appear to him best adapted for the purpose the information required by this Proclamation or by the rules made thereunder with respect to:—

(*a*) any body of men belonging to His Majesty's Military Forces;

(*b*) all persons who during the time appointed for taking any Census were travelling or for any other reason were not abiding in any house of which account is to be taken by the Census Officer as aforesaid;

and shall include such information in the abstract to be made by him as hereinafter provided.

8. It shall be the duty of the Census Officers to deliver or cause to be delivered to any Superintendent or person in charge of any mine or estate on which labourers are employed schedules in the prescribed form to be filled up by such Superintendent or person in charge with the particulars required in such schedule.

9. The Resident Commissioner shall cause an abstract to be made of all schedules and returns and shall forward the said abstract to the High Commissioner.

10. Any Census Officer who,

(*a*) without sufficient cause refuses or neglects to act as such or to use reasonable diligence and care in performing any duty imposed upon him;

(*b*) wilfully puts an offensive or improper question or knowingly makes any false return;

(*c*) asks, receives or takes from any person otherwise than an authorised Officer of the Administration any payment or reward;

(*d*) divulges any information obtained during the performance of his duty as an Officer of the Census;

shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding one hundred pounds, and in default of payment to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month or to both such fine and such imprisonment.

11. This Proclamation shall have force and take effect from the date of its publication in the *Gazette*.

The Proclamation for Bechuanaland is identical with that for Basutoland.

The Ordinance for Swaziland, as amended in 1921, reads as follows:

1. It shall be lawful for the High Commissioner to appoint from time to time by Proclamation published in the *Gazette* that a census be taken at such time as shall be notified in such Proclamation, and any day upon which falls the time so appointed shall be known as Census day.

2. It shall be lawful for the High Commissioner to appoint a fit and proper person to be called the 'Commissioner of the Census' to superintend the taking of any census and at any time to appoint some other person in his place or to appoint any person to act temporarily for such Commissioner of the Census.

3. The High Commissioner may make rules—

(1) prescribing the duties of census officers;

(2) prescribing any forms to be used in the taking of a census under this Proclamation and the particular forms to be used for particular purposes in relation to any census;

(3) prescribing the particulars to be furnished by or on behalf of the occupier of every dwelling in Swaziland in respect of every living person who slept at that dwelling on the night of the census day;

(4) prescribing the particulars to be furnished by every person having charge of any live stock on census day, in respect of that live stock;

(5) providing for the collection of statistics relating to agriculture, education, religious denominations, industrial, mining and commercial establishments and undertakings, and to friendly or building societies or trades unions or to any society formed for lawful objects, or to unemployment;

(6) providing for the ascertaining of the number of persons and live stock travelling, or produce or articles of commerce being conveyed, on census day within Swaziland and for the obtaining of the prescribed particulars in respect of every such person and live stock, produce, or articles;

(7) prescribing the mode in which any information shall be obtained for the purposes of the census and generally for the better carrying out of the objects and purposes of this Proclamation.

The rules may provide penalties for a contravention thereof or failure to comply therewith, not exceeding a fine of ten pounds or, in default of payment, imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month.

4. The Commissioner may in writing appoint any person as enumerator or supervisor or in such other capacity as may be necessary to take or aid in taking or to supervise the taking of the census within any specified local area and may at any time revoke such appointment.

5. Every Commissioner of Census and every person appointed under section *two* or section *four* of this Ordinance shall be a census officer within the meaning of this Ordinance.

6. [same as Basutoland, 3.]

7. Every census officer may ask all such questions of all persons within the limits of his local area as by rule made in this behalf by the High Commissioner he may be directed to ask.

8. Every person of whom any question is asked under the last preceding section shall be bound to answer such question to the best of his knowledge and belief.

9–12. [practically the same as Basutoland, 5–8.]

13. Every enumerator shall deliver to the supervisor all schedules and all such returns as may be required by the Commissioner of the Census on or before a day to be appointed for the purpose by the Commissioner and it shall be the duty of such supervisor to verify them and to transmit them forthwith to the Commissioner.

14. The Commissioner of the Census shall upon the receipt of the schedule and returns cause an abstract to be made of the same and forward the said abstract to the High Commissioner within such time as may be appointed by the High Commissioner and the same shall be printed and published for general information.

15. [same as Basutoland, 10.]

16. Any person who;

(*a*) refuses to answer to the best of his knowledge and belief any question asked of him by an enumerator which he is legally bound so to answer or wilfully makes a false answer thereto;

(*b*) makes signs delivers or causes to be made signed or delivered any wilfully false or incorrect schedule statement or return;

(*c*) refuses to allow the enumerator such reasonable access to any land house enclosure or other place as he is required by this Ordinance to allow;

(*d*) removes obliterates alters or injures before the expiry of four weeks from the time of the taking of census letters marks or numbers which have been painted marked or affixed for the purposes of the census;

(*e*) refuses or neglects to comply with any provision of this Ordinance or of any rule made thereunder;

shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding ten pounds or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month.

17. No entry in any book register or record made by a census officer or by any other person in the discharge of his duty under this Ordinance shall be admissible as evidence in any civil or in any criminal proceeding save and except a prosecution instituted under this Ordinance in respect of such entry against the person who made

signed or delivered the same or caused the same to be made signed or delivered anything in any Ordinance contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

'Regulations for the Taking of the Census, 1936' were made by the Acting Resident Commissioner of Basutoland and the Resident Commissioner of Bechuanaland and approved by the High Commissioner,[1] who made similar Regulations for Swaziland.[2]

The Regulations for Basutoland provided:

1. At the Census to be taken on the fifth day of May, 1936, the forms set forth in the Schedules annexed hereto, marked A, B, C and D shall be the forms to be completed with reference to persons, dwellings and live-stock.

The said forms shall be supplied by the Government Secretary of Basutoland.

2. The occupier or person in charge of any house, hut, building, structure, booth, tent or other erection, or any wagon, cart, or other vehicle in or under which any person habitually sleeps, at which any appropriate form set forth in the Schedules A, B, C and D referred to in the preceding regulation has been delivered by a census officer, shall, on demand, hand over the same duly completed in every particular to the census officer who calls for or requires the return of the form: Provided that any persons residing in an hotel, boarding-house, or similar establishment, may furnish the required particulars on separate forms and hand the same to the census officer in sealed envelopes.

3. It shall be the duty of every owner or person in charge of every wagon or other vehicle, whether plying for hire or not, proceeding on any journey necessitating an outspan or camp out on the night of the census day, to make such arrangements as will ensure the enumeration of all persons travelling in or upon such wagon or other vehicle, as well as any other person accompanying such owner or person in charge; provided that nothing in this regulation shall absolve any such passenger or other person from individual liability under Regulation No. 4 should such owner or person in charge fail to ensure such enumeration.

4. Any person who, from any cause whatsoever, has not been enumerated within ten days after the census day, shall, not later than the fourteenth day after the said day, attend at the office or residence of the District Commissioner, Assistant District Commissioner or a census officer of the district in which he is at the expiry of the tenth day after the census day and shall then and there complete the appropriate form or furnish the District Commissioner, Assistant District Commissioner or census officer with such particulars as may be required to complete such form.

5. Any person who, without reasonable cause, makes default in complying with any of the foregoing regulations shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding ten pounds, or, in default of payment, to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month.

The Regulations for Bechuanaland were as follows:

1. 2. [same as Basutoland 1. 2., but references to Schedules A, B, C, D, E, and F.]

3. Every person travelling in any railway carriage or employed in or upon any railway train on the night of the census day shall answer, fully, truly, and correctly all questions put to him by any census officer to enable such census officer to complete in respect of such person or any member of his household travelling with him the form set forth in Schedule F of these regulations.

Every form so filled up shall be attested by the signature or mark of such person.

4. To every such person as in the last preceding regulation mentioned who shall

[1] See High Commissioner's Notices Nos. 51 (27 Mar.) and 57 (9 Apr.), Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1936*, pp. 94–105, *Basutoland Proclamations and Notices, 1936*, pp. 95–103.

[2] See High Commissioner's Notice No. 60 (9 Apr.), *Swaziland Orders-in-Council, &c., 1936*, pp. 33 (1–10).

have furnished the required particulars the census officer shall issue a certificate recording the fact that such person has been enumerated, and such person shall be bound to hand the said certificate to the occupier or person in charge of the first dwelling at which he assumes residence after leaving the railway train.

5. Every person travelling in any aircraft within the Bechuanaland Protectorate on the night of the census day shall, if he has not been enumerated elsewhere, furnish the census officer appointed at the first airport at which the aircraft lands, with such particulars as may be required for the completion in respect of such person or any member of his household travelling with him of the form set forth in Schedule F of these regulations.

6. [same as Basutoland 3., but reference to 'regulation No. 7'.]

7. [practically the same as Basutoland 4.]

8. [same as Basutoland 5.]

The Regulations for Swaziland were as follows:

1–3. [same as Basutoland 1–3, but references to Schedules 'A, B, C, D, and E', and no reference to livestock.]

4. [practically the same as Basutoland 4.]

5. Any person who fails to comply with any of the foregoing regulations shall be liable on conviction to the penalties prescribed in section *sixteen* of Transvaal Ordinance No. 9 of 1904, as amended and in force in Swaziland.[1]

Thus the number of different schedules used was not the same in the three Territories, but the following schedules were used in each of them:

Schedule 'A'. Particulars to be furnished in respect of Europeans, and Dwellings occupied by them.

Schedule 'B'. Particulars to be furnished in respect of Coloured Persons and Persons of Mixed Race, and Dwellings occupied by them.

Schedule 'C'. Particulars to be furnished in respect of Indians and other Asiatics, and Dwellings occupied by them.

I shall reproduce here the particulars asked in Schedule A in Basutoland, omitting those referring to dwellings and showing in footnotes the deviations of Schedules B and C from Schedule A.

A.—*Name in full* of each European,[2] whether member of family, visitor, lodger or servant, who spent the night between Tuesday, 5th May, and Wednesday, 6th May, 1936, in this dwelling, or who was absent on that night but returned to these premises on the 6th May without having been counted elsewhere.[3]

B.—*Relationship to Head of Family:* State whether the person whose name appears at the top of the column, is the head or wife, son or daughter, visitor, lodger, etc.

C.—*Sex:* State whether the person recorded in each column is a male or female. Write M. for male, and F. for female.

D.—Date of Birth.[4]

E.—*Age:* In years and months. (For infants under one month, write 'Under 1 month.')

F.—(i) *Industry, Trade, Profession, or Service:* State the branch of industry, trade, etc., in which employed, such as gold-mining, building, legal, municipal service, etc.[5] For persons receiving wages or salary, the industry, etc.,

[1] See p. 4 above.

[2] Schedule B, 'person'; Schedule C, 'Asiatic'.

[3] Added in Schedule B: 'State in regard to each person the particular branch or section of the Coloured Race to which he or she belongs, e.g. Cape Malay, Cape Coloured, Griqua, Koranna, Hottentot, Bushman, Namaqua, St. Helenian, Zanzibari, Swahili, etc.'

[4] Omitted in Schedule C.

[5] Schedule C, 'gold-mining, building, legal, commercial business, municipal service, etc.'

will be that industry or business which is carried on by the employer. For domestic servants and others in private personal service, write 'Personal Service.' For persons employed in unpaid domestic service at home, write 'Home Duties.'

(ii) *Personal Occupation or Craft:* State the craft or calling which each person was following at the time of the Census, such as Clerk, Attorney, Blacksmith, Governess, Music Teacher, etc.[1] If out of work at time of Census, state usual occupation. (If retired from business, of independent means, or if living solely on a pension, state accordingly.)

(iii) *Unemployment:* State as correctly as possible, number of days lost during the period 1st May, 1935, to 30th April, 1936, through—

(*a*) Sickness, Accident or Injury . . . . . .
(*b*) Scarcity of work . . . . . .
(*c*) Old age . . . . . .
(*d*) Other cause (state) . . . . . .

G.—*Marriage:*

If never married.	write 1
If married	write 2
If widowed, but not remarried	write 3
If divorced, but not remarried	write 4

H.—*Nationality:*[2] State the nation of which you are at present a subject. Persons of Union citizenship or nationality, whether such by birth, domicile, or naturalization, should record themselves as 'South African.' If a British or Union subject by naturalization, add 'N.'

I.—*Birthplace:*[3] If born in South Africa, state the Province or Territory in which born. In other cases, insert name of Country only, or if born at sea, insert 'At Sea.'

J.—*Residence in Basutoland:* If not born in Basutoland, state the number of completed years of residence therein (ignoring temporary absences). If resident less than one year, write 'Under One.'

K.—*Languages:*

If able to speak both English and Afrikaans	write 1
If able to speak English only	write 2
If able to speak Afrikaans only	write 3
If unable to speak either English or Afrikaans . . .	write 4

L.[4]—What is the language usually spoken in your home?

M.—*Religion:*[5] State clearly the religious denomination or sect. Do not use words that may stand for more than one religious body, such as 'protestant,' 'catholic,' etc.

N.[6]—*Visitors:* State in regard to visitors, and relatives present in this dwelling on Census night (i.e. enumerated on this form), their usual or normal place of residence, in the column headed by their respective names, giving the magisterial district and town or farm. Temporary visitors from beyond the Basutoland Borders to state country of residence only.

[1] Schedule C, 'Clerk, Attorney, Blacksmith, Nurse, Manager, Typist'.

[2] Schedule C: 'Nationality: State whether British Indian, Portuguese Indian, South African Indian, Chinese, Japanese, Burmese, etc.'

[3] Schedule C: 'Birthplace: If born outside Basutoland, state the Country, or in the case of Indians, the Province of India in which born. If born in the Union, state whether in the Cape, Natal, Transvaal, or Orange Free State Province. If born at sea, write "At Sea".'

[4] Schedule C: 'What is the Asiatic language usually spoken in your home? viz.: Tamil, Hindi, Telegu, Gujarati, Urdu, Chinese, Japanese, etc.'

[5] Schedule C: 'Religion: State clearly the particular religion such as "Hindu," "Buddhist," "Parsee," "Mohammedan," "Confucian," "Shinto," "Roman Catholic," etc.'

[6] Omitted in Schedule C.

Schedules A and B in Bechuanaland and Swaziland were the same as in Basutoland, with one exception. The question concerning Nationality read as follows:

Bechuanaland: 'State the nation of which you are at present a subject. If a British or Union subject by naturalization, add "N."'

Swaziland: 'State the nation of which you are at present a subject.'

Schedule C in Bechuanaland and Swaziland was the same as in Basutoland, except that the question concerning Birthplace read in Swaziland:

'If born outside Swaziland, state the Country.'

In Basutoland Schedule 'D' asked for the following '*Particulars to be furnished in respect of Natives*':[1]

Name of Head of Family.

Head of Family or Relationship to Head of Family.

Sex.

Age.—1. Infant (under 1 year). 2. Child (1–14 years). 3. Mature (15–50 years). 4. Old Age (over 50 years).

Condition as to Marriage. 1. Single. 2. Married. 3. Widowed. 4. Divorced. If married according to Native Custom, state Number of Wives Living.

Education. 1. Read and Write. 2. Read only. 3. Unable to Read and Write.

Mission at which Educated. E. = Church of England. R.C. = Roman Catholic. F.P. = French Protestant. Etc. State Religion of Mission.

Occupation. Peasant, Teacher, Scholar, etc.

Birthplace. If Born Outside South Africa (which for this Census includes South-West Africa and Northern Rhodesia), state the Country only. If Born in South Africa, state whether 'Cape,' 'Natal,' 'Transvaal,' 'O.F.S.,' 'Basutoland,' 'Bechuanaland Protectorate,' 'Rhodesia,' 'South-West Africa,' or 'Swaziland.'

Religious Denomination. C.E. = Church of England. R.C. = Roman Catholic. F.P. = French Protestant. A.M.E. = African Methodist Episcopalian. Etc.

Tribe. Basuto, Zulu, Tembu, Fingo, Pondo, etc.

Particulars of Absent Members of Family. Number of Persons Absent at Labour Centres (Mines, Harbours, Railways, Domestic Services, etc.):—Males, Females, Persons.

In Bechuanaland Schedule 'D' asked for the following particulars concerning Natives:[2]

Ruling Tribe.

Sub-Tribe of Persons here enumerated. (Persons of different sub-tribes or races and aliens must appear on separate forms for each group.)

Head of Family.

Males. Unweaned Babies. Under 16. Over 16. Old People.

Females. Unweaned Babies. Under 16. Over 16. Old People.

Educational. Literate. Males, Females, Total. Illiterate. Males, Females, Total.

Religious Denomination of Family. London Missionary Society, Church of England, Roman Catholic. (No denomination, insert a dash.)

Occupation, if any, of Head of Family.

Absentee Members. Mines. Farm Work. Visiting. Miscellaneous.

In Swaziland two schedules were used for the enumeration of Natives.

Schedule 'D'. Particulars to be furnished in respect of Natives (Bantu) and Dwellings occupied by them in Urban Areas.

[1] I do not reproduce here questions concerning livestock, vehicles, and huts.

[2] I do not reproduce here questions concerning livestock and vehicles.

Schedule 'E'. Particulars to be furnished in respect of Natives and Dwellings occupied by them in Native Areas, Reserves, Locations and of Crown Lands, Native and Tribally owned Farms.

The questions on Schedule 'D', apart from those concerning dwellings, were as follows:

A. B. C. [Practically the same as Schedule 'A'.]

D. *Age.*—If age is less than one year, write 'under one.' If age is over one year, state age last birthday, or approximate age if exact age is unknown.

E. *Personal Occupation or Craft.* State the craft or calling which each person was following at the time of the Census, such as Peasant, Squatter, Farm Labourer, Teacher, Messenger, Domestic Servant, Boot Repairer, Home Duties, etc. Give full particulars, such as Goldmine Labourer, Railway Labourer, Builder's Labourer.

F.—*Marriage:*

If never married	write 1
If married (including by Native Custom)	write 2
If widowed, but not remarried	write 3
If divorced, but not remarried	write 4

G.—*Birthplace.*—If born outside Swaziland, state country only.

H.—*Religion.*—State clearly the particular religious denomination or sect, such as 'Nederduits Gereformeerde Kerk,' 'Wesleyan,' 'Roman Catholic,' 'English Church,' 'Separatist Native Church,' etc. If no religion write 'Heathen.'

I.—*Tribe.*—State the tribe to which each person belongs, e.g.: 'Baca,' 'Barolong,' 'Barotse,' 'Basuto,' 'Bavenda,' 'Bechuana,' 'Bomvana,' 'Damara,' 'Fingo,' 'Herero,' 'Hlangweni,' 'Mashona,' 'Mozambique,' 'Ndebele,' 'Ovambo,' 'Pondo,' 'Pondomise,' 'Shangaan,' 'Swazi,' 'Tembu,' 'Tonga,' 'Xesibe,' 'Xosa,' 'Zulu.'

The questions on Schedule 'E', apart from those concerning dwelling huts, were as follows:

Name of Kraalhead.
Name of Head of Family.
Head of Family or Relationship to Head.
Sex (M. = Male; F. = Female).
Age (Exact age or approximate. If less than 1 year, write 'Under one').
Personal Occupation.
Marriage (S. = Single; Mar. = Married; Wid. = Widowed; Div. = Divorced).
Where Born (Province or Country).
Religious Denomination.
Tribe.
Where Employed.
Native Reserves or Locations (not Municipal Locations):—
Number of Persons absent for Labour purposes on Farms, Railways, Mines, or Domestic Service, etc.: Males, Females, Persons.

There were in addition in Bechuanaland a Schedule 'E', asking 'Particulars to be furnished in respect of Live Stock in Urban Areas', and a Schedule 'F', asking 'Particulars to be furnished in respect of Persons travelling by Rail or Aircraft'.

It will be noticed that the important question regarding native absentees differed in the three Territories. Basutoland asked for the number of male and female persons absent at Labour Centres; Swaziland asked for the number of male and female persons absent for labour purposes;

Bechuanaland asked for the number of absentees, without distinction of sex, but according to the occupation or purpose (for example: mines, farm work, visiting).

As regards the more recent censuses, the published official documents throw little light on the methods used and the accuracy of the results. But the information is more ample for the earlier censuses.

Basutoland

1875. The most noteworthy incident of the year has been the taking of the first Census. The announcement that a census would be taken awakened considerable trepidation in the minds of the natives, and most alarming rumours were spread by the timid and ignorant or by the evil disposed. Fortunately, the good sense of the people and the confidence which they reposed in the assurances of the government officers tended quickly to allay these feelings of alarm, and the Census was taken without any difficulty being made by either chiefs or people who cordially and cheerfully yielded such assistance as they could to the enumerators.[1]

The peaceful taking of the Census was a triumph for the Government.[2]

1891. By the courtesy of the Director of Census of the Cape Colony in affording full information as to the system there employed, we have been able to work on identical lines in the enumeration as far as was found practicable to extend it, and we have had the additional advantage of adopting all the carefully prepared Forms that were freely placed at our disposal. . . .

Basutoland officers were employed as Supervisors, the chiefs and headmen working with educated Basuto as enumerators.

Previous to the day appointed for the Census, nominal rolls of the heads of families and number of huts at the different villages and quantity of stock were taken by the enumerators acting under the direct supervision of the officers.

The five succeeding days were occupied in checking and amplifying results so obtained.

It was found necessary to detail one officer and influential native staff to ascertain the scattered population of the mountains.

The distances to be traversed, the flooded state of the rivers, and the sparse and scattered nature of the settlements rendered it impossible to make the final check of the results so obtained but there is no doubt in my mind that they are practically accurate. . . .

The difficulty arose in checking information, not in acquiring it. . . .

The paramount and other chiefs throughout the country rendered every support and assistance to Government and the various missionary bodies freely lent the services of the Schoolmasters which proved of much value.[3]

The census reports published for 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936 contain merely tables, but the Annual Colonial Reports make some comments on the 1904 and 1911 censuses.

1904. The enumeration of the people was accomplished without difficulty, and with the willing co-operation of the Chiefs and Headmen, and through the agency of native enumerators, who performed their duties with intelligence and zeal. The Directors of the Missions placed at the disposal of the Government for this purpose the services of a number of native school teachers, whose education enabled them to

[1] Annual Report of the Assistant Resident Magistrate, Thaba Bosigo Sub-District, 1875, Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1876*, p. 7.

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

[3] *Census Returns for Basutoland 1891* (Dispatch from Resident Commissioner to High Commissioner, dated 27 May 1891). See also *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1890–91*, p. 6.

render valuable assistance. There is every reason to think that the figures obtained as the result of this Census are substantially correct.[1]

1911. A Census of the inhabitants of the territory was taken by the Government during the two weeks beginning the night of the 23rd April and ending on the 7th May. Native enumerators were used throughout. The various Missions in the country very kindly closed their schools and placed their native teachers at the disposal of the Government as enumerators. These men were supervised by the European District Officers, and the result was distinctly satisfactory. The forms used were more elaborate and the information called for was considerably more advanced than that required on former occasions. The result was very satisfactory considering the difficulties with which the men had to deal. I give below the unaudited general return of population. This return may need some slight amendment, but in the meantime it may be taken as substantially correct.[2]

According to the 1921 census report of the Union of South Africa, 'the Union Census Office undertook and carried through the tabulation of the census schedules for Basutoland'.[3]

Bechuanaland

The reports on the estimates or counts, made in 1904, 1911, and 1921, consist of one or two tables. Figures for the 1936 census have apparently been published so far only in the *Official Year Book of the Union and of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland*.[4] But comments on the earlier enumerations are to be found in the Annual Colonial Reports for Bechuanaland Protectorate and in the Report of the Pim Commission.

1904, 1911. The Census [of 1911], for which preparations had been going on for some months, was not taken until the 7th of May . . . . The total population . . . amounted to 125,350, of whom 1,692 were Europeans. Seven years ago the total population was shown as 120,776, 1,004 being Europeans. According to these figures the native population has remained practically stationary, but I do not believe this to be the case. The Census taken in 1904 was not nearly so carefully taken or so accurate as that recently completed, and there can be no doubt that in N'gamiland the population was greatly over-estimated. This year, thanks largely to the very hearty support and valuable assistance of the Chief Mathiba, the returns from N'gamiland were wonderfully well prepared. They showed a total population of 11,172 as against 21,000 in 1904. In the case of the Kalahari desert, too, the population, which was given as 18,000 in 1904, was largely reduced when the people were more accurately counted last May, with the result that in the returns they now appear as 10,238 only.[5]

[1] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1903–4*, p. 6. See also the report of the Assistant Commissioner of Maseru District, ibid., p. 31: 'I was a little handicapped in the taking of the census owing to the absence of Lerothodi from the district, but I got him to appoint influential messengers to accompany my enumerators, and the whole work went off without a hitch. I employed 28 educated native enumerators and each one was accompanied by a Chief's messenger to prevent any trouble from individuals perhaps alleging that their Chief had not informed them of the proposed work. The Paris Evangelical Missionary Society placed at my disposal as many of their schoolmasters as I cared to employ, and I took advantage of this kind offer to call upon them for 24, and I am deeply grateful to the Society for their assistance, as it meant a great deal of inconvenience to them and practically the closing of all their schools in the district for a period of two weeks.'

[2] Ibid. *1910–11*, pp. 11–12. 'The 7th May was fixed for the census day after consultation with the Governments of Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, Rhodesia, and Swaziland, who all adopted the same date. In Basutoland, however, it was found necessary later to alter the date, and the census was taken in that territory on the 23rd April.' (*Census of the Union of South Africa 1911, Report*, p. v.)

[3] Union of South Africa, *Census of the Population, 1921*, Part I, p. vi.

[4] See, for example, *Year Book 1941*, p. 1193.

[5] Acting Resident Commissioner, *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland Protectorate 1910–11*, pp. 3–4.

1921. The census was unfortunately carried out on lines giving the minimum of information; it did not, for example, give any information as to the numbers of the different tribes. The degree of its accuracy may be estimated by the character of the methods which had to be adopted. In certain districts the census papers consisted of pieces of string in which the headman tied knots to indicate the number under his charge.[1]

Swaziland

The census reports published for 1911, 1921, and 1936 contain merely tables. The Union Census Office carried through the tabulation of the 1921 census schedules as for Basutoland. The Colonial Report for 1910–11 said that the figures shown at the census taken in May 1911 'may be taken as representing approximately the population present in the country in 1910'.[2]

The cost of the Basutoland 1936 census was £4,514. 6*s*. 5*d*.[3] or £8. 0*s*. 7*d*. for each 1,000 enumerated persons.[4] In Bechuanaland and Swaziland the expenditure was estimated at £800 and £400 respectively.[5] If these were the actual cost the expenditure for each 1,000 enumerated persons would have been £3. 0*s*. 2*d*. and £2. 14*s*. 4*d*. respectively.

2. *1946*

Notices issued by the High Commissioner provided that censuses be taken in Basutoland and Bechuanaland on 7 May 1946.[6] He made a similar Proclamation for Swaziland.[7]

'Regulations for the Taking of the Census, 1946' were made by the Resident Commissioners of Basutoland and Bechuanaland and approved by the High Commissioner, who made similar Regulations for Swaziland.[8]

The Regulations for Basutoland provided:

1. At the Census to be taken on the seventh day of May, 1946, the forms set forth in the Schedules annexed hereto, marked A and B, shall be the forms to be completed with reference to persons, dwellings and livestock.

The said forms will be supplied by the Government Secretary of Basutoland.

2–5. [practically the same as 1936, 2–5, but references to Schedules A and B only.]

The Regulations for Bechuanaland were as follows:

1. At the Census to be taken on the seventh day of May, 1946, the forms set forth in the Schedules annexed hereto, marked A, B, C, D, and E, shall be the forms to be completed with reference to persons, dwellings, livestock and agricultural products.

The said forms will be supplied by the Government Secretary of the Bechuanaland Protectorate.

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, p. 7. [2] *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1910–11*, p. 12.

[3] See Basutoland, *Annual Blue Book 1937*, p. 12; *1938*, p. 12.

[4] That a proper census cannot be taken without adequate expenditure was realized in Basutoland as far back as 1875. The census of that year cost £567. 17*s*. 6*d*. 'exclusive of establishments', or £4. 8*s*. 7*d*. for each 1,000 enumerated persons (see Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1876*, pp. 20–1; *1877*, p. 22).

[5] See Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure 1936–7*, p. 21; Swaziland, *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure 1936–7*, p. 17.

[6] Basutoland, No. 87 (18 Apr.), Bechuanaland, No. 88 (1 Apr.), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland*, 26 Apr. 1946, p. 18.

[7] No. 1 (Administration) of 1946 (18 Apr.), ibid., p. 17.

[8] See High Commissioner's Notices Nos. 90, 91, 92 of 25 Apr., ibid., 3 May 1946, pp. 22–33.

2. [same as 1936, 2, but reference to Schedules A, B, C, D, and E only.]

3. It shall be the duty of Native Authorities in the areas where Native Authorities have been appointed, and of District Commissioners in areas where no Native Authorities have been appointed, to assemble the heads of all native families at convenient places to meet the enumerators and there to give all the required information in respect of the members of their families.

4–7. [practically the same as 1936, 3–6, but references to Schedules D and E.]

8. Any person who, from any cause whatsoever, has not been enumerated within thirty days after the census day, shall, not later than the *fortieth* day after the said day, attend at the office or residence of the Administrative Officer or a census officer of the district in which he is at the expiry of the *thirtieth* day after the census day and shall then and there complete the appropriate form or furnish the Administrative Officer or census officer with such particulars as may be required to complete such form.

9. [same as 1936, 8.]

The Regulations for Swaziland were as follows:

1. At the census to be taken on the seventh day of May, 1946, the forms set forth in the Schedules annexed hereto, marked A and B shall be the forms to be completed with reference to persons and dwellings.

The said forms will be supplied by the Government Secretary of Swaziland.

2–5. [practically the same as Basutoland, 2–5.]

While in 1936 different Schedules (A, B, and C) were used for Europeans, for Coloured Persons and Persons of Mixed Race, and for Indians and other Asiatics, the same Schedule (A) was used in 1946 for all three groups. One Schedule was to cover all European, Asiatic, and Coloured members of a household 'who spent the night of 7th May in this dwelling'. I shall reproduce here first the particulars asked on the front page in Basutoland, showing in footnotes the slight deviations in Bechuanaland and Swaziland.

A.—*Name in Full* { Surname—in Block Letters. / Other (Christian) Names.

B.—*Relationship to Head of Family.*—Head, Wife, Son, Lodger, Servant, etc.

C.—*Race.*—European, Asiatic or Coloured.

D.—*Sex.*—Male or Female.

E.—*Date of Birth.*

F.—*Age.*—In years and months.

G.—*Marriage.*—Never Married, Married, Widowed or Divorced.

H.—(1) *Personal Occupation.*—For example: Blacksmith, Carpenter, Miner, Farmer, Milliner, Typist, Housewife, Scholar, etc.

(2) *Employment.*—'Own Business', Employee, Unemployed (i.e., out of a job) or not applicable.

(3) *Name of Employer.*—For example: A. B. Smith & Co., Benoni Gold Mines, Iscor, Union Government, not applicable, etc.[1]

(4) *Industry or Profession.*—For example: Building, Gold Mining, Coal Mining, Railways, Medical, Boot Manufacturing, General Dealing, etc.[2]

I.—*Birthplace.*—Country or Province of Union.[3]

[1] In Swaziland: '*Name of Employer.*—For example: A. B. Smith & Co., Havelock Mine, Swaziland Government, not applicable, etc.'

[2] In Swaziland: '*Industry or Profession.*—For example: Building, Gold Mining, Railways, Medical, General Dealing, etc.'

[3] In Bechuanaland: '*Birthplace.*—Name of Country only.'

J.—*Period of Residence in Basutoland.*[1]—(If not born in Basutoland.)[1] [In years and months.]

K.—*Present Nationality.*—South African, S. A. Naturalized, British, French, Indian, etc.

L.—*Home Language.*—i.e. the language spoken most frequently at home.

M.—*Languages.*—If able to speak—Both English and Afrikaans, write 'Both'; English only, write 'English'; Afrikaans only, write 'Afrikaans'; Neither English nor Afrikaans, write 'Neither'.

N.—*Religion.*—State particular denomination.

O.—*Usual Place of Residence.*—For persons who usually live in this dwelling, write 'Here'. For others give usual residential address in full.

The reverse side of Schedule A asked in Basutoland for the following particulars:[2]

A.—*Income of Individuals.* Total income during 12 months, 1st January, to 31st December, 1945, of each person enumerated on the other side of this form. Do not state the actual amount of income, but mark the income group[3] of each person with a X . . . .

B.—*Particulars of Family.* (Each family on a separate form.)

1. *Members of Family* whether present or not on night of Census:—

	Number.		
	Males.	*Females.*	*Persons.*
Head and/or Wife			
Children under 16 years of age . . .			
Children 16 years and over			
Total in Family			

2. Particulars of *Principal Breadwinner* supporting Family:—
Race; Sex; Age; Never Married, Married, Widowed or Divorced; Relationship to Head of Family; Occupation.

3. How many members of this Family earned or received income during the 12 months 1st January, to 31st December, 1945?

C.—*Particulars of Whole Dwelling. . . .*

Schedule B was used for Africans. In Bechuanaland the particulars asked for each person were as follows:[4]

A.[5]—*Name.*

B.—*Head of Family.*—Or relationship to Head, i.e. Wife, Son, etc.

C.—*Sex.*—M = Male; F = Female.

D.—*Age.*—(Exact age or approximate. If less than 1 year, write 'Under One'.)

E.—(1) *Marriage.*—S = Single.
M = Married.
W = Widowed.
D = Divorced.

(2) If married state whether by Civil or Religious Rites or Native Custom.

[1] In Bechuanaland: 'Bechuanaland Protectorate'; in Swaziland: 'Swaziland'.

[2] Same in Bechuanaland and Swaziland, but there were (under B) 'Two Additional Questions for Families on Farms'.

[3] The income groups were: No income; Under £50 per year; £50 to £99; £100 to £149; £150 to £199; £200 to £249; £250 to £299; £300 to £349; £350 to £399; £400 to £499; £500 to £599; £600 to £799; £800 to £999; £1,000 to £1,999; £2,000 to £2,999; £3,000 to £3,999; £4,000 to £4,999; £5,000 and over.

[4] I shall show in footnotes essential deviations in Basutoland.

[5] Omitted in Basutoland.

(3) If married by Native Custom, state number of wives living.

(4) *In respect of married women*:

(*a*) Completed years of marriage.

(*b*) Number of children born.

(*c*) Children still living.

F.—*Present Personal Occupation.*—

(*a*) Nature of employment or occupation, viz., (Teacher, Scholar, Clerk, Housewife, etc.) [Peasants to state Other Occupations.]

(*b*) Wages *Per Month.*

(*c*) Working hours.

I.[1]—*Religious Denomination.*

J.—*Literacy.*

Native Language (Mother Tongue): Read and Write. Read only. Neither.
English: Read and Write. Read only. Neither.[2]
School Attendance: Now Attending. Standard Passed. Never Attended.

K.—*Languages spoken.*

Schedule B asked in addition in respect of each family: Ruling Tribe; Sub-Tribe; Number of Dwelling Huts owned; Number of persons absent outside the Territory at date of Census; Agricultural Statistics; Incidence of Blindness.[3] The particulars to be entered for persons absent were:

Male or Female.
How long has each person been absent from the Territory.
Present whereabouts (Town or Locality).
Occupation or other reason of absence: Mines or Industries. Farms. Miscellaneous Occupations. Visiting.

In Swaziland, where in 1936 one Schedule (D) was used for Natives in Urban Areas and one (E) for all other Natives, there was in 1945 apparently no Schedule for Natives in Urban Areas. Schedule B asked for the following 'Particulars to be furnished in respect of Natives residing in Native Areas, Reserves, Locations, Crown Lands, European-owned Farms, Tribally-owned Lands, and Native Land Settlement Areas':

A.—Name in full.

B.—Relationship to Head of Family.

C.—Sex (Male or Female).

D.—Age (Exact or approximate).

E.—(1) Marriage: Whether 'Never Married', 'Married', 'Widowed', 'Divorced'.

(2) If married state whether:

(*a*) By civil rites.

(*b*) By process of lobola.

(*c*) Just living together.

F.—(1) Present Occupation.

(2) By whom and where employed.

G.—Birthplace.

H.—In respect of women:—

(*a*) Number of children born.

(*b*) Number of children still alive.

I.—Religion: State denomination.

[1] This schedule did not include questions headed G and H.
[2] In Basutoland added: Afrikaans: Read and Write. Read only. Neither.
[3] Incidence of Blindness omitted in Basutoland.

J.—Literacy:—
Native Language.
English.
Afrikaans.

K.—Languages spoken.

L.—Place of residence: Native Area, Crown Land, etc., etc.

In Bechuanaland there were in addition a Schedule C asking for 'Particulars to be furnished in respect of livestock in Urban Areas', a Schedule D 'Railway Traveller's form (Europeans, Asiatics and Coloured persons)', and a Schedule E 'Railway Traveller's form (Africans)'.

II. Total Population

1. *Basutoland*

It has been stated that when Basutoland in 1868 was annexed by the British Government 'the total population can hardly have exceeded some 40,000',[1] but this was certainly an underestimate. Theal says that at the outbreak of the war between the Free State and the Basutos in 1865 the subjects of the paramount chief Moshesh were about 175,000,[2] and, if his statement that in August 1865 'some twenty thousand Basuto warriors were gathered' at Thaba Bosigo[3] is correct, Moshesh's subjects cannot have numbered very much less than 175,000. In the following four years the Basutos, to be sure, suffered considerably through war casualties, famine, disease, loss of territory, and emigration. The Governor's Agent, Charles D. Griffith, in a report dated 31 January 1874, described the situation in 1868 as follows:[4]

> The state of the Basutos at the conclusion of the war was most deplorable. Weakened by defection and desertion on every side, and by the loss of about 2,000 men, killed during the war,[5] reduced from considerable wealth and ease to complete poverty and destitution, and suffering from famine, they had no longer any force to oppose to their enemies. Their stock had been mostly captured or slaughtered, their ploughs and wagons, houses, clothes, money, and movable property captured or destroyed, whilst the people were so dispersed and intermingled that all organization was lost. . . . Owing to the impoverished state of the people, and to the general scarcity of food, as well as to the unwholesome state of the caves in which they lived, typhoid fevers had broken out everywhere, carrying off their victims by the hundred. At one time nearly one-half of the tribe was laid up with fever, and this contributed in no small degree to the general depression and discouragement. The Basutos were, so to speak, at the last gasp, and must infallibly have succumbed and been broken up as a tribe had the British Government not stepped in and saved them. At the peace the country occupied by them was reduced to about one-half of its original extent, whilst the tribes under 'Mopedi', 'Makwai', 'Lebenya', and 'Monyake', together with the Zulu settlers from Natal, forming an aggregate of not less

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, p. 29. For earlier estimates, see, for example, Letter from the Chief Moshesh to the Secretary to Government, 15 May 1845 (*Basutoland Records*, vol. i, pp. 84–5); Report of Commandant Gideon D. Joubert, 25 Aug. 1845 (ibid., pp. 108–9); Theal, *History of South Africa 1854–72*, pp. 160, 404; Ellenberger, *History of the Basuto*, pp. 302–3.

[2] See Theal, *History of South Africa 1854–72*, p. 160. [3] See ibid., p. 173; see also p. 178.

[4] Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1874*, p. 21.

[5] See also Memorandum of Sir Hercules Robinson, *Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland*, 1883, p. 6.

than 15,000 souls, had left the country.[1] The remnant were crushed and humbled. Their outward aspect was most pitiable. Clothed in ragged skins—many of them nearly naked, black, and emaciated, they seemed the last of human beings.

But great as the sufferings no doubt were, they did not affect the whole of the population,[2] and it, therefore, seems out of the question that it could have been reduced to something like 40,000. Moreover, the census of March 1875 showed a population of 128,176, and it is most unlikely that this census should have overstated the number of people.[3] It is true that between 1868 and 1875 the population grew through the return of former emigrants[4] and probably also through natural increase,[5] but there was apparently no immigration of persons born outside Basutoland,[6] and many Basutos working abroad, particularly in the Cape Colony and the Orange Free State, were absent from their homes on census date.[7] The population in 1868, therefore, cannot have been very much smaller than in 1875.

[1] 'Ten thousand men, it is estimated, distributed themselves throughout the neighbouring districts of the Cape Colony, Kimberley, the Orange Free States, and Natal, in search of labour' (Irvine, *British Basutoland and the Basutos*, p. 19). '. . . about 15,000 had migrated in despair . . .' (Lagden, *The Basutos*, vol. ii, p. 480).

[2] Thus the Resident Magistrate of Quthing District reported that the people of this District 'were but little involved in the Free State Basuto war, and consequently lost little or no stock, as I can only hear of one very half-hearted and profitless raid having been made to this part' (Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1878*, p. 17). See also Theal, *History of South Africa 1854–72*, p. 276: 'But though some sections of the [Basuto] tribe were reduced to the direst distress, others had hardly suffered at all.'

[3] The official report stated that the census was taken in Basutoland 'with very satisfactory results' (*Census of the Cape of Good Hope 1875*, Part I, p. 2), but Widdicombe said that the census 'was a first attempt, and necessarily imperfect and incomplete' (*Fourteen Years in Basutoland*, pp. 40–1). The census figure, moreover, was not higher than had been expected. In a report made a month before the taking of the census the Governor's Agent had said: 'The population of this territory, roughly estimated, I should take to be from 120,000 to 140,000 souls' (Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1875*, p. 3).

[4] The Assistant Resident Magistrate of the Thaba Bosigo District, Emile Rolland, told of these returners in his annual reports for 1872–4. 'Considerable numbers of Basutos have . . . returned from service in the [Cape] Colony and Free State, bringing with them the earnings of several years' (*Report of the Governor's Agent, Basutoland, for 1872*, p. 8). 'A large extent of fresh ground has been brought under cultivation, and the population as well as the live-stock have been increased by the arrival of a good many Basutos returning with their earnings from the Free State and Cape Colony' (Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1874*, p. 35). At the Annual Public Meeting (Pitso) held at Maseru on 2 Oct. 1874 he stated: 'People who have been absent for many years, are coming back with the wealth they have acquired . . .' (ibid. *1875*, p. 15). A considerable number, however, remained abroad. At the same meeting one headman said: 'As to the narrowness of the country, many who come home to us from the Colony will be obliged to go back again; I think even now there must be more Basutos in the Orange Free State than there are in the Lesutho [Basutoland]. There is no room for them here.' (Ibid., p. 20.)

[5] See in this connexion the statement of Chief Mokhameledi, brother of the late Moshesh, at the meeting in Maseru on 2 Oct. 1874: 'This is the largest pitso I have seen for years . . . . These people were all scattered by famine; to-day there is abundance, and the people begin to return. Our houses used to be but little huts, and few were our children; now we want larger dwellings, and our children are rapidly increasing in number.' (Ibid., p. 17.) As regards the general progress of the country in 1868–75 see also report of District Surgeon, Thaba Bosigo District, for 1878 (ibid. *1879*, p. 28), and Rolland's statement before the Committee on Hostilities in Basutoland, 27 Aug. 1879 (*Report*, pp. 82–3).

[6] At the census of 1875 only 2,373 persons were returned as born outside Basutoland; see *Census of the Cape of Good Hope 1875*, Part II, p. 527.

[7] Migration to neighbouring countries for work had been customary for several decades. Basutos worked on Boer farms in the Orange Free State in the 1840's. Casalis wrote in 1859: 'The country of the Basutos furnished the Cape Colony every year with a great many workmen who easily

The census of 1891 showed a population of 218,902. It is obvious that if the number of inhabitants did actually increase by as much as 71 per cent. (or 3·4 per cent. per year) since 1875, immigration must have been very great. But there is no doubt that immigration was considerable. A *Précis of Information* published by the War Office in November 1877 said that 'there was a great influx of population in 1876, from crowded parts of surrounding districts',[1] and until 1879 the population increased not only by immigration of persons born abroad but also by the return of former emigrants and by natural increase.[2] However, the Morosi rebellion (1879), the Gun War (1880–1), and the ensuing disorders which lasted until 1885 checked population growth. Many of the 'Loyals' fled to the Orange Free State[3] or to East Griqualand.[4] But immigration started again in 1885 and led to a considerable population increase.

1885. The population has greatly increased during the past year. Natives from the outlying territories have immigrated in numbers . . . .[5]

1886. The Basuto and the stock they possess are increasing very rapidly.[6]

found employment owing to the confidence inspired by their reputation for loyalty and honesty' (*Les Bassoutos*, p. 123). But the exodus apparently reached enormous proportions when the defeated Basutos had lost their most fertile lands (1868). 'After 1869 the Basuto became the more or less permanent labour force of the Free State' (de Kiewiet, *British Colonial Policy*, p. 235; see also, for example, de Kiewiet, *The Imperial Factor in South Africa*, pp. 154–5, and *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, vol. viii, pp. 444, 814). The official reports from Basutoland in 1872–4 give many details concerning those migrant workers (see *Report of the Governor's Agent, Basutoland, for 1872*, pp. 2, 6–7; Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1874*, pp. 22–3, 34–6, *1875*, pp. 7, 9–10). Rolland, in a report dated 31 Dec. 1875, stated (ibid. *1876*, p. 8):

'That the Basutos may compare favourably with other South African natives, in respect of their industry, can also be deduced from the fact that out of a population of 25,000 adult males, of whom (excluding old men, headmen, and persons actually employed in Basutoland) some 20,000 may be considered as able bodied labourers, about 15,000 annually receiving passes to go and work in the Free State, the Colony, and the Diamond-fields, that is to say, not only do the men work at home, raising with the help of their women from 30 to 40 bags of grain per household, but the European communities get the benefit of the labour of 3 out of 4 of all who are able to work.

. . . passes have been issued during the year 1875 at this Magistracy (population about 26,000 souls) to over 7,500 persons, being more than 1,000 over last year.' (The numbers of passes issued in 1872 and 1873 had been 6,445 and 6,549 respectively; see ibid. *1874*, pp. 35–6.)

The total number of persons born in Basutoland and enumerated in the Cape Colony at the 1875 census was 11,249. Unfortunately figures are not available for the Orange Free State.

[1] *Précis of Information concerning South Africa*, &c., p. 79; see also Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1877*, p. 6.

[2] See ibid. *1878*, p. 17; *1880*, pp. 19, 28. Rolland, on 27 Aug. 1879, estimated the population of Basutoland at 'between 140,000 and 150,000' (*Report of Committee on Hostilities in Basutoland*, p. 94), and J. M. Orpen put it in 1880 at 150,000 (*Some Principles of Native Government*, p. 1).

[3] See Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1881*, p. 7; *1882*, vol. i, part i, pp. 216, 219, part ii, p. 2.

[4] See ibid. *1884*, p. 95.

[5] Report of Resident Commissioner Basutoland, for 1884–5, *Further Correspondence respecting the Cape Colony and adjacent Territories*, p. 26. See also ibid., pp. 36, 38. The Assistant Commissioner, Leribe District, estimated the population of this District at 48,900 'exclusive of numerous settlers in mountains who acknowledge no Chief' (ibid., p. 40). 'The increase upon the number 31,367 (according to census of 1875) is accounted for by natural increase of population and immigration from other districts, the Free State, &c., &c. . . . There appears to have been of late years an increase in the numbers of dwellers in the mountains, but it is impossible to form even an estimate of the numbers of such a population.'

[6] Report of Assistant Commissioner Mafeteng, 1885–6, *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland*, p. 21. See also Report of Assistant Commissioner, Leribe District (ibid., p. 23): '. . . immigration from the Free State continues.'

1887. Berea. It is generally admitted that, in addition to natural increase, there has been a considerable influx of emigrants from other districts and territories.[1]

Leribe. There is a large number of new villages in this district, inhabited by people coming in from the Orange Free State and elsewhere.[2]

1888. Cornet Spruit. Population is on the increase, more especially in the mountainous parts of the district.[3]

1891. During the last ten years thousands of natives of various tribes, chiefly Kafirs from the Transkeian territories, and Barolongs from Thaba 'Nchu, have emigrated into Basutoland with the consent of Letsie and the other chiefs, and now even the remote valleys of the Malutis are rapidly becoming populated. . . . It is thought that the present population cannot be far, if anything, short of a quarter of a million.[4]

Since the population ascertained at the 1891 census was 219,000, it may seem as if Widdicombe, whose book was published a few months before the census was taken, had over-estimated the population. But the census probably was not complete.

For the next years the increase was believed to be very large, but not so in the period 1896–1903.

1895. Population is increasing steadily both by natural increase and immigration. According to the Census of 1891 there was a total of 211,324 souls;[5] it is now estimated at 250,000.[6]

1899. A calculation based on the increased payment of Hut Tax gives 263,600 as the present native population, which is probably not far from the actual number.[7]

1901. In compliance with instructions from the High Commissioner, an estimate of the population was carefully prepared. . . .[8]

Besides the ordinary resident population [263,414], there are as refugees in this

[1] Report of Acting Assistant Commissioner, Berea District, 1886–7, *Despatch from Sir Hercules Robinson*, &c., 1887, p. 8.

[2] Report of Assistant Commissioner, Leribe District, 1886–7, ibid., p. 13. It should be noted, however, that in some cases the immigrants were returning emigrants. See Report of Assistant Commissioner, Leribe District, 1887–8, *Report of Resident Commissioner 1887–8*, p. 15: '. . . the population of the district . . . is increasing rapidly through the influx of families who have been working for some years in the Cape Colony and Orange Free State, and are now returning to Basutoland with their stock.'

[3] Report of Inspector, B.M.P., Cornet Spruit District, 1887–8, ibid., p. 13.

[4] Widdicombe, *Fourteen Years in Basutoland*, pp. 40–1. Permanent emigration is mentioned only in a few cases (see *Further Correspondence respecting the Cape Colony and adjacent Territories*, 1885, p. 31; *Report of the Resident Commissioner 1888–9*, p. 21), and was apparently on a small scale. But the official documents for 1875–91 contain a mass of information concerning the large temporary migration to the Cape Colony and the Orange Free State. In the year ending 30 June 1889 'more than 40,000', and in the following twelve months 'over 39,000' passes were issued to Basutos leaving the country (see *Report of Resident Commissioner 1888–9*, p. 5; *1889–90*, p. 5). Many of the natives returned after having been abroad for only six months or less, and 'owing chiefly to a general reduction of wages at the principal mining centres' (*Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1890–91*, p. 5), the number of migrants decreased considerably in 1890–1, but the number of Basutos outside Basutoland at the time of the 1891 census must have been very large. (The number of persons born in Basutoland and enumerated in the Cape Colony in 1891 was 17,586. Figures for the Orange Free State are again lacking.)

[5] Meant evidently 218,324 souls (excluding Europeans).

[6] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1894–5*, p. 11. See also ibid. *1895–6*, p. 32, concerning Qacha's Nek: 'The population of the district is very much on the increase, due principally to immigration. . . . the mountain area is being rapidly filled up by immigrants from Natal and the Cape Colony . . . .'

[7] Ibid. *1898–9*, p. 15. According to Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, p. 3, the total population was estimated in 1898 at 256,000. In the Medical Report for 1900 (*Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1900 and 1901*, p. 25) the population is given for 1899 as 270,000, including 700 Europeans, and for 1900 as 275,640, including 1,400 Europeans.

[8] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1900–1*, p. 9.

territory from the Orange River Colony: Europeans 1,845, and natives 5,660. The latter number appears, however, to be very much under estimated.[1]

1902. Population. This may be taken as having slightly increased since the estimate of last year .... Nearly all the white refugees, and many of the refugee natives, have left Basutoland for their homes in the Orange River Colony ....[2]

1903. The population may be estimated at 263,000 ....[3]

While, therefore, the Administration assumed that the population had increased since 1891 by about 45,000, the census of April 1904 indicated a rise of 130,000.

The native population of Basutoland is ascertained to be 347,731, as against 218,324, in 1891, or an increase of slightly under 60 per cent. in 13 years.[4]

The Census returns show a rather startling increase in numbers, and there is no doubt that year by year the Basuto must become, with other natives, of more industrial and economic importance in South Africa.[5]

No explanation was given for this startling increase, which apparently was assumed to have been due mainly to an excess of births over deaths. But it is out of the question that an average yearly increase of 3·6 per cent. could have occurred without a huge immigration. Yet, if immigration had been very great, it could not have escaped the attention of the administration. There are, moreover, some facts which suggest that immigration was largely offset by both temporary and permanent emigration. In discussing the 1904 census returns the Resident Commissioner said: 'I estimate that the average number of able-bodied men who are at one time outside the country working may be 25,000.'[6] The census returns indicate indeed that the number of absentees had increased considerably between 1891 and 1904, the excess of females over males having risen from 7,806 to 21,102. But the absentees constituted only a small fraction of the total number staying abroad. According to the censuses of 1904 there were in the present territory of the Union not fewer than 83,000 persons born in Basutoland.[7]

There cannot be the least doubt that the estimate of 1901 had grossly understated the population,[8] and it is most likely that all prior censuses had been incomplete. But the 1904 census was possibly not wide of the mark. The 1911 census showed a population of 404,507, an increase of 16 per cent. since 1904 or 2·1 per year. The number of native men working

[1] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1900–1*, p. 13. [2] Ibid. *1901–2*, p. 17.

[3] Ibid. *1902–3*, p. 10. In *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1902*, p. 461, the population for 1903 was given as 262,580, including 580 Whites. When the Resident Commissioner for Basutoland was asked by the Transvaal Labour Commission on 18 Aug. 1903 whether he had any figures or could give 'an estimate of what the present population is' as compared with the estimate of 1901 he said: 'No. I have no means of doing so. I know there must have been a certain natural increase in two years, and I should think, as a set-off against that, there has been a certain exodus of people to the Orange River Colony after peace was declared.' But the Commissioner of Native Affairs for the Transvaal, Sir Godfrey Lagden, stated on 30 July 1903 that the population of Basutoland was 'about 290,000'. See *Reports of the Transvaal Labour Commission, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*, pp. 91, 207.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1903–4*, p. 6. [5] Ibid., p. 10. [6] Ibid.

[7] The excess of males over females among these persons was almost identical with the excess of females over males among the population of Basutoland.

[8] It showed 125,819 male and 136,742 female natives, while the 1904 census figures were 163,216 and 184,515 respectively.

outside the Territory was reported to be only 20,225.[1] To what extent the increase between 1904 and 1911 was due to immigration it is impossible to tell, but it is noteworthy that of the people enumerated in 1911 only about 43,350 or 10·7 per cent. were born outside Basutoland. This, in any case, is apt to strengthen the opinion that the apparent population increase of 185,605 in 1891–1911 was due in part to an understatement of the population in 1891. But the increase of 55,659 in 1904–11 may have been genuine.

The census of 1921 showed a total population of 498,781, which indicates again an average yearly increase of 2·1 per cent. in spite of the heavy mortality from influenza in 1918.[2] The number of persons returned as 'Absentees at Labour Centres' was 47,141 (including 9,314 females). On the other hand, the number of persons born outside Basutoland was about 9,150 larger than in 1911. Including Absentees at Labour Centres the population increased from 429,137 in 1911 to 545,922 in 1921 or by 2·4 per cent. per year. As the outgo in this period was at least as great as the influx, the increase of the population would have to be attributed exclusively to excess of births over deaths.[3] But it is difficult to believe that the natural increase could actually have been so large.

The census of 1936 showed a total population of 562,311, indicating an average yearly increase of only 0·8 per cent. since 1921. But immigration

[1] The distribution of the natives 'resident in the Territory, returned as absent from the Territory on 23rd April, 1911' was as follows:

Employed at mines		*In service other than at mines*		*Visiting*		*At school*		*Total*	
Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
11,816	—	8,409	1,480	1,256	1,447	177	45	21,658	2,972

All except 3 males in service other than at mines were in the Union. The total number of persons born in Basutoland and staying in the Union had decreased from about 83,000 to about 76,000.

[2] The *Annual Colonial Report for 1918–19* says (p. 9): 'The so-called "Spanish Influenza" epidemic was rife in this Territory during the months of October and November. In the absence of any registration of births and deaths, no accurate statistics in regard to mortality from the disease are available. Apart from the direct observation of the Medical Staff, information obtained by the District officials, from the native chiefs and from local statistics supplied by missionaries and traders, goes to show that the deaths in the Territory may be safely estimated at 15,000. Probably 75 per cent. of the total population was affected.' W. M. Macmillan thinks that the death roll 'was certainly under-estimated at 15,000' (*Cambridge History of the British Empire*, vol. viii, p. 675).

[3] Assuming that one-quarter of the 43,350 aliens enumerated in 1911 had died before the 1921 census the number of immigrants who had come since 1911 and survived the 1921 census would have been 10,838+9,150 = 19,988. The number of children returned in 1921 as born in Basutoland who were the offspring of immigrants who had come since 1911 may be put at something like 15 per cent. of 19,988 or 2,998. On the other hand, the total number of persons born in Basutoland and staying in the Union increased from 76,043 to 112,660. These figures include the Basutoland Absentees at Labour Centres. If we ignore the probably irrelevant migrations to countries other than the Union, the number of permanent emigrants staying abroad would appear to have increased from 51,413 to 65,519, or by 14,106. Assuming that one-quarter of the 51,413 permanent emigrants enumerated in 1911 had died before the 1921 census the number of emigrants who had gone since 1911 and survived the 1921 census would have been 12,853+14,106 = 26,959. Assuming that one-eighth of those who had actually gone had died before 1921, the total number of permanent emigrants would have been 26,959+3,851 = 30,810. Therefore, something like 116,785−19,988−2,998+30,810 = 124,609 would have to be allocated to the natural increase of the population living in 1911 in Basutoland (including absentees).

had been small in that period[1] while the exodus of labourers had increased enormously, the number of 'Absentees at Labour Centres' returned at the census being 101,273 (including 22,669 females).[2] Thus a considerable part of the natural increase was lost through emigration. But the natural increase itself was apparently much smaller than in former times. Including Absentees at Labour Centres the population increased from 545,922 in 1921 to 663,584 in 1936 or by 1·3 per cent. per year, and this seems to have been about the rate of the natural increase.[3]

For 31 December 1939 the population has been estimated at 590,000 (excluding absentees).[4]

The area of the Territory is only 11,716 square miles, and there were in 1936 (excluding absentees) 48 persons to the square mile. The density varies very much. The Pim Commission reported in 1935:[5]

> The bulk of the population is still concentrated in the lowlands[6] in which the density is probably as great as in any part of South Africa. Up to a comparatively recent period the highlands were almost entirely reserved for grazing, and even such a considerable concentration of population as now exists in the rich valleys near the Maletsunyane Falls only dates from about ten years ago . . . .

[1] Some of the immigrants seem to have been the children of former emigrants. Hodgson and Ballinger (p. 13) speak of 'the return to the homes of their fathers of men who had been born in the Union of Basuto parents, and who had gone to live in the Union but have found the burden of Union Native legislation more and more irksome'.

[2] *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 214, says: 'There were 101,273 Basuto, male and female, absent from the Territory in temporary employment in gold mines, on farms and in other occupations in the Union of South Africa at the time of the census.' This statement, and a similar statement in *An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire* (*1937*), p. 93, suggest that the figure of 101,273 does not include those absentees in the Union who were unemployed, visitors, or at school (nor the few absentees in countries other than the Union). But the census schedule (see p. 8 above) actually asked for particulars concerning all 'Absent Members of Family', and the very large number of female absentees (22,669) makes it unlikely that, for example, visitors were omitted.

[3] The number of persons born outside Basutoland decreased between 1921 and 1936 from about 52,500 to about 46,700. Assuming that three-eighths of the 52,500 aliens enumerated in 1921 had died before the 1936 census the number of immigrants who had come since 1921 and survived the 1936 census would have been 19,688–5,800 = 13,888. The number of children returned in 1936 as born in Basutoland who were the offspring of immigrants who had come since 1921 may be put at something like 20 per cent. of 13,888 or 2,778. On the other hand, the total number of persons born in Basutoland and staying in the Union increased from 112,660 to 163,838. These figures include the Basutoland Absentees at Labour Centres. If we again ignore the probably irrelevant migrations to countries other than the Union the number of permanent emigrants staying abroad would appear to have decreased from 65,519 to 62,565, or by 2,954. Assuming that three-eighths of the 65,519 permanent emigrants enumerated in 1921 had died before the 1936 census the number of emigrants who had gone since 1921 and survived the 1936 census would have been 24,570 − 2,954 = 21,616. Assuming that three-sixteenths of those who had actually gone had died before 1936, the total number of permanent emigrants would have been 21,616 + 4,988 = 26,604. Therefore, something like 117,662 − 13,888 − 2,778 + 26,604 = 127,600 would have to be allocated to the natural increase of the population living in 1921 in Basutoland (including absentees).

[4] See *Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations 1942/44*, p. 12.

[5] *Report Basutoland*, p. 4.

[6] 'The approximate area of the highlands is 9,364 sq. miles or four-fifths of the territory, and that of the lowlands is 2,352 sq. miles or one-fifth of the territory' (Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II, p. 47). See also *Cambridge History of the British Empire*, vol. viii, p. 673: 'Of the estimated area of 11,716 square miles as much as 6,000 square miles has been reckoned practically uninhabitable.' See furthermore Staples and Hudson, *An Ecological Survey*, p. 4; *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1943–4*, quoted p. 71 below.

TABLE 1. *Population by Race and Sex, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland, 1875–1936*[1]

Year	*Europeans*			*Native (Bantu)*			*Asiatics*			*Other Coloured*[2]			*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
BASUTOLAND															
1875	254	215	469	60,349	66,787	127,136	..	..	..	298	273	571	60,901	67,275	128,176
1891	343	235	578	105,102	113,042	218,144	..	..	..	103	77	180	105,548	113,354	218,902
1904	520	375	895	163,216	184,515	347,731	..	..	..	137	85	222	163,873	184,975	348,848
1911	799	597	1,396	182,583	219,224	401,807	156	24	180	564	560	1,124	184,102	220,405	404,507
1921	866	737	1,603	222,342	273,595	495,937	121	51	172	506	563	1,069	223,835	274,946	498,781
1936	750	684	1,434	238,705	320,568	559,273	202	139	341	608	655	1,263	240,265	322,046	562,311
BECHUANALAND															
1904	657	347	1,004	58,712	60,699	119,411	..	..	..	205	156	361	59,574	61,202	120,776
1911	1,049	643	1,692	61,460	61,843	123,303	..	..	..	203	152	355	62,712	62,638	125,350
1921	1,010	733	1,743	77,857	72,328	150,185	47	5	52	500	503	1,003	79,414	73,569	152,983
1936	1,064	835	1,899	129,259	130,805	260,064	55	11	66	1,904	1,823	3,727	132,282	133,474	265,756
SWAZILAND															
1904	582	308	890	36,851	47,678	84,529	2	—	2	36	34	70	37,471	48,020	85,491
1911	623	460	1,083	44,098	54,635	98,733	5	2	7	79	57	136	44,805	55,154	99,959
1921	1,239	966	2,205	46,922	57,383	104,305	7	—	7	254	190	444	48,422	58,539	106,961
1936	1,476	1,264	2,740	64,679	79,030	143,709	4	—	4	375	326	701	66,534	80,620	147,154

[1] See *Census of the Cape of Good Hope 1875*, Part II, p. 523; *Basutoland Census Returns 1891*, Table 1; *Basutoland Census 1911*, pp. 5, 9, *1921*, p. 7, *1936*, p. 1; *Census Bechuanaland 1904, 1911, 1921*; *Official Year Book of the Union*, &c., *1939*, p. 1232; *Census of the Transvaal Colony and Swaziland 1904*, pp. iv, 88; Swaziland, *Census 1911*, pp. 5–6, *1921*, pp. 5, 7, *1936*, pp. 5, 8. All figures exclude absentees.

[2] The figures for Basutoland 1875, 1891, and 1904, and for Bechuanaland 1904 and 1911, include Asiatics.

'Maseru, the capital and largest town, has a population of 3,000 Natives and 331 Europeans.'[1]

2. *Bechuanaland*

When in 1895 'British Bechuanaland' was handed over to the Cape Colony and a new administration was to be provided for the Protectorate of Bechuanaland, the High Commissioner, Sir Hercules Robinson, in a Telegraphic Dispatch to Mr. Chamberlain, dated 8 November, stated:

> Recent reports show that area of Bechuanaland Protectorate is 217,000 square miles; total population 90,000 natives and 400 Europeans.[2]

The total population ascertained in 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936 was 120,776, 125,350, 152,983, and 265,756 respectively. When the count of 1911 showed a very small increase for 1904–11 the Acting Resident Commissioner said that the population in 1904 had been over-estimated.[3] The average yearly increase was apparently 2·0 per cent. in 1911–21[4] and 3·7 per cent. in 1921–36. The Administration had assumed that the population had increased much less since 1921.[5] But it may well be that the returns of the 1936 census came near the truth, and the counts of 1911 and 1921 certainly had been incomplete.[6]

Absenteeism until quite recently did not play a very important part in Bechuanaland.[7] The total number of 'Absentee Members' returned at the 1921 census was 5,169.[8] But the figure has been much higher since 1933. In 1935 6,370 Natives, and in 1936 6,202, were employed by the Witwatersrand gold-mines alone,[9] and this number rose to 7,369 in 1937 and to 9,022 in 1938.[10]

[1] *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 214.

[2] *Correspondence relative to the Future of the Bechuanaland Protectorate*, p. 24. The *Colonial Office Lists* for 1897 to 1901 said: 'Its area is estimated at about 386,200 square miles, and the native population at about 100,000. The European population does not exceed 500.' The *Lists* for 1902 to 1904 contained the same statement except that they put the native population at 'about 130,000'. The *List* for 1905 gave the 1904 census figures but said that the 'area is estimated at about 275,000 square miles'. (See *Colonial Office List 1897*, p. 284; *1898*, p. 278; *1899*, p. 240; *1900*, p. 218; *1901*, p. 262; *1902*, p. 276; *1903*, p. 294; *1904*, p. 301; *1905*, p. 307.) *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1901*, p. 766, gave as population on 31 Dec. 1902 147,500, including 500 Whites.

[3] See p. 11 above.

[4] The increase in this period was checked by the influenza epidemic of 1918. The mortality amongst the natives, 'from the disease and its complications, has been estimated at between 4 and 5 per centum' (*Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1918–19*, p. 5). The increase was checked furthermore by emigration, the number of persons born in Bechuanaland and enumerated in the Union having risen from 5,364 in 1911 to 13,488 in 1921 (see *Census of the Union of South Africa 1911*, Annexures to General Report, pp. 988–9; *1921*, Part V, p. 4, Part VIII, pp. 106, 114).

[5] The population in 1933 was estimated at 180,000 or 200,000; see Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, pp. 7, 82, 190. See also *Medical Report 1934*, p. 20.

[6] The fact that in 1921 males exceeded females by 5,845 or 7·9 per cent. while at the same time there were in the Union 4,440 more males than females born in Bechuanaland suggests that a considerable number of females were omitted at the Bechuanaland census of 1921.

[7] See Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 31: 'The number of Bechuana recruits is small as compared with Basutoland or even with Swaziland, but recruiting for these mines [Rand mines] is not allowed north of latitude 22°, so shutting out a large proportion of the Native population . . . .' This restriction was relaxed in 1933.

[8] See *Bechuanaland Protectorate Census 1921*.

[9] It is surprising, therefore, that in 1936 only 2,521 males and 1,527 females were returned at the census of the Union as born in Bechuanaland Protectorate. See *Census of the Union of South Africa 1936*, vol. ix, p. 68.

[10] See *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1935*, p. 24; *1936*, p. 24; *1937*, p. 27; *1938*, pp. 27–8. 'The

The area of the Territory is estimated at 275,000 square miles,[1] and there is only one inhabitant to the square mile. The density, of course, varies much.

The immense waterless stretches of the Kalahari restrict its population to a few thousand scattered Bushmen, Hottentots, and Bakalahari, and the great bulk of the Native population is found in the eastern area with its less inadequate water supply, in the better watered areas along the Botletle River, and in the neighbourhood of Lake Ngami and of the Okavango delta.

The European population, apart from a few scattered officials, traders, and missionaries, is also confined to a narrow strip along the eastern border, except for a small number of Boer farmers at Ghanzi, near the border of South West Africa.

The Native population is chiefly concentrated in eight Tribal Reserves aggregating 102,000 square miles, finally demarcated in 1899, and about 7,500 square miles have been granted to European farmers. The remaining area of approximately 165,000 square miles remains as Crown Land, for the most part practically unoccupied and almost wholly undeveloped.[2]

In the Reserves there are a number of very large villages at considerable distances apart, one of which, Serowe, has an estimated maximum population of 30,000 people.[3]

3. *Swaziland*

In his *Report on Swazieland* Colonel Sir F. de Winton stated in 1890:

The numbers of the Swazie nation may be roughly estimated at 63,000. The calculation is made by taking the fighting men at 9,000 strong and multiplying that number by 7.[4]

situation created during the year [1937] by the acute shortage of labour in the Union and the correspondingly intensified efforts of recruiting agents in the Territory, together with the unauthorized exodus of native labourers in ever increasing numbers resulted in an undue proportion of adult males leaving the Reserves, to the serious detriment of tribal welfare' (ibid. 1937, p. 27). See also *Minutes of the 17th Session of the Native Advisory Council*, 20 May 1936, pp. 52–62; *19th Session*, 7 Mar. 1938, pp. 76–88, and 'Note on Labour Recruiting', 31 Jan. 1938, ibid., Appendices, pp. xiii–xiv; *21st Session*, 29 Mar. 1940, pp. 58–62; *Minutes of the 24th Session of the European Advisory Council*, 4 Feb. 1938, pp. 64–6; Schapera, *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate*, pp. 19–20, 100–1.

In the course of the War an ever-increasing number of natives joined the African Auxiliary Pioneer Corps in the Middle East. By May 1943 the figure exceeded 9,000; see *Minutes of the 24th Session of the African Advisory Council*, 3 and 14 May 1943, pp. 3–4, 131.

[1] This has been the official estimate from 1905 on.

[2] Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 7; see also ibid., p. 190. Shortly after the preparation of this report, in July 1933, a ninth Reserve was created. 'To-day, then, there are in the Protectorate nine different areas reserved for the use of Natives. Their combined area is about 103,250 sq. miles, and they contain some ninety per cent of the total Native population' (Schapera, *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate*, 1943, p. 13).

[3] *Report of the Director of Education 1944*, p. 1. According to Schapera, p. 24, Serowe 'is the largest town in the Protectorate, with a population of approximately 25,000'.

[4] *Report on Swazieland*, p. 8. See also Memorandum by the Rev. Mr. Jackson, ibid., p. 20: '... I reckon that they could not possibly raise more than 10,000 or 12,000. The whole population may be 60,000. Before White men came into the country (i.e., Natal and Transvaal) they increased, notwithstanding the great amount of killing that took place. . . . There is much less killing now than in former times. . . . They are, however, now in danger of being destroyed by drink through the greed, folly, and wickedness of White men.' The native population had also been put at 'about 60,000' in a letter of the Aborigines Protection Society to the Colonial Office, dated 23 Oct. 1889 (*Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland and Tongaland*, 1890, p. 207). An article 'Swaziland' in the *Natal Witness* of 13 May 1887 had stated: 'The army is about 15,000 strong . . .' (*Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland*, 1887, p. 66).

The population ascertained at the censuses of 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936 was 85,491,[1] 99,959, 106,961,[2] and 147,154 respectively. The figures exclude absentees. No information seems to be available concerning their number in 1904.[3] 'To the 44,098 Bantu males of the 1911 Census should be added the estimated number absent from Swaziland at the time, viz. 5,800.'[4] The number of Natives reported as working outside Swaziland on 3 May 1921 was 5,990 (including 151 females), and on 5 May 1936 9,561 (including 110 females).[5] Including absentees the population increased between 1921 and 1936 at an average yearly rate of 2·2 per cent., and since there was practically no immigration this increase would have to be attributed to an excess of births over deaths. But part of the apparent increase may have been due to incompleteness of the 1921 census. The population for the end of 1935 had been estimated at only 127,355,[6] indicating an increase of 14,404 over the 1921 census while the census taken on 5 May 1936 showed an increase of 43,764.

For 31 December 1940–2 the population (including absentees) has been estimated at 159,100, 159,610, and 158,090 respectively,[7] suggesting a very slight increase since 1936.

The area of the Territory is 6,705 square miles,[8] and there were in 1936 (excluding absentees) 22 inhabitants to the square mile. The Pim Commission which reckoned with 2,800 Europeans and 120,000 Natives[9] stated:

> An area of 3,767 square miles is held by a small number of Europeans with a population density of 6·5 to the square mile.[10] On this area only 20,000 natives have been permitted to remain, but have no rights and are liable to ejectment at any time. . . .
>
> 2,660 square miles are held by the Swazi nation with a density of population of 38 to the square mile.[11]

[1] This figure was 'very much in excess of what was anticipated' (*Census of Transvaal, 1904, Preliminary Report*, p. 2).

[2] The slightness of the increase in 1911–21 was not due to the influenza epidemic of 1918 which 'appeared here in a milder form than in most other parts. . . . During the epidemic the death-rate amongst the Europeans was nine, or ½ per cent. of the white population and amongst the natives approximately 1,250, or 1 per cent. of their total number.' (*Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1918–19*, p. 8.) But population increase in this period was checked considerably through emigration, the number of persons born in Swaziland and enumerated in the Union having risen from 21,876 in 1911 to 29,495 in 1921 (see *Census of the Union of South Africa 1911*, Annexures to General Report, pp. 988–9; *1921*, Part V, p. 4, Part VIII, pp. 106, 114).

[3] The number of Natives from Swaziland holding passports and working in Transvaal Labour Districts on 31 Jan. 1904 was only 1,594 as compared with 7,572 from Basutoland; see *Correspondence relating to Conditions of Native Labour employed in Transvaal Mines*, p. 44.

[4] *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 5.

[5] See ibid., p. 6; *1936*, p. 5. The total number of persons born in Swaziland and enumerated in the Union increased only from 29,495 in 1921 to 31,092 in 1936; see *Census of the Union of South Africa 1936*, vol. ix, p. 69.

[6] See *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1935*, p. 5.

[7] See Swaziland, *Annual Blue Book 1940*, p. 62; *Medical Report 1941*, p. 1, *1942*, p. 1.

[8] See *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 219.

[9] See *Report Swaziland*, p. 6.

[10] See also ibid., p. 7: 'The area in the possession of Europeans is controlled by some 500 owners of whom 40 per cent. are habitually absent from the Territory'.

[11] Ibid., p. 22.

III. Composition of Native Population

1. *Basutoland*

Absentees. The composition of the native population present at any time in Basutoland is, of course, very much affected by the fact that an enormous number of persons, particularly men, are staying temporarily in the Union. On 5 May 1936, when 90,201 men between 15 and 50 years were present in the Territory, no fewer than 78,604 males—nearly all men between 15 and 50—were absentees.[1] Thus, the proportion of absentees among the men of this age exceeded 45 per cent., and apparently something like one-third of the wives present in the Territory had absentee husbands.[2]

Birthplace. Of the 559,273 Natives (Bantu) enumerated in 1936 in Basutoland 514,093 were born in the Territory, 44,734 in the Union of South Africa, and 254 elsewhere. The corresponding figures for 1921 were 444,185, 49,795, and 698 respectively,[3] and for 1911 360,153, 41,289, and 230 respectively.[4] The number of persons born in the Union was smaller in 1936 than in 1921 and only a little greater than in 1911, while on the other hand the number of Basuto Natives working in the Union had increased enormously between 1911 and 1936.

Nationality. Practically all Natives are British.[5]

Table 2. *Population born within and outside Basutoland and Absentees by Sex, 1911, 1921, and 1936*[1]

Year	*Born in Basutoland*			*Born elsewhere*[2]		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1911	163,570	197,467	361,037	20,532	22,938	43,470
1921	199,207	245,964	445,171	24,628	28,982	53,610
1936	221,139	294,274	515,413	19,126	27,772	46,898

Year	*Absentees*			*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1911	21,658	2,972	24,630	205,760	223,377	429,137
1921	37,827	9,314	47,141	261,662	284,260	545,922
1936	78,604	22,669	101,273	318,869	344,715	663,584

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1911*, pp. 12–17; *1921*, pp. 6, 21–2; *1936*, pp. 1, 5, 28–31.
[2] Including birthplace unknown.

[1] Native men and women between 15 and 50 in Basutoland numbered 90,201 and 161,145 respectively. At the same time there were in the Union 90,000 men and 35,000 women between 15 and 50 who were born in Basutoland.

[2] 64,314 husbands present in the Territory had 73,029 wives. Assuming that the 3,850 husbands from whom such information was not obtained had on an average the same number of wives, the 68,164 husbands present in the Territory would have had 77,401 wives. Even if all these 77,401 wives had been present in the Territory, the number of wives with absentee husbands would have been 35,872 since the wives present in the Territory numbered 113,273.

[3] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, p. 22. [4] See ibid. *1911*, p. 15.

[5] The census reports for 1921 and 1936 do not show the nationality of the Natives. At the 1911 census apparently only 3 Natives (born in Portuguese East Africa) were not returned as British: see ibid., pp. 15, 17.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males increased from 107·6 in 1891 to 113·0 in 1904, 120·1 in 1911, 123·1 in 1921, and 134·3 in 1936. But this rise in the preponderance of women was due exclusively to the increasing number of labourers working in the Union. Including absentees the ratio was 108·8 in 1911, 108·7 in 1921, and 108·2 in 1936.

TABLE 3. *Native Population by Birthplace and Sex, Basutoland, 1936*[1]

Sex	*Basuto-land*	*Union of S.A.*	*Bechuana-land*	*Swazi-land*	*S. W. Africa*	*Portu-guese Terri-tory*	*Other countries*	*Unspe-cified*	*Total*
Males .	220,496	18,012	66	21	10	—	12	88	238,705
Females .	293,597	26,722	103	24	2	6	10	104	320,568
Total .	514,093	44,734	169	45	12	6	22	192	559,273

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1936*, pp. 30–1.

TABLE 4. *Native Population by Birthplace and Sex, Swaziland, 1936*[1]

Sex	*Swazi-land*	*Union of S.A.*	*Basuto-land*	*Bechuana-land*	*S.W. Africa*	*Portu-guese Terri-tory*	*Other countries*	*Unspe-cified*	*Total*
Males .	72,301	1,591	57	—	4	147	20	10	74,130
Females .	77,636	1,367	68	2	5	40	2	20	79,140
Total .	149,937	2,958	125	2	9	187	22	30	153,270

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1936*, p. 14. Figures include Absentees.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the natives present in the Territory was very high, 46·2 per cent. in 1921 and 43·6 per cent. in 1936. Including, however, absentees the percentages were 42·2 and 36·9 respectively.[1] The proportion of men between 15 and 50 years decreased from 17·6 to 16·1 per cent. excluding absentees, but increased from 23·0 to 25·6 per cent. including absentees. The proportion of women between 15 and 50 years increased from 28·2 to 28·8 per cent. excluding absentees and from 27·5 to 27·8 per cent. including absentees. The proportion of old people (over 50 years) increased from 8·0 to 11·5 per cent. excluding absentees and from 7·3 to 9·7 per cent. including absentees. The large increase in the proportion of old people was largely due to an enormous rise in the number of women returned as such.

Conjugal Condition. Of the 115,905 adult males enumerated in 1936, 36·1 per cent. were bachelors, 59·0 per cent. husbands, 4·3 per cent. widowers, and 0·6 per cent. divorced. Of the 199,465 adult females 20·7 per cent. were spinsters, 56·9 per cent. wives, 21·2 per cent. widows, and 1·2 per cent. divorced. There were 166 wives to 100 husbands as compared with 147 in 1921 and 143 in 1911.[2] But this increase in the preponderance of wives was due exclusively to the increase in the number of absentee

[1] In this and the following computations I am assuming—what is certainly inaccurate—that the absentees were all between 15 and 50 years.

[2] In 1875 the ratio had been 140 to 100; see *Census of the Cape of Good Hope 1875*, Part II, p. 524.

TABLE 5. *Native Children and Adults by Sex, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland, 1891–1936*[1]

Year	Basutoland[2]				Bechuanaland[3]				Swaziland[4]			
	Males		Females		Males		Females		Males		Females	
	Under 15	15 and over	Under 15	15 and over	Under 15	15 and over	Under 15	15 and over	Under 15	15 and over	Under 15	15 and over
1891	57,126	48,080	54,998	58,120	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1904	87,915	75,301	86,128	98,387	29,437	30,137	28,559	32,643	19,723	17,128	19,085	28,593
1911	97,859	84,724	100,837	118,387	32,443	30,273	29,978	32,656	21,573	22,525	21,597	33,038
1921	116,615	105,727	112,637	160,958	34,859[5]	42,998[6]	30,147[5]	42,181[6]	25,666	27,095	25,074	32,460
1936	122,800	115,905	121,103	199,465	..	..	..	..	37,925	36,205	35,486	43,654

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1904*, Table 1, *1911*, p. 21, *1921*, p. 7, *1936*, p. 7; *Census Bechuanaland 1911, 1921*; *Census of the Transvaal Colony and Swaziland 1904*, p. 213; Swaziland, *Census 1911*, p. 5, *1921*, p. 8, *1936*, p. 7.

[2] Figures for 1891 and 1904 comprise all Non-Europeans.

[3] Figures for 1904 and 1911 comprise all races.

[4] Figures for 1921 and 1936 include Absentees.

[5] Under 16 years.

[6] Over 16 years.

TABLE 6. *Native Population by Age and Sex, Basutoland and Swaziland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Territory	Year	Infants (under 1 year)		Children (1–14 years)		Mature (15–50 years)		Old Age (over 50 years)		Unspecified		Total	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Basutoland .	1921	13,050	14,221	103,565	98,416	87,163	139,665	18,564	21,293	—	—	222,342	273,595
	1936	12,245	13,194	110,555	107,909	90,201	161,145	25,702	38,319	2	1	238,705	320,568
Swaziland[2] .	1921	3,039	3,255	22,627	21,819	24,338	25,901	2,751	6,555	6	4	52,761	57,534
	1936	4,079	4,608	33,846	30,878	31,703	32,084	4,500	11,565	2	5	74,130	79,140

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, p. 7, *1936*, p. 7; *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 8, *1936*, p. 7.

[2] Including Absentees.

TABLE 7. *Adult Native Population by Conjugal Condition and Sex, Basutoland, 1911, 1921, and 1936*[1]

Year	*Males*						*Females*					
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
1911	28,982	53,914	1,822	3	3	84,724	23,262	77,300	17,807	8	10	118,387
1921	36,502	64,130	4,149	339	607	105,727	35,958	94,138	28,077	1,932	853	160,958
1936	41,702	68,164	5,004	720	315	115,905	41,197	113,273	42,104	2,341	550	199,465

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1911*, pp. 36–7; *1921*, pp. 7, 10; *1936*, pp. 7, 16.

TABLE 8. *Adult Native Population by Conjugal Condition and Sex, Swaziland, 1911, 1921, and 1936*[1]

Year	*Males*						*Females*					
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
1911	10,377	12,148	..	..	—	22,525	6,780	26,258	..	..	—	33,038
1921	12,593	13,578	811	108	5	27,095	5,289	20,335	6,681	128	27	32,460
1936	15,465	19,685	917	122	16	36,205	8,102	25,970	9,291	275	16	43,654

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1911*, p. 5; *1921*, pp. 8–9; *1936*, pp. 7–8. Figures for 1921 and 1936 include Absentees.

husbands. Polygamy has actually decreased, the percentage of husbands with more than one wife having declined from 18·7 in 1911 to 15·8 in 1921, and 11·4 in 1936, and the average number of wives per husband from 1·24 to 1·20 and 1·14 respectively.[1] Some of the census results are quite puzzling, for example, the increase in the proportion of bachelors (from 34·2 per cent. in 1911 to 34·7 per cent. in 1921 and to 36·1 per cent. in 1936) in spite of the decline of polygamy and the increase of absenteeism.

TABLE 9. *Married Native Men according to Number of Wives, Basutoland, 1911, 1921, and 1936*[1]

Year	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11 or more*	*Not stated*	*Total*
1911	43,843	8,207	1,361	325	106	38	9	7	4	3	11[2]	—	53,914
1921	52,210	8,218	1,194	242	84	29	16	8	8	2	12[3]	2,107	64,130
1936	57,009	6,287	753	190	51	10	4	7	2	1	—	3,850	68,164

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1911*, p. 40; *1921*, p. 15; *1936*, p. 19.
[2] Three 11, one 12, two 14, one 16, two 17, one 24, one 37.
[3] Three 11, two 12, two 15, one 16, one 19, one 34, two 35.

TABLE 10. *Married Native Men according to Number of Wives, Swaziland, 1921*[1]

Year	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11 or more*	*Not stated*	*Total*
1921	9,253	2,720	760	262	108	60	24	26	32	16	26[2]	291	13,578

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 10.
[2] Seven 11, two 12, four 13, one 14, four 15, four 20, one 21, one 23, one 29, one 46.

2. *Bechuanaland*

No data concerning birthplace, nationality, or conjugal condition are available for any year, and no age data for the 1936 census.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males was 103·4 in 1904, 100·6 in 1911, 92·9 in 1921, and 101·2 in 1936. But no conclusions should be drawn from the changes in this ratio as, at least prior to 1936, the enumerations may have been incomplete.

Age. The age data of the 1921 census inspire little confidence. Of the 77,857 males 8,764 were returned as 'unweaned babes', 26,095 as 'under 16', 35,690 as 'over 16', and 7,308 as 'old people'. The corresponding figures for females were 7,307, 22,840, 32,488, and 9,693 respectively. It seems unlikely that as many as 10·7 per cent. of the total population should have been unweaned babes, and the great preponderance of males among children (0 to 16) is probably due to the fact that many female children were counted as adults.

[1] As is usual, the prevalence of polygamy was overstated very much by early writers. See, for example, Minnie Martin, *Basutoland* (1903), p. 41: 'Almost all the heathen males possess at least two or three wives...'

TABLE 11. *Persons Born in Basutoland and enumerated in Union of South Africa by Race and Sex, 1875–1936*[1]

Sex	Cape Colony								Union					
	1875	*1891*	*1904*	*1911*	*1918*	*1921*	*1926*	*1936*	*1904*[2]	*1911*	*1918*	*1921*	*1926*	*1936*
EUROPEANS														
Males . .	17	28	42	47	61	70	73	95	180	177	227	282	332	408
Females .	31	24	31	39	65	78	71	109	126	145	231	269	309	400
Total .	48	52	73	86	126	148	144	204	306	322	458	551	641	808
NATIVES														
Males . .	5,947	9,637	11,646	8,010	..	8,754	..	9,091	51,461	48,798	..	73,525	..	110,245
Females .	4,800	7,781	8,508	5,024	..	7,030	..	6,783	29,908	26,334	..	38,248	..	53,593
Total .	10,747	17,418	20,154	13,034	..	15,784	..	15,874	81,369	75,132	..	111,773	..	163,838
ALL RACES[3]														
Males . .	6,279	9,734	11,784	8,085	..	8,898	..	9,234	52,567	49,337	..	73,998	..	110,778
Females .	4,970	7,852	8,588	5,091	..	7,159	..	6,931	30,640	26,706	..	38,662	..	54,124
Total .	11,249	17,586	20,372	13,176	..	16,057	..	16,165	83,207	76,043	..	112,660	..	164,902

[1] See *Census of the Cape of Good Hope 1875*, Part I, p. 152, *1891*, pp. 78–9, *1904*, pp. 100–1; *Census of the Colony of Natal 1904*, p. 532; *Census of Transvaal and Swaziland 1904*, pp. 146–7; *Census of the Orange River Colony 1904*, Annexures to General Report, p. 28; *Census of the Union of South Africa 1911*, Annexures to General Report, pp. 988–91, *1918*, Part VII, p. 12, *1921*, Part V, pp. 4–5 Part VIII, pp. 106–7, 114, *1926*, Part VII, p. 18, *1936*, vol. v, pp. 1–2, 91, 93, 123, 125, vol. ix, pp. 68–70.

[2] Figures for the Union include Swaziland; those relating to Europeans and Natives exclude Natal, only figures for all Races being available in this Colony.

[3] Including Asiatics and Other Coloured.

TABLE 12. *Natives Born in Basutoland and Swaziland and enumerated in Union of South Africa by Age and Sex, 1936*[1]

Birthplace	*Sex*	*Years of age*							*Total*[2]	*Urban areas*	*Rural areas*
		0–9	*10–19*	*20–29*	*30–39*	*40–49*	*50–59*	*60 and more*			
Basutoland	Males	4,172	12,387	33,036	29,872	16,824	7,040	6,869	110,245	57,279	52,964
	Females	4,647	6,226	10,431	12,395	8,065	4,870	6,925	53,593	15,651	37,940
	Total	8,819	18,613	43,467	42,267	24,889	11,910	13,794	163,838	72,930	90,904
Swaziland	Males	423	2,148	7,007	5,252	3,213	1,425	1,835	21,311	11,061	10,250
	Females	442	942	1,692	1,818	1,442	1,226	2,210	9,781	2,358	7,423
	Total	865	3,090	8,699	7,070	4,655	2,651	4,045	31,092	13,419	17,673

[1] See *Census of the Union of South Africa 1936*, vol. ix, pp. 68–70.

[2] Including 'Unspecified'.

3. *Swaziland*

Absentees. The composition of the native population present at any time in Swaziland is affected considerably, though not as much as in Basutoland, by the absence of men working in the Union. On 5 May 1936 nearly 30 per cent. of the men between 15 and 50 years were at work outside Swaziland.[1]

Birthplace. Of the 153,270 Natives (Bantu) enumerated in 1936 (including absentee workers) 149,937 were born in the Territory, 2,958 in the Union of South Africa, and 345 elsewhere. In 1921[2] only 900 had been returned as born in the Union.

Nationality. No data concerning nationality are available.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males decreased from 129·4 in 1904 to 123·9 in 1911, 122·3 in 1921, and 122·2 in 1936. These figures exclude absentees. Including persons working abroad there were 109·0 females to 100 males in 1921 and 106·8 in 1936.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the natives present in the Territory was very high, 48·7 per cent. in 1921 and 51·1 per cent. in 1936. Including absentee workers the percentages were 46·0 and 47·9 respectively. The proportion of men between 15 and 50 years dropped from 17·7 to 15·5 per cent. excluding absentees and from 22·1 to 20·7 per cent. including absentees. The proportion of women between 15 and 50 years dropped from 24·7 to 22·2 per cent. excluding absentees and from 23·5 to 20·9 per cent. including absentees. The proportion of old people (over 50 years) increased from 8·9 to 11·2 per cent. excluding absentees and from 8·4 to 10·5 per cent. including absentees.

Conjugal Condition. Of the adult males (including absentee workers) in 1936 42·7 per cent. were bachelors, 54·4 per cent. husbands, and 2·9 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the adult females 18·6 per cent. were spinsters, 59·5 per cent. wives, and 21·9 per cent. widows or divorced. As in Basutoland, the number of widows was extraordinarily high. There were 132 wives to 100 husbands as compared with 150 in 1921. Polygamy has apparently declined, but since the basic figures include absentee workers it seems to be still somewhat frequent.

IV. Composition of Non-Native Population

The censuses distinguish (1) Europeans, (2) Natives, (3) Asiatics, (4) Coloured. At the recent censuses Europeans comprised persons of pure European descent (whether born in Europe or not); Natives, pure blooded aboriginals of the Bantu race; Asiatics, persons born of, or descended from, races belonging to the continent of Asia (including Syrians and Parsees); Coloured, pure blooded persons other than Europeans, Asiatics, and

[1] There were 31,703 men between 15 and 50 years, including absentee workers, and the absentee workers (who practically all must have been between 15 and 50) numbered 9,451. Native men and women between 15 and 50 present in Swaziland numbered about 22,000 and 32,000 respectively. At the same time there were in the Union 17,000 men and nearly 6,000 women between 15 and 50 who were born in Swaziland.

[2] See *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 15.

Bantus, and all half-castes. At most of the earlier censuses apparently the majority of the persons who should have been counted as 'Coloured' were allocated to 'Natives'.

1. *Basutoland*

Race. When Basutoland, in 1868, was annexed by the British Government the number of Europeans in the country was very small. It increased, however, rapidly in the following years,[1] and amounted to 469 at the 1875 census. It probably did not rise in the following troublesome decade[2] and numbered 578 in 1891. During the Boer War the number of Whites rose temporarily very much. According to an estimate prepared in 1901 there were in the Territory 647 European residents and 1,845 White refugees from the Orange River Colony.[3] At the census of 1904, the Europeans numbered 895 and at the 1911 census 1,396. In the following 25 years the number of Europeans fluctuated much, without showing any definite trend. During the first World War 'a large number of Europeans have left Basutoland to take part in the War'.[4] On 3 May 1921 the Europeans numbered 1,603 but on 5 May 1936 only 1,434. The decrease since 1921 was due to a decline in the number of European children (under 15) from 490 to 275.[5] As no land has been alienated in Basutoland the number of Europeans engaged in agricultural occupations is negligible. It amounted to 16 in 1936.[6]

The numbers of Asiatics and other Coloured Non-Natives ascertained at the censuses of 1875, 1891, 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936 were 571, 180, 222, 1,304, 1,241, and 1,604 respectively. The number of Asiatics was 180 in 1911, 172 in 1921, and 341 in 1936.

Birthplace. Of the 1,434 Europeans enumerated in 1936 in Basutoland, 316 were born in the Territory, 622 in the Union, 9 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 247 in the United Kingdom or Ireland, 125 elsewhere in Europe, 2 in India, 1 in Japan, 82 in Canada, 3 in Newfoundland, 7 in the United States, 8 in Australia, and 2 in New Zealand. The changes in the distribution of Europeans by birthplace occurring between 1921 and 1936 were quite startling. The number of Europeans born in Africa decreased from 1,081 to 947, and the number of Europeans born in the United

[1] See Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, p. 29: '. . . the number of traders increased from 6 in 1871 to 50 in 1873 . . . .' See also Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1874*, p. 23.

[2] At the outbreak of the Gun War (1880–1) many traders moved from Basutoland to the Orange Free State; see ibid. *1881*, p. 8.

[3] See *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1900–1*, p. 13.

[4] Ibid. *1916–17*, p. 14.

[5] The number of European children under 5 decreased from 217 in 1911 to 192 in 1921 and to 127 in 1936; the number of children between 5 and 15 increased from 205 in 1911 to 298 in 1921 and dropped to 148 in 1936. The decline in the number of children was probably due exclusively to a reduction of fertility and not to an increasing habit of sending children to schools in the Union. The number of Europeans born in Basutoland and staying in the Union increased from 551 in 1921 to 641 in 1926, and to 808 in 1936. That a decreasing proportion of these Europeans were children sent to Union schools is suggested by the fact that in 1926 23 were under 5, 67 between 5 and 10, 124 between 10 and 15, 114 between 15 and 20, and 313 over 20, while the corresponding figures in 1936 were 26, 44, 95, 122, and 521 respectively (see *Census of the Union 1926*, Part VII, pp. 46–7; *1936*, vol. v, pp. 22–5).

[6] See *Basutoland Census 1936*, p. 20.

TABLE 13. *European Population by Birthplace, Basutoland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Country of birth	*1921*	*1936*		
	Total	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Basutoland	380	160	156	316
Bechuanaland	1	—	—	—
Mauritius	—	—	1	1
Rhodesia	6	1	6	7
Swaziland	—	1	—	1
Union of South Africa	693	348	274	622
Portuguese East Africa	1	—	—	—
Africa Total	1,081	510	437	947
England	261	94	74	168
Wales	5	1	2	3
Scotland	81	38	26	64
Ireland	35	6	6	12
Austria-Hungary	10	—	—	—
Belgium	1	2	5	7
France	59	26	25	51
Germany	19	2	42	44
Greece	2	—	—	—
Holland	2	—	1	1
Italy	2	—	—	—
Lithuania	—	1	—	1
Poland	2	1	5	6
Russia	3	—	—	—
Spain	1	—	—	—
Switzerland	15	6	9	15
Europe Total	498	177	195	372
India	7	1	1	2
China	1	—	—	—
Japan	—	—	1	1
Asia Total	8	1	2	3
Canada	1	47	35	82
Newfoundland	—	3	—	3
U.S. America	2	1	6	7
America Total	3	51	41	92
Australia	4	4	4	8
New Zealand	7	2	—	2
Oceania Total	11	6	4	10
Unknown	2	5	5	10
Grand Total	1,603	750	684	1,434

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, p. 21; *1936*, pp. 28–9.

TABLE 14. *European Population by Birthplace, Swaziland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Country of birth	*1921*	*1936*		
	Total	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Swaziland	769	512	510	1,022
Basutoland	—	3	2	5
Bechuanaland	—	1	—	1
Kenya	—	3	—	3
Nyasaland	—	1	1	2
Rhodesia	12	—	5	5
South-West Africa	—	1	2	3
Union of South Africa	1,124	717	566	1,283
Madagascar	—	1	—	1
Portuguese East Africa	9	10	9	19
Elsewhere in Africa	—	1	2	3
Africa Total	1,914	1,250	1,097	2,347
England	163	98	49	147
Wales	—	2	1	3
Scotland	50	32	20	52
Ireland	35	13	9	22
Austria	1	4	2	6
Denmark	—	1	—	1
Germany	16	11	8	19
Holland	—	2	—	2
Italy	1	20	26	46
Latvia	—	6	4	10
Lithuania	—	4	3	7
Norway	—	1	14	15
Portugal	—	7	3	10
Russia	3	6	2	8
Sweden	1	1	3	4
Switzerland	—	1	1	2
Elsewhere in Europe	—	—	3	3
Europe Total	270	209	148	357
Ceylon	—	1	—	1
India	—	1	2	3
Other Br. Poss. in Asia	—	1	—	1
Non-British Asia[2]	1	3	—	3
Asia Total	1	6	2	8
Br. Poss. in America	—	—	1	1
Non-British America[3]	13	6	14	20
America Total	13	6	15	21
Australia	7	4	2	6
At sea	—	1	—	1
Unknown	—	—	—	—
Grand Total	2,205	1,476	1,264	2,740

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 14; *1936*, p. 13.
[2] 1936 China. [3] 1936 U.S. America.

Kingdom and Ireland from 382 to 247. On the other hand, the number of Europeans born in Canada or Newfoundland increased from 1 to 85.

Of the 341 Asiatics enumerated in 1936 in Basutoland 210 were born in the Territory, 36 in the Union, 1 in another British possession in Africa, 87 in India, 1 in Palestine, and 6 at sea.

Of the 1,263 Coloured (other than Bantu) 794 were born in Basutoland, 455 in the Union, 1 in Rhodesia, 1 in Mauritius, and 1 in Portuguese East Africa.[1]

Length of Residence. Of the 492 Europeans in 1936, not born in South Africa, 132 had been in the Territory for less than 5 years, 188 from 5 to 29 years, 78 for 30 years and over; for 94 the length of residence was not ascertained. Apparently about one-half of the new-comers were Canadians.

Of 80 Asiatics only 8 had been in the Territory for less than 5 years, 42 from 5 to 29 years, and 30 for 30 years and over.[2]

Nationality. Of the 1,434 Europeans, 1,281 were British (493 British, 1 British Naturalized, 764 South African, 23 South African Naturalized), 7 Belgian, 1 Dutch, 59 French, 53 German, 6 Polish, 22 Swiss, and 5 American (U.S.A.).[3] Since 1921[4] the number of British had declined by 165 while the number of foreigners had remained practically unchanged.

The Asiatics and likewise the Other Coloured were, with one exception, all British.[5]

TABLE 15. *European Population born outside South Africa by Length of Residence, Basutoland and Swaziland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Territory	Year	Length of Residence (Years)															Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5 to 9	10 to 14	15 to 19	20 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 34	35 to 39	40 to 44	45 to 49	50 and over	Not stated	
Basuto-	1921	34	34	12	1	—	51	66	100	96	46	22	12	28	8	9	4	523
land .	1936	37	29	23	12	31	50	35	37	38	28	35	19	16	2	6	94	492
Swazi-	1921	27	21	10	2	5	19	19	43	68	19	25	8	11	4	9	10	300
land .	1936	50	23	17	22	11	78	53	37	20	22	22	11	13	7	6	37	429

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, p. 23, *1936*, p. 32; *Swaziland Census 1921*, p. 15, *1936*, p. 14.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males among Europeans has increased steadily from 69 in 1891 to 91 in 1936. Among the Asiatics there were in 1936 69 females to 100 males and among the Other Coloured 108.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the European population decreased from 30·6 per cent. in 1921 to 19·2 per cent. in 1936, and that of men between 15 and 50 from 30·2 to 28·5 per cent. while the proportion of women between 15 and 50 increased from 25·1 to 29·2 per cent., and that of old people (50 and over) from 14·1 to 23·1 per cent. Among the Asiatics, on the other hand, the proportion of children increased from 29 to 41 per cent.

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1936*, pp. 28–9.
[2] See ibid., p. 32.
[3] See ibid., pp. 33–4.
[4] See ibid. *1921*, p. 24.
[5] See ibid. *1936*, pp. 33–4. Of the Asiatics 294 were British and 46 South African, of the Other Coloured 478 were British and 784 South African.

TABLE 16. *Non-Native Population by Age and Sex, Basutoland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Age Years	1921						1936					
	Europeans		Asiatics		Coloured		Europeans		Asiatics		Coloured	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
0–4	94	98	13	7	51	57	65	62	25	25	88	87
5–9	100	84	7	9	69	71	58	51	20	25	78	76
10–14	56	58	5	6	78	71	23	16	31	14	87	89
15–19	39	23	5	5	50	55	24	32	23	16	66	71
20–4	50	61	5	4	28	40	60	51	10	10	36	49
25–9	70	59	10	4	25	28	86	79	8	12	33	52
30–4	62	70	14	4	21	32	72	75	8	10	31	34
35–9	81	85	19	1	22	29	60	70	3	11	42	41
40–4	109	69	12	2	27	30	55	59	11	2	29	30
45–9	73	35	11	2	19	24	52	53	13	4	17	32
50–4	32	29	6	—	29	18	62	51	17	6	19	24
55–9	30	20	7	—	8	10	61	37	13	1	17	20
60–4	34	20	2	—	11	11	37	23	8	1	18	10
65–9	19	14	2	—	5	5	13	8	6	—	14	13
70 and over	17	10	—	—	9	8	22	17	5	1	26	22
Not stated	—	2	3	7	54	74	—	—	1	1	7	5
Total	866	737	121	51	506	563	750	684	202	139	608	655

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 6.

TABLE 17. *Non-Native Population by Age and Sex, Swaziland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Age Years	Europeans 1921		Europeans 1936		Coloured 1936	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
0–4	164	141	138	176	54	82
5–9	131	148	146	132	60	61
10–14	134	105	131	130	55	50
15–19	101	106	114	123	53	26
20–4	100	66	128	105	46	37
25–9	103	78	144	115	31	31
30–4	87	72	127	97	27	16
35–9	80	70	90	85	11	7
40–4	95	56	93	78	14	4
45–9	84	46	75	58	11	3
50–4	64	33	83	43	6	4
55–9	38	16	79	49	4	1
60–4	23	12	46	29	2	2
65–9	15	9	50	13	2	2
70 and over	20	8	32	30	3	—
Total	1,239	966	1,476	1,264[2]	379	326

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1936*, pp. 5–6. Coloured include Asiatics.
[2] Including 1 Unspecified.

Conjugal Condition. Of the male Europeans over 15 years in 1936, 40 per cent. were bachelors, 56 per cent. husbands, and 4 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans over 15 years in 1936, 42 per cent. were spinsters, 53 per cent. wives, and 5 per cent. widows. The number

and the proportion of spinsters have increased considerably since 1921. The ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 87 both in 1921 and 1936. Among the Asiatics[1] there were in 1936 80 husbands and 40 wives.

TABLE 18. *European Adult Population by Conjugal Condition and Sex, Basutoland and Swaziland, 1921 and 1936*[1]

Territory	Year	Males					
		Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
Basutoland . .	1921	249	339	22	3	3	616
	1936	240	338	23	3	—	604
Swaziland . .	1921	390	396	19	5	—	810
	1936	458	564	26	10	3	1,061

Territory	Year	Females					
		Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
Basutoland . .	1921	171	296	28	1	1	497
	1936	230	294	26	—	5	555
Swaziland . .	1921	160	383	28	1	—	572
	1936	244	525	47	7	3	826

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1921*, pp. 7, 10, *1936*, pp. 6, 15; *Swaziland Census 1921*, pp. 6, 9, *1936*, pp. 5, 8.

2. *Bechuanaland*

No data are available concerning birthplace, nationality, or conjugal condition.

Race. 'Up to the year 1896 the only Europeans in the Territory were a few missionaries, hunters, and traders .... With the advance of the railway after 1895 the number of Europeans began to increase and settlement commenced in the eastern strip ....'[2] According to the returns of 1904, 1911, 1921, and 1936 the Europeans in the Protectorate numbered 1,004, 1,692, 1,743, and 1,899 respectively. The large increase from 1904 to 1911 'is partly accounted for by the fact that there happened to be no less than 363 Europeans passing through the Protectorate as railway passengers on the night of the Census as against only about 100 in 1904'.[3] One reason why the increase was so small in 1911–21 was emigration into the Union. The number of male Europeans in Bechuanaland was almost the same in 1936 as in 1911.[4]

The number of persons returned as Coloured (including Asiatics) increased from 355 in 1911 to 1,055 in 1921, and to 3,793 in 1936. The Asiatics numbered 52 in 1921 and 66 in 1936.

[1] See *Basutoland Census 1936*, p. 17.

[2] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, p. 13.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1910–11*, p. 4.

[4] No recent data are available concerning occupation, but 'there are sufficient European farmers and traders to justify the existence of a European Advisory Council' (Hodgson and Ballinger, p. 5).

TABLE 19. *Europeans Born in Bechuanaland and Swaziland and enumerated in Union of South Africa, 1911–36*[1]

Sex	Born in Bechuanaland					Born in Swaziland				
	1911	*1918*	*1921*	*1926*	*1936*	*1911*	*1918*	*1921*	*1926*	*1936*
Males	141	578	578	218	233	94	119	133	197	359
Females	147	441	633	286	226	69	113	136	232	353
Total	288	1,019	1,211	504	459	163	232	269	429	712

[1] See *Census of the Union of South Africa 1911*, Annexures to General Report, pp. 988–9; *1918*, Part VII, p. 6; *1921*, Part V, p. 4; *1926*, Part VII, p. 6; *1936*, vol. v, p. 1.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males among Europeans has increased steadily from 53 in 1904 to 78 in 1936. The Asiatics are nearly all men. Among the Coloured there were in 1936 96 females to 100 males.

Age. Of the 1,010 European males enumerated in 1921 388 were under 21 years, and of the 733 females 349. These are apparently the only age data available for the non-native population.

3. *Swaziland*

Very little is known about the number of Europeans prior to 1904. In his *Report on Swazieland* Sir F. de Winton said in 1890:[1]

As regards the White residents, it is difficult to arrive at their correct numbers, so many persons being non-resident, though possessed of interests in Swazieland, and a proper register of those entitled to vote for the White Committee never having been kept. The mineral holders, miners, canteen and store keepers, missionaries, and a few permanent farmers are the only residents in the country. These consist chiefly of subjects of Great Britain.[2] The non-residents consist of grazing holders and concessionaires.[3] They are chiefly subjects of the Transvaal, or persons who have interests in the South African Republic. Roughly speaking, the subjects and sympathisers of the South African Republic represent 3 to 1 as to other nationalities, but they do not represent much capital.

European ranching began in 1889, and the number of traders increased towards the end of the century.

. . . the main industry of later times, that of selling grain to the natives, did not commence until after the depletion of native resources by the very heavy losses of cattle caused by the epidemics of 1896–97 and of 1902 and by the disturbances during the Boer War. . . .[4]

[1] *Report on Swazieland*, p. 13.

[2] In a Dispatch of 1 Dec. 1892 to the High Commissioner Sir Henry B. Loch, the Marquess of Ripon said that 'those settlers who claim British nationality . . . were said some time ago to number about 450 out of about 750 permanent white residents' (*Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland*, 1893, p. 142).

[3] See also *Report on Swazieland*, p. 14: 'The history of the concessions of Swazieland is probably without a parallel. There are many instances where native rulers have given large and important rights to individuals and to corporations, but in Swazieland the late king and his council have parted not only with all their actual territory, but with rights which should only belong to the Government of a country, to a lot of adventurers whose sole object was to make money by them.' See furthermore *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1907–8*, p. 13: 'Practically the whole area of the country was covered two, three, or even four deep by concessions of all sizes, for different purposes, and for greatly varying periods.'

[4] Pim Commission, *Report Swaziland*, p. 12.

But the total number of Europeans was only 890 in 1904 and 1,083 in 1911, that is less than in either Basutoland or Bechuanaland. It was only after the final partition of the land between natives and Europeans in 1914 that white immigration started on a larger scale. In 1921 the Europeans, numbering 2,205, were twice as numerous as in 1911, and in 1936 there were 2,740 in the Territory. The number of persons engaged in agricultural occupations was 570[1] (as compared with only 16 in Basutoland).

The number of Coloured Persons (including a very few Asiatics) increased from 72 in 1904 to 143 in 1911, 451 in 1921, and 705 in 1936.

Birthplace. Of the 2,740 Europeans enumerated in 1936 in Swaziland, 1,022 were born in the Territory, 1,283 in the Union, 19 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 23 elsewhere in Africa, only 224 in the United Kingdom or Ireland, 133 elsewhere in Europe, 5 in British Possessions in Asia, 3 in China, 1 in British America, 20 in the United States, 6 in Australia, and 1 at sea. As in Basutoland, the number born in the United Kingdom and Ireland had decreased since 1921, when it was 248.

Of the 705 Coloured Persons no fewer than 586 were born in Swaziland, 95 in the Union, and 24 elsewhere.[2]

Length of Residence. Of the 429 Europeans in 1936 not born in South Africa, 123 had been in the Territory for less than 5 years, 210 from 5 to 29 years, 59 for 30 years and over; for 37 the length of residence was not ascertained. While in 1921 only 103 of those for whom the length of residence was stated had been less than 15 years in the Territory and 187 for a longer period, the corresponding figures in 1936 were 254 and 138 respectively.

Nationality. Of the 2,740 Europeans 2,605 were British (1,992 British, 22 British Naturalized, 588 South African,[3] 3 South African Naturalized), 4 Austrian, 1 Czecho-Slovakian, 1 Danish, 15 German, 2 Greek, 1 Hungarian, 39 Italian, 5 Latvian, 6 Lithuanian, 11 Norwegian, 1 Polish, 14 Portuguese, 4 Russian, 4 Swedish, 2 Swiss, 1 Yugoslavian, and 24 American (U.S.A.). The number of foreigners had increased since 1921 from 36 to 135. Of the 705 Coloured 677 were British, 21 South African, and 7 'Other and Unspecified'.[4]

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males among Europeans has increased steadily from 53 in 1904 to 86 in 1936. Among the Coloured there were in 1936 87 females to 100 males.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the European population decreased from 37·3 per cent. in 1921 to 31·1 per cent. in 1936, and that of men between 15 and 50 from 29·5 to 28·2 per cent., while the proportion of women between 15 and 50 increased from 22·4 to 24·1 per cent., and that of old people (50 and over) from 10·8 to 16·6 per cent. Among the Coloured more than one-half were returned as under 15 years of age.

[1] See *Swaziland Census 1936*, p. 9.

[2] See ibid., p. 13.

[3] It is noteworthy that though in Swaziland the number of persons born in the Union is twice as large as in Basutoland, many fewer persons were returned in Swaziland as of South African nationality.

[4] See ibid. *1921*, p. 16; *1936*, p. 15.

Conjugal Condition. Of the male Europeans over 15 years in 1936, 43 per cent. were bachelors, 54 per cent. husbands, and 3 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans over 15 years 29 per cent. were spinsters, 64 per cent. wives, and 7 per cent. widows or divorced. The ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 97 in 1921 and 93 in 1936; there were very few husbands who were not accompanied by their wives.

Of the Coloured people comparatively few were married: 76 among 209 males over 15 years, and 68 among 133 females over 15 years.[1]

V. Native Birth and Death Registration

'The Voluntary Births Registration Act, 1880' of the Cape Colony which was in force in Bechuanaland until January 1940 and is possibly still in force in Basutoland[2] was to cover both natives and non-natives, but it is doubtful whether any native birth has been registered under this Act in either of the two Territories. The 'Bechuanaland Protectorate Births and Deaths Registration Proclamation, 1939' excluded native births (and deaths) from registration. Proclamation No. 27 of 1900 of Transvaal which was in force in Swaziland until 1927 made registration of both native and non-native births and deaths compulsory but was apparently never applied to natives, and the 'Swaziland Births, Marriages and Deaths Registration Proclamation, 1927' abolished compulsory registration for natives and made it voluntary. Thus there is now no compulsory registration for natives in any of the Territories and no provision for voluntary registration of native births or deaths in Bechuanaland and of native deaths in Basutoland.

But the establishment of registration through Native Administrations has been rendered possible in each Territory.[3] The 'Bechuanaland Protectorate Native Administration Proclamation, 1934'[4] provided[5] that 'a Chief or Sub-Chief if required to do so shall issue orders to be obeyed by the natives within the area under his authority in respect of the same: . . . (*h*) for the collection of such statistics, including vital statistics, as may be called for by the Government.' But apparently no Chief was required by the Government to issue such order.

1934. The introduction of recent legislation defining the duties of Native Chiefs will in due course make it possible to obtain from them records from which Native vital statistics can be compiled.[6]

[1] See ibid. *1936*, pp. 6, 8.

[2] See pp. 49–50 below.

[3] No such provision had been made in Swaziland prior to 1944, but the 'Swaziland Statistics Proclamation, 1931' (No. 43 of 1931, 21 Oct., *Swaziland Proclamations and High Commissioner's Notices 1931*, pp. 18, 1–4) says:

'2. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Proclamation and to the directions of the Resident Commissioner, statistics shall be collected annually or at any other time as the Resident Commissioner may direct in relation to all or any of the following matters:—

(*a*) Vital, social, educational, and industrial matters . . . .'

However, no attempt seems to have been made to use this Proclamation for the collection of vital statistics.

[4] No. 74 of 1934 (4 Jan. 1935), reprinted in Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1934*, pp. 88–95.

[5] Section 17 (1).

[6] Bechuanaland, *Medical Report 1934*, pp. 20–1.

1936. No vital statistics are available for the Native population as there are no means at present existing in the Protectorate whereby they may be obtained.[1]

The 'Bechuanaland Protectorate Native Administration Proclamation, 1934' was repealed by the 'Bechuanaland Protectorate Native Administration Proclamation, 1943'[2] which provided:

24. Subject to the provisions of any law for the time being in force and to the general or special directions of the High Commissioner, a Native Authority may, subject to the general or special directions of the Native Authority, if any, to which it is subordinate, issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the local limits of its authority—

(*i*) *Vital statistics:* requiring the birth, marriage or death of any native within the local limits of its authority to be reported to it or to such other person as it may direct.

The 'Basutoland Native Administration Proclamation, 1938'[3] says:

8. (1) Provided that such orders do not conflict with any law for the time being in force in the Territory, the Paramount Chief may issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the area of his jurisdiction—

(*n*) requiring the birth or death of any native within his jurisdiction to be reported to him or to such other person as he may direct.

The 'Swaziland Native Administration Proclamation, 1944'[4] contains a similar clause.

9. Provided that such orders do not conflict with any law for the time being in force in the Territory the Native Authority for the Territory may issue orders to be obeyed by natives in the Territory, and a subordinate native authority, subject to the general or special directions of the Native Authority for the Territory, may issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the local limits of its authority—

(*m*) requiring the birth, death, child betrothal, or marriage of any native within its jurisdiction to be reported to it or to such other person as it may direct.

There is no evidence that any native birth or death has ever been recorded in any of the three Territories by either a European registrar or a Native Authority.

Sample studies have been made on a very small scale. In Basutoland, in 1926, 'a "questionnaire" relative to their families was made to a certain number of women coming to the dispensary at Maseru. They were not selected but were representative of the average Mosuto woman.'[5] The number of women questioned was 519 and they were asked the number of years they had been married, the number of children they had borne, and the number of children that had died. The results will be discussed in Section VII of this chapter.

In 1940 and 1941 some investigations were made of fertility and child mortality in Bechuanaland. The Medical Officer Dr. Squires described

[1] Bechuanaland, *Medical Report 1936*, p. 16. See also ibid. *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 13.

[2] No. 32 of 1943 (3 Sept.), reprinted in Bechuanaland, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1943*, pp. 29–50.

[3] No. 61 of 1938 (12 Dec.), reprinted in *Basutoland Proclamations and Notices 1938*, pp. 175–84.

[4] No. 44 (27 Oct.), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland*, 27 Oct. 1944, pp. 11–15.

[5] Basutoland, *Medical Report 1926*, p. 26.

the methods and results in a lecture delivered on 22 April 1941 in the African Advisory Council.

Last year, at Francistown, Dr. Morgan and I began collecting information on this point from women attending the dispensary. Many of these women were not sick themselves, but had brought their children for attention, and those who *were* sick suffered from slight ailments only, which did not affect their powers of conception or of child bearing. With regard to age, the series was well spread out over the child-bearing period of life. Every woman was questioned as to the number of her pregnancies, miscarriages, and number of children dead and alive.

Early this year Mr. Ashton collected similar information from men, mostly at Kgotla meetings in the Tati Reserve. I need only say that his results were very much the same as ours.

The total number of women questioned was 220: between them these women had 838 pregnancies, which works out at about four per woman. Of these pregnancies 84, or one in ten, ended in miscarriage. 754 children were born, of whom 169 died before they attained the age of one year; this infantile mortality rate works out at 224 per thousand. . . .

Next let us consider the fate of the children who survive their first year. Of these children, 585 survived this period, but of these 32 have already died. At present therefore there are now 553 children alive, born of 220 mothers, an average of between two and three per mother.[1]

Unfortunately, for various reasons no conclusions can be drawn from this investigation. (1) A graph accompanying the lecture shows that each woman questioned had at least one live-born child. Thus, sterile women and women who so far had had only pregnancies ending in miscarriage or stillbirth were excluded. (2) Some of the 838 pregnancies covered by the investigation must have resulted in stillbirths, but whether these were included in 'miscarriages' or not it is impossible to tell. (3) The fact that 'the series was well spread out over the child-bearing period of life' leaves one guessing what the total number of pregnancies of these women might be. (4) The figures concerning child mortality are evidently defective. It is out of the question that actually only 32 of the 585 children who survived the first year of age died prior to the investigation. Since the women questioned had on an average 3·4 live-born children, many children must have been exposed to the risk of death for a very long period.

At the maternity and child-welfare centre started in 1933 at Bremersdorp, Swaziland, 202 women were questioned regarding the number of their pregnancies, abortions, and stillbirths, and the mortality of their children.[2] The results will be found in Section VII of this chapter.

VI. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration

1. *Basutoland and Bechuanaland*

The legal basis for birth and death registration in Bechuanaland (until 1940) is to be found in an Ordinance of the Cape Colony of 1833 and in an Act of the Cape Colony of 1880.

The 'Ordinance for regulating the Registration of Wills and the Administration of the Estates and Property of Persons dying, either testate or

[1] *Minutes of the 22nd Session of the African Advisory Council*, p. 20.

[2] See *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1933*, p. 9; *Medical Report 1933*, p. 10.

intestate, in so far as the same are situated within this Colony'[1] provided among other things that notice of any death (of a European) occurring in the Cape Colony must be given to the authorities.

9. And be it further enacted, that whenever any death shall occur the nearest relative or connection of the deceased who shall at the time be at or near the place of death, and in default of any such near relative or connection, the person who at or immediately after the death, shall have the chief charge of the house in or of the place on which, the death shall occur, shall cause notice of the death to be given in manner following, that is to say,—where the death shall occur in Cape Town or within six hours' distance thereof, at the office of the Master of the Supreme Court; where the death shall occur elsewhere and in, or within six hours' distance of any town or village in which the office of any Resident Magistrate shall be holden, at such office; and where the death shall occur at any place situated at a greater distance from any such town or village, to the Field-cornet of the Field-cornetcy in which the death shall occur. And every person herein required to cause such notice as aforesaid to be given, who shall without some lawful and sufficient excuse fail to do so, shall, on conviction thereof before the Resident Magistrate of the district, at the instance of the Clerk of the Peace thereof, incur a penalty not exceeding five pounds sterling nor less than five shillings, to be levied out of the movable property of such person. And every Field-cornet within the Cape district, and the district of Stellenbosch, to whom any such notice as aforesaid of any death shall be given, shall forthwith transmit the same to the office of the Master of the Supreme Court; and every Field-cornet in any other district to whom any such notice shall be given, shall forthwith transmit the same to the Resident Magistrate of such district; and every Resident Magistrate to whom any such notice shall be transmitted, shall forthwith transmit the same to the Master of the Supreme Court: Provided always, that it shall not be necessary for any person to cause notice of any death to be given under and in terms of the provisions of this Ordinance before the lapse of the period within which it is hereinafter provided that inventories taken of the property left by deceased persons shall be transmitted in manner hereinafter mentioned, and that such notices may at all times be transmitted along with such inventories in manner hereinafter mentioned, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

10. And be it further enacted, that all such notices of death as are hereinbefore required to be given, shall contain and set forth the following particulars, in so far as the same shall be known to the person giving the same, that is to say:

1. The name and birth-place and names of the parents of the deceased.
2. His or her age.
3. His or her condition.
4. Whether married or unmarried or widower or widow.
5. The day of the decease.
6. At what house or where the person died.
7. Names of the deceased's children, and whether they are majors or minors.
8. Whether deceased has left property of any kind.

Provided always, that in such notice it shall not be necessary to specify the nature or amount of such property.

11. And be it further enacted, that a register, to be called the 'Death Register,' shall be kept in the office of the Master of the Supreme Court, in which the said Master shall cause to be inserted every notice of death which shall be transmitted to him in manner hereinbefore provided, together with all the particulars therein contained.[2]

[1] No. 104 of 5 July 1833, reprinted in *Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope 1652–1886*, vol. i, pp. 951–70.

[2] The 'Executors' and Trustees' Accounts Act, 1873' (No. 11, 26 June), reprinted ibid., pp. 973–5, provided that 'Every person who shall by virtue . . . of the Ordinance No. 104 be bound and obliged to deliver or transmit to the Resident Magistrate of the district in which he shall reside,

'The Voluntary Birth Registration Act, 1880'[1] provided that (native and non-native) births occurring in the Cape Colony be registered in case the parents desired such registration. This Act read as follows:

Whereas it is expedient to provide for the voluntary registration of births within the several divisions of this colony: Be it therefore enacted by the Governor of the Cape of Good Hope, with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council and House of Assembly thereof, as follows:—

I. From and after the first day of September, 1880, there shall be kept at the office of every civil commissioner within this colony, a book, to be called the 'Births Registration Book,' in which shall be entered and registered by such civil commissioner, or other person lawfully deputed by him for that purpose, in manner and form hereinafter provided, the particulars of all such births occurring within the division for which he shall act as such civil commissioner, as the parents, or in case of their decease or inability to act, the next of kin of, or other person interested in, the child or children so born, shall desire to have so entered and registered.

II. The 'Births Registration Book' aforesaid shall contain the particulars and be in the form set forth in the first schedule to this Act annexed.[2]

III. Every such registration as aforesaid shall take place within two calendar months from the date of the birth of the child so desired to be enregistered: Provided that after the expiration of the said period of two calendar months such registration may still take place upon payment of double the amount of fee payable as is in the fifth section hereof hereinafter provided for or in respect of every such registration made within the said period of two calendar months: Provided, also, however, that after the expiration of twelve calendar months from the date of birth, no registration thereof shall upon any pretence be made except in such cases as are in the seventh section hereof hereinafter provided for.

IV. Before making any such registration as aforesaid, the civil commissioner, or his deputy as aforesaid, shall require the person desiring such registration to make and subscribe before any justice of the peace the solemn declaration set forth in the second schedule to this Act annexed, and such declaration shall be filed in the office of the said civil commissioner.

V. There shall be payable to the said civil commissioner in respect of every such registration as aforesaid, by the person desiring the same, a fee of one shilling (except in cases where as is in the third section hereof hereinbefore provided for the same shall be double that amount), and at the time of such registration the said civil commissioner shall furnish such person with a certificate thereof, signed by the said civil commissioner, in the form set forth in the third schedule to this Act annexed, which certificate shall, on production, either before any court of justice or elsewhere, be deemed and taken to be *prima facie* legal evidence of the birth, the due registration of which is therein certified to.

VI. It shall be competent for any person at any time after the said first day of September, 1880, and during ordinary office hours, to inspect the said 'Births Registration Book,' and also for any person, upon payment of a fee of one shilling, to obtain from the said civil commissioner (or his deputy as aforesaid) a certificate

either directly or through the Field-cornet of the Field-cornetcy in which any death shall occur, any . . . notice of the death . . . shall at the same time deliver or transmit, as the case may be, a duplicate or otherwise a copy fairly written of every such . . . death notice . . . .' It stipulated furthermore that 'Every Resident Magistrate receiving such duplicates or copies . . . shall cause the same to be preserved and registered; and any person may on any day, Sundays and holidays excepted, inspect and take copies thereof.'

[1] No. 20 of 1880 (30 July), 'An Act to provide for the Voluntary Registration of Births within the several Divisions of this Colony', reprinted in *Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope 1879–83*, pp. 198–201.

[2] These particulars are: No. of Entry; Date of Registration; Name, in full; Sex; Declared Day of Birth; Parents' Names, in full—Father, Mother; Abode of Parents at time of Child's Birth; Quality, Trade, or Profession of Father; By whom Declaration of Birth made; By whom Registered.

Since Bechuanaland has published mortality statistics based on the compulsory death notifications, and since I did not find a single Basutoland document suggesting that the 1833 Ordinance or the 1880 Act have ever been put into operation, I think it likely that compulsory death notification, if indeed it ever existed in Basutoland, has fallen into oblivion, but that there is some opportunity for voluntary birth and death registration (not necessarily based on the Voluntary Births Registration Act of 1880).[1]

As regards Bechuanaland, the Ordinance of 1833 is in force still to-day. But the Voluntary Births Registration Act of 1880 was repealed by the 'Bechuanaland Protectorate Births and Deaths Registration Proclamation, 1939'[2] which came into force on 1 January 1940. It was issued 'Whereas it is expedient to make provision for the registration of births and deaths of persons other than natives in the Bechuanaland Protectorate'.[3]

Under Section 20 of this Proclamation the High Commissioner issued Regulations[4] which, on the whole, represent a brief extract from the Swaziland Regulations of 1927,[5] but contained the following additional provisions:

5. (2) For the purpose of verifying the prescribed particulars and the amplification or correction thereof the District Registrar may require, by notice in writing, the informant or any other person whose duty it is to register the birth or death, or, in default of such person, any credible person having knowledge of the truth of the case, to attend personally at his office within a reasonable time to be specified in the notice and to supply such other evidence or information as may be required by such

[1] The Basutoland *Medical Reports* say year in, year out: 'Registration of births, deaths and marriages is recorded for Europeans living in the country but not for any section of the native population.' See, for example, *Report 1938*, p. 6.

[2] No. 59 of 1939 (20 Nov.), Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1939*, pp. 100–6.

[3] The reason why the Administration was interested in the registration of non-natives only is indicated in the first three sections of a Note distributed to the Members of the European Advisory Council before the discussion of the Draft Proclamation. It began as follows:

'1. The question of introducing compulsory registration of births and deaths was raised some years ago in connexion with the English Evidence (Foreign, Dominion and Colonial Documents) Act, 1933.

'2. The objects of the Act are:—

(I) To save costs where certain official foreign documents such as certificates of births, deaths, and marriages are required for use in legal proceedings or for other legal purposes in the United Kingdom, and

(II) to enable reciprocal agreements to be concluded with foreign countries or with other parts of the Empire to dispense with the "legalization" of such documents, the effect of which would be to save time and expense to officials and other persons in the United Kingdom when English documents of this kind are required for use in the foreign country or part of the Empire concerned.

'3. Reciprocity between the United Kingdom and the Bechuanaland Protectorate already exists, but if the 1933 Act is to be of any practical benefit to the Protectorate in connexion with births and deaths, it is necessary that registers should be kept under the authority of the law of the Protectorate. The compulsory registration of marriages is already in force.

'4. There are, also, other obvious advantages in having an accurate record of a country's vital statistics.'

(*Minutes of the 26th Session of the European Advisory Council*, 15 Feb. 1939, pp. 16–17.)

[4] High Commissioner's Notice No. 211 of 1939 (24 Nov.), Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Proclamations and Government Notices 1939*, pp. 234–44.

[5] See pp. 53–6 below.

District Registrar. The informant shall then certify to the correctness of all alterations or additions so made to the prescribed particulars by affixing his initials or mark thereto.

(3) The District Registrar shall preserve the notice and such other written evidence as may have been submitted to him in support thereof as he may deem advisable.

6. Every person shall be entitled, upon giving twenty-four hours' notice to the Registrar, and upon payment of the fees set forth in the Second Schedule hereto, to search the index to and inspect any entry in any Register or return in the custody of the Registrar and to have a certified copy under the hand of that officer of any such entry.

The main provisions of the Proclamation, ensuring registration of births and deaths, are as follows:

Registrar and District Registrars

2. (1) The Resident Commissioner may from time to time, by Notice in the *Gazette*, appoint an officer to be styled the Registrar of Births and Deaths, who shall be the custodian of all notices of births and deaths and of all returns, registers and records of any birth or death in the Territory.

(2) The Resident Commissioner may also from time to time, by Notice in the *Gazette*, appoint officers to be styled District Registrars of Births and Deaths for each of the districts of the Territory or for such other areas therein as he may from time to time prescribe.

Birth and Death Registration

1. This Proclamation shall apply to all persons in the Territory except natives, which term shall include any aboriginal native belonging to any tribe of Africa and also any persons of mixed race living as members of any native community, tribe, kraal or location in the Territory.

21. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, it shall be lawful for the Registrar to register, within six months after the commencement of this Proclamation, the birth of any person born in the Territory prior to the commencement of this Proclamation, whose birth has not been registered under the provisions of Act No. 20 of 1880 of the Cape of Good Hope applied to the Territory by Proclamation No. 36 of 1909, on production of proof, satisfactory to the Registrar, of such birth, and upon payment of a fee of twenty shillings.

In case of a live-birth or stillbirth (1) the father and mother, (2) any person present at the birth or the occupier of the dwelling in which the child is born shall within three months give notice to the District Registrar or to a police officer or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £10 or to imprisonment not exceeding one month or to both fine and imprisonment.

In case of a death (1) every adult relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased or at his dwelling with him, (2) every adult person present at the death, (3) the occupier of the dwelling in which the death occurred, (4) every adult inmate of the dwelling or any person who has caused the body to be buried shall within thirty days give notice to the District Registrar or to a police officer or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £10 or to imprisonment not exceeding one month or to both fine and imprisonment.

Headings of Registers

Birth (Form A): No.; Date of Birth and Time of Birth; Place of Birth; Name if any; Sex; Name and Surname, Residence and Occupation of

Father; Name and Maiden Surname, Residence and Occupation of Mother; Nationality of Parents; Full Name, Occupation and Residence of Informant, and in what capacity he gives information; When Registered; Signature of Registrar; Name, if added after Registration of Birth.

Death (Form B): No.; Date of Death and Time of Death; Place of Death; Name and Surname; Sex; Age; Residence and Occupation; Nationality; Cause of Death; Full Name, Occupation and Residence of Informant, and in what capacity he gives information; When Registered; Signature of Registrar.

The Registrar and the District Registrars receive no compensation for their services in this capacity. Registration of births and deaths in due time is free of charge. But fees have to be paid for the registration of a birth after three months (if within one year 5*s*., for each year or part of a year thereafter 5*s*.), for the registration of a death after one month (if within one year 5*s*., for each year or part of a year thereafter 5*s*.), for registration of name subsequent to registration of birth or alteration in name (5*s*.), for inspection of any Register, return or index (1*s*.), for a certified copy of any entry in any register or return (5*s*.), for any correction of an error of fact (5*s*.).

2. *Swaziland*

Two years after the conquest of the Transvaal the Governor of this new Colony proclaimed[1] that the laws of the Transvaal 'shall *mutatis mutandis* and as far as they may be applicable be in force' in Swaziland. Thereupon registration of births and deaths became compulsory in Swaziland in accordance with a Transvaal Proclamation of 18 October 1900.[2] This Proclamation had been issued 'Whereas it is essential for the better government of the Colony of the Transvaal that all Births and Deaths occurring within the Colony should be registered as accurately and with as little delay as possible'. The registration forms asked among other things for the race of the father and the mother of the child and for the race of the deceased, and nothing in the text of the Proclamation suggests that it was not to apply to 'all Births and Deaths', but it was apparently never enforced for Natives.[3]

The Proclamation was repealed for Swaziland in 1927 by a 'Proclamation Consolidating and amending the laws in force in Swaziland relating to the Registration of Births, Marriages, and Deaths'[4] which made birth and death registration compulsory for Non-Natives and voluntary for Natives.

Under Section 28 of this Proclamation the High Commissioner made

[1] Proclamation No. 3 of 1904 (1 Oct.), the 'Swaziland Administration Proclamation 1904', *The Transvaal Government Gazette Extraordinary*, 3 Oct. 1904, pp. 1–6.

[2] No. 27 of 1900, reprinted in *Transvaal Colony Proclamations 1900–2*, pp. 13–16.

[3] See, for example, *Official Year Book of the Union, &c., 1919*, p. 950.

[4] No. 22 of 1927 (12 May), 'Swaziland Births, Marriages and Deaths Registration Proclamation, 1927', *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa*, 20 May 1927, pp. 17–19, reprinted in *Swaziland Laws 1927*, p. 11.

Regulations[1] for the guidance of registrars the most important of which were as follows:

2. Subject to the provisions of the Proclamation the powers and duties of a registrar, district registrar, and assistant district registrar shall be—

A.—Registrar:

(1) To take charge of and preserve all books, registers, and records of births, marriages, and deaths which occurred prior to this Proclamation in any part of Swaziland which should be in his custody and of which no record or duplicate is in his custody;

(2) to examine and amend in accordance with these regulations any register, return, or documentary proof or order the amendment thereof, and to call for any documentary proof he may deem necessary;

(3) to take charge of and preserve all such books, forms, registers, returns, and other documents as form part of the records of the Registrar's office;

(4) to receive and deal with applications in terms of sections *six*, *seven* and *eight* of the Proclamation;

(5) to receive and deal with applications for searches and for certified copies of birth, marriage, and death registers or other documentary proofs and to obtain and furnish such information concerning births, marriages, and deaths as may be required;

(6) to cause indexes to be made of all birth, marriage, and death records in his custody;

(7) to have the general control and superintendence of the registration of births, marriages, and deaths in Swaziland and all officers on whom by these regulations or any law dealing with the registration of births, marriages, and deaths in force in Swaziland any power or duty is imposed or conferred shall, in the exercise of such power or duty conform to the lawful instructions of the registrar.

B.—District Registrar:

(1) To fill in the prescribed forms on behalf of persons who verbally give information concerning births, deaths, and still-births occurring in his district;

(2) to receive forms of information accompanied by declarations, if required, verifying the information given therein;

(3) to receive forms of information after previous registration from assistant district registrars of his district or without previous registration from officers holding inquests or inquiries or from justices of the peace or police officers;

(4) to examine forms of information received and any documents in support thereof and cause any defect therein to be supplied or inaccuracy corrected;

(5) to register forms of information by inserting the date in the space prescribed ('when registered') signing his name in the space prescribed ('signature of district registrar'), and inserting in the space prescribed the name of his district;

(6) to transcribe all the particulars given on forms of information into the 'births register,' 'deaths register,' or 'still-births register' (as the case may be) and to number such forms;

(7) to prepare indexes for the 'births register' and the 'deaths register';

(8) to supply assistant district registrars, justices of the peace, and police officers in his district with all prescribed books, forms, and documents required by them;

(9) to furnish the public upon application and upon payment of the prescribed fee with birth and death certificates, and to carry out any search that may be required;

[1] See High Commissioner's Notice No. 59 of 1927 (20 May), *Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa*, 20 May 1927, pp. 23–31, reprinted in *Swaziland Laws 1927*, pp. 27 (1–27).

(10) to receive and forward to the registrar applications made in terms of sections *six*, *seven*, and *eight* of the Proclamation when such applications are tendered to him;

(11) to superintend and control, subject to the lawful instructions of the registrar, the registration of births and deaths in his district and all officers in his district in as far as they may be engaged in carrying out the provisions of the Proclamation and these regulations;

(12) to transmit at the end of each month to the registrar by registered post a package containing all original forms of information of births, still-births, and deaths, together with all certificates and other documents pertaining thereto, and simultaneously transmit under the same or a separate cover an invoice specifying the contents of such package.

C.—Assistant District Registrars:

(1) To fill in the prescribed forms on behalf of persons who give verbal information of births, deaths, and still-births;

(2) to receive forms of information accompanied by declarations, if required, verifying the information given;

(3) to receive forms of information from officers holding inquests or inquiries, or from justices of the peace or police officers;

(4) to register forms of information by inserting the date in the space prescribed ('when registered'), signing his name in the space prescribed ('signature of assistant district registrar') and inserting in the prescribed space the name of his station;

(5) to transcribe into the prescribed registers from the forms of information filled in, such particulars as are necessary to complete the entries in such registers;

(6) to receive and forward to the registrar applications made in terms of sections *six*, *seven*, and *eight* of the Proclamation when such applications are tendered to him;

(7) to transmit to the district registrar of his district weekly, if there is suitable postal or other communication and, if not, then, by every available opportunity, all forms of information, together with any medical certificates and other documents relating thereto.

D.—General:

(1) Every district registrar and assistant district registrar shall ascertain and thoroughly acquaint himself with the boundaries of the district or portion of the district for which he has been appointed and with the boundaries of all urban areas in such district or portion of a district.

(2) Every district registrar, assistant district registrar, and every other person to whom duties are assigned by the provisions of the Proclamation or of these regulations shall thoroughly acquaint himself with such provisions, and with every particular respecting his duties as therein set forth, and he shall further acquaint himself with the forms with which he is supplied and their prescribed uses;

(3) every district registrar, assistant district registrar, justice of the peace, or police officer, entrusted with registration work under the Proclamation or these regulations, shall keep himself supplied with such books, forms, and documents as may be required for the carrying out of his powers and duties in connexion with such registration work;

(4) every district registrar or assistant district registrar who has the use of a safe shall keep all his books and completed documents and forms therein;

(5) all books, registers, and other records of births and deaths in the custody of any district registrar or assistant district registrar, other than those which he may be required to forward to the registrar, shall remain in the custody of and be carefully preserved by such district registrar or assistant district registrar (as the case may be).

3. (1) All the particulars relating to a birth, still-birth or death required on the form prescribed in the Schedule hereto shall be furnished by the informant.

(3) If a birth has been registered as illegitimate, and satisfactory proof is produced that the parents could have legally married each other at the date of the birth of the child, and have so married each other, either parent or any other person having the lawful custody of such child may apply to the registrar to have such entry cancelled in the register. The registrar shall, if satisfied with the evidence produced, order that the entry be cancelled, and that the birth registered as legitimate. No reference whatsoever to the previous registration shall be made on the new form.

4. The prescribed information concerning any birth, still-birth, or death shall be given by the informant to the district registrar or assistant district registrar, if such birth, still-birth, or death occurred within an urban area, or to the district registrar, assistant district registrar, or any justice of the peace or police officer, if such birth, still-birth, or death occurred in a rural area, by verbal communication or by transmitting by hand or prepaid post, the prescribed form of information duly filled in. If such information is given by transmitting the prescribed form as aforesaid, such form shall be signed by the informant in the presence of a justice of the peace, commissioner of oaths, or police officer, who shall also sign the form in the allotted space.

5. If a woman be delivered of more than one child at one birth, the information concerning the birth of each child shall appear on a separate form, and the exact time or hour (if known) of each birth recorded.

6. (1) Still-births shall not be entered either in the births' register or the deaths' register, but a separate register as prescribed in the schedule hereto shall be kept by the district registrar in which particulars relating to such still-births shall be noted. Certificates of still-births shall be issued by the registrar only.

(2) If the child was born alive, even though not viable, but died immediately after its birth, both a birth information form and a death information form shall be made out, and both events shall be registered in the usual way.

7. When an inquest or other inquiry into the cause of the death of any person is held the person holding such inquest or inquiry shall in terms of section *twelve* of the Proclamation transmit to the district registrar the form prescribed in the schedule hereto (Form B.M.D. 2) in which the following particulars in regard to the cause of death must be given:—

(*a*) In the case of a death from disease—the nature of the disease so far as ascertainable, and, if a medical practitioner is a witness, in the words of such medical practitioner.

(*b*) In the case of a death from violence—

(i) whether the injury causing death was homicidal, suicidal, or accidental; and

(ii) nature of the injuries; and

(iii) the means whereby or instrument wherewith the injury was inflicted and the special circumstances, if any, under which it was sustained (e.g. if a death be caused by machinery, the kind of machine shall be stated; if by burns or scalds, the circumstances and manner in which sustained; if by poison, the name of the poison; if by drowning, whether the drowning occurred while bathing, boating, or crossing a river or stream, or under what circumstances); and

(iv) what time elapsed between the receipt of the injury and death.

8. The person in charge of any hospital, maternity home, nursing home, orphanage, or similar institution shall, when called upon to do so by the district registrar of the district or area in which such institution is situated, furnish a weekly return of all births and deaths occurring in such institution.

Such a return shall show—

(*a*) in the case of a birth, the date thereof and the name and address of the mother;

(*b*) in the case of a death, the date thereof and the name of the deceased.

9. Every birth, still-birth, or death shall be registered in the district in which it occurred, and any person whose duty it is to give information concerning a birth, still-birth, or death who before such birth, still-birth, or death is registered removes out of the district in which the birth, still-birth, or death occurred into another district, shall within the time prescribed by the Proclamation, give information of such birth, still-birth, or death to the district registrar or assistant district registrar into whose district he has removed, and such district or assistant district registrar shall sign and date the form of information and transmit it to the district registrar of the district in which such birth, still-birth, or death occurred.

The main provisions of the 1927 Proclamation, ensuring registration of births and deaths, are as follows:

Registrar, District Registrars, and Assistant District Registrars

1. For the administration of this Proclamation the High Commissioner may from time to time appoint an officer to be styled the registrar of births, marriages and deaths, who shall be the custodian of all notices of births and deaths, of all such returns as are required by any regulation to be rendered to him by district registrars, of all registers and returns required to be rendered by marriage officers under this Proclamation or any marriage law in force in Swaziland, and of all records of any birth or death or marriage in Swaziland prior to the commencement of this Proclamation.

2. (1) The High Commissioner may from time to time appoint officers to be styled district registrars of births and deaths for each of the districts of Swaziland or for other areas therein as may be from time to time prescribed by notice in the *Gazette*; provided that wherever there is no district registrar appointed for a district the assistant commissioner thereof shall *ex officio* be the district registrar.

(2) The High Commissioner may from time to time, for districts for which district registrars have been appointed, appoint persons to be styled assistant district registrars of births and deaths; provided that wherever there is no assistant district registrar appointed, the assistant commissioner of the district shall *ex officio* be the assistant district registrar.

(3) The duties of any district registrar or assistant district registrar shall be as prescribed by this Proclamation or by any regulation.

Birth and Death Registration

17. Nothing in this Proclamation contained shall be construed as applying to the notification or registration of the births and deaths of natives except in such districts as may be specified by the High Commissioner by notice in the *Gazette* as districts in which this Proclamation shall be in force in regard to the notification and registration of births and deaths of natives.

Provided that any native who so desires shall be entitled to avail himself of the facilities for registration offered.

18. The expression 'native' in this chapter means a person both of whose parents belong or belonged to an aboriginal race or tribe of Africa and includes any person of mixed race living as a member of any native community, tribe, kraal or location.

In case of a live-birth (1) the father, (2) any person, other than the mother, present at the birth or the occupier of the dwelling in which the birth occurred, (3) the person having charge of the child, shall within thirty days give notice to the district registrar or assistant district registrar or to a justice of the peace or to a police officer, or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £25 or in default of payment to imprisonment with or without hard labour not exceeding three months.

In case of a death (1) every adult relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased or at his dwelling with

him, (2) every adult person present at the death, (3) the occupier of the dwelling in which the death occurred, (4) every adult inmate of the dwelling or any person who has caused the body to be buried, shall within thirty days give notice to the district registrar, assistant district registrar, justice of the peace or police officer, or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £25 or in default of payment to imprisonment with or without hard labour not exceeding three months.

Headings of Registers

Birth (Form B.M.D.1A): CHILD: 1. Date of birth, 2. Place where born, 3. Usual place of residence of parents or guardian, 4. Christian names, 5. Sex, 6. Place of marriage of parents; FATHER: 7. Christian names and surname, 8. Birthplace, 9. Age, 10. Race, 11. Occupation, 12. Industry; MOTHER: 13. Christian names and maiden surname, 14. Birthplace, 15. Age, 16. Race, 17. Occupation, 18. Industry; INFORMANT: 19. Signature, 20. Qualification, 21. Residence, 22. Witness to informant's signature, 23. Date.—Number of entry; When registered or received, Station, Assistant District Registrar; When registered, District, District Registrar; Name added or altered after registration of birth, Date.

The following information required for statistical purposes only should be obtained if possible: (*a*) Year of marriage; (*b*) Number of children of this mother (including child now being registered)—(1) Born alive and now living, (2) Born alive but now dead, (3) Still-born.

Death (Form B.M.D.2A): DECEASED: 1. Christian names and surname, 2. Name of Parent or Guardian (if deceased was under the age of ten years), 3. Sex, 4. Age, 5. Race, 6. Birthplace, 7. Whether single, married, divorced, widower, or widow, 8. Occupation, 9. Industry, 10. Pensioner or Dependent of pensioner, 11. Date of death, 12. Place of death, 13. Usual place of residence, 14. Intended place of burial, 15. Causes of death, 16. Duration of disease or of last illness, 17. Name of Medical Practitioner; INFORMANT: 18. Signature, 19. Qualification, 20. Residence, 21. Witness to informant's signature, 22. Date.—Number of entry; When registered or received, Station, Assistant District Registrar; When registered, District, District Registrar.

The Registrar, District Registrars, and Assistant District Registrars receive no compensation for their services in this capacity. Registration of births and deaths within a year after the event is free of charge. But fees have to be paid for registration after one year (10*s.*), for alteration of a name (if application is made within twelve months after birth 2*s.* 6*d.*, if after that period £1), for each search made (per calendar year or part thereof 1*s.*),[1] for a certificate of a birth or a death (2*s.* 6*d.*).

[1] Search fees shall not be charged (1) when a birth or death certificate is required (*a*) when application is made at time of reporting birth or death, (*b*) when birth or death has been reported within the prescribed period and correct date of event is quoted, (*c*) when, though the event was reported after the prescribed period, the exact date of report is quoted; (2) in the case of applications for alteration of name (*a*) when the birth has been reported within the prescribed period and the correct date of the event is quoted, (*b*) when, though the event was reported after the prescribed period, the exact date of report is quoted.

VII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

1. *Basutoland*

Fertility. The Principal Medical Officer of Basutoland stated in 1927:

For some years one has had the impression that Basuto women are not bearing the same number of children as they did, say, twenty years ago.[1]

'As there was no registration of births and deaths in the country, no figures were available from which statistics could be drawn.' He therefore made a special investigation covering 519 women coming to the dispensary at Maseru. The results concerning fertility were as follows:

	I *Married 0 to 8 years*	II *Married 8 to 16 years*	III *Married 16 years and upwards*
Number of women questioned . .	210	175	134
Average years married . . .	5	12	Over 16
Total children born	301	584	751
Average number of children born per married woman	1·43	3·33	5·60

The figures thus obtained, though not large, are, I think, sufficient from which to draw certain deductions.[2]

The reason for dividing up the years of married life into these periods of eight years each is that knowing that the average Mosuto woman is married at about twenty years of age and that she ceases bearing children at about forty-four years of age—one has a stretch of twenty-four years, and for the sake of convenience of comparison three periods of eight years each are taken.

Birth control is not exercised among the Basuto: to them children are an asset, and therefore large families are always desired and sought for—the only precaution taken is to try to have a period of about two years between each child,[3] so that were they bearing normally in the first period there would be at least two children per marriage instead of 1·43, in the second period five children instead of 3·33, and in the last period about six. The birth rate per marriage in Russia, which was the highest in Europe in 1888, was 5·7, compared with which the Basuto families of over sixteen years standing are 5·56. . . .[4]

In column II of the above table the average child birth rate per woman married for at least twelve years of her most fecund period is 3·3 and therefore unlikely to increase materially. This is a big drop from the earlier period shown in column III, in which the child birth rate per family was 5·68. . . .[5]

The determining factor for this decline in the birth rate is undoubtedly gonorrhœa—one says this confidently because of the prevalence of this disease among the young married women of the tribe. The disease is mostly contracted within five or six years of married life, and the victims do not come for treatment till complications, especially salpingitis, have set in, with their known sterilizing effect.

In the out-patient department a very large number of women seek advice because they are sterile after the birth of one or two children, and one finds most frequently that gonorrhœal infection has occurred.

Syphilis does not seem to have had much effect, in that, since the 'seventies' of

[1] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 26. [2] Ibid.

[3] See also Minnie Martin, *Basutoland* (1903), p. 43: 'As a rule baby number one attains to two or even three years before the arrival of baby number two, and so on.'

[4] Evidently a misprint for 5·60. [5] Evidently a misprint for 5·60.

last century it has been so prevalent among the Basuto that competent authorities have computed that for over thirty years fully 80 per cent. of the tribe have been syphilised—this due to the non-venereal mode of infection, and yet the birth rate till sixteen years ago was normal for a healthy and virile people—whereas gonorrhœa till the late 'eighties' of last century was infrequently seen, but during the last twenty-five years it has been increasing rapidly and has become very prevalent in both sexes—unfortunately the restraining stigma connected with this disease in civilized races does not exist among the Basuto, and one foresees continuous spread of the condition throughout the tribe with a resulting diminution of the population slow but certain.[1]

I shall deal here first with the spread of venereal disease, and afterwards with the actual results of the investigation of 1926.

Prior to the appointment of District Surgeons in Leribe and Thaba Bosigo Districts, in 1878, no official document seems to have mentioned the incidence of venereal disease in Basutoland. The medical reports for 1878 and 1879 confirm that venereal disease then was rare, but it began to spread in 1881 owing to the presence of European Forces fighting in the Gun War, and there is no evidence that gonorrhoea appeared later than syphilis.

1878. Leribe. Venereal disease, though not unknown to the Basuto is, I find, extremely uncommon, and when it exists, can generally be traced to the Free State or Diamond-fields.[2]

Thaba Bosigo. If I may be permitted to judge of the extent of prostitution by the occurrence of the diseases which it engenders, I should say that it was not very great. Venereal affections are but uncommon, and amongst them syphilis is happily rare in this country, pathologically speaking.[3]

1879. Leribe. I must also notice the freedom of the Basuto in this district from venereal disease. The one case of syphilis reported was a European; three of the six cases of gonorrhoea were also in white men. From the police camp, consisting of over 150 men, women, and children, I have not had reported to me one instance of this disease.[4]

1881. Leribe. Venereal Disease. Has obtained an entry among them [the 'loyal' Basutos in the camp at Thlotse Heights], as the presence of the European Forces here has undoubtedly tended to lower their moral condition and encourage more or less the practice of prostitution among the women. Many have come to me with various forms of venereal diseases, as Syphilis and Gonorrhœa, and these affections all in this district were most rare in former years, have now tainted, to some considerable extent, the native population of the camp, and it is greatly to be feared, that when they eventually return to their homes, this class of disease will become disseminated through the district by their means.[5]

1882. Mafeteng. The number of cases of venereal disease that came under treatment was very small. No cases occurred amongst Europeans . . .[6]

Leribe. Venereal disease in the form of Gonorrhœa has been rife, and must be looked upon as a legacy left from the war, as before the year 1880 it was unknown on Thlotsi Heights, and in the Leribe District, and is an evident importation of the Europeans.[7]

[1] *Medical Report 1926*, pp. 26–8.

[2] Report of District Surgeon, Leribe District, for 1878, Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1879*, p. 8.

[3] Report of District Surgeon, Thaba Bosigo District, for 1878, ibid., p. 28.

[4] Report of District Surgeon, Leribe District, for 1879, ibid. *1880*, p. 18.

[5] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, for 1881, ibid. *1882*, Part I, pp. 211–12.

[6] Report of Temporary Medical Officer, Thaba Bosigo District, for 1882, ibid. *1883*, p. 265.

[7] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, for 1882, ibid., p. 282.

1886. Quthing. Venereal disease appears to be of frequent occurrence, and I have recently heard of some bad cases.[1]

1888. Thaba Bosigo. I beg to append a detailed analysis[2] of the cases treated, from which it will be seen that syphilis and the various disorders of the digestive system have contributed most largely. I have long been in doubt whether the disease called by the natives macaula should be classed as syphilitic, and whilst still not wishing to commit myself to a decided opinion, I have thought it advisable to classify it under that head in the appended analysis.[3]

Leribe. The disease known among the Basuto as 'mokaula' is apparently spreading.[4]

Quthing. Numbers of men, women, and children are afflicted with the venereal disease known among the Basuto as 'macaula,' but as Government supply medicine to the natives at small cost, I expect this disease will gradually die out.[5]

1889. Cornet Spruit. The general health of the district is good, makaula amongst the natives being the only really troublesome disease.[6]

1890. Maseru. The disease called makaula seems steadily on the decrease. It is difficult to decide whether it is a modified form of syphilis or not. The number of cases of true tertiary syphilis were very few.[7]

1891. Leribe. About 10 per cent. of attendants [at public dispensary] were suffering from various venereal diseases, the most common being the syphilitic secondary sores, so-called mocaula, and gonorrhœa.

Gonorrhœa is very prevalent among the police force, half of the men suffering chronically from it.

Syphilis, though also prevalent in the district, seems to be less virulent . . . Children are more affected by it than adults, and though commonly inheriting the malady, they are undoubtedly the means of spreading it, a child getting mocaula from another and infecting the parents afterwards.[8]

1892. Leribe. Gonorrhœa and other venereal and uterine diseases are . . . on the increase. This is owing to the general prostitution practised by married women and girls among the Basutos.[9]

Mafeteng. The extraordinary prevalence of this disease [syphilis] may, I think, be attributed to want of cleanliness, and ignorance or disregard of its contagious nature, and to lesser extent, perhaps to immorality.

The native, too, is much more susceptible to this disease than the European.

In 308 instances the disease was acquired, and 203 infants and children hereditary. The great amenability of this disease to medical treatment, coupled with the tendency to natural extinction makes me hopeful that in time it will cease to be so general.[10]

1893. Leribe. It may also be noted that syphilis is decidedly on the decrease, whether because the disease having been very prevalent at one time has lost its virulence, or perhaps natives are more alive to the treatment to follow in each case.

Gonorrhœa is still prevalent as well as other uterine ailments, among women.

Several cases of abortions, premature births, and impotence among men may be attributed to venereal diseases and sexual depravity.[11]

[1] Report of Assistant Commissioner, Quthing District, for 1885–6, *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland*, 1886, p. 26.

[2] Not printed.

[3] Report of Medical Officer, Thaba Bosigo (Maseru) District, *Report of the Resident Commissioner 1887* [–88], p. 10. See also ibid. *1888–9*, pp. 7–8, 12, 14.

[4] Report of Assistant Commissioner, Leribe District, ibid. *1887–8*, p. 17.

[5] Report of Inspector B. M. Police, Quthing District, ibid., p. 23.

[6] Report of Inspector B. M. Police, Cornet Spruit District, ibid. *1888–9*, p. 14.

[7] Report of Medical Officer, Maseru District, ibid. *1889–90*, p. 20. See also ibid., pp. 21–3.

[8] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1890–1*, pp. 15–16. See also ibid., pp. 20, 22.

[9] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, ibid. *1891–2*, p. 23.

[10] Report of Medical Officer, Mafeteng District, ibid., p. 29.

[11] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, ibid. *1892–3*, pp. 22–3.

Mafeteng. Syphilis still continues to be very prevalent.[1]

Mohales Hoek. An analysis of the diseases treated shows still a large percentage of syphilitic cases, especially those of a hereditary nature.[2]

1894. The medical officers are of opinion that the ratio of syphilis to the population is steadily decreasing, and that it and kindred diseases are readily yielding to the treatment afforded in this territory.[3]

1895. A diminution in the number of severe tertiary manifestations has been noticed during the last year, and this alone testifies to the influence exercised by the medical work of the last five years in alleviating a condition which at one time threatened to become almost a national calamity.[4]

Mafeteng. If confined to the treatment of this disease [syphilis] alone, which by its widespread and disastrous effects is little less than a national calamity, the Government dispensaries would justify their existence, since, while there are good grounds for believing that the disease is yearly diminishing, and working less evil among the inhabitants, the number of those affected who present themselves for treatment maintains a high proportion, and the results of treatment are in the highest degree encouraging.[5]

Mohales Hoek. Syphilis still continues to bear an undue proportion to other cases treated. 179, or 12 per cent. of all cases, were syphilitic. Of these 116 were adults with whom it was probably acquired; in 63 cases it was congenital.[6]

1896. My own experience, extending now over a considerable period, is to the effect that, owing to the aid so readily sought and obtained against the ravages of this disease [syphilis], it has no longer the serious import such as obtained some six years ago. As I remarked in my last report, the severe tertiary manifestations are now rarely met with, and I have lately observed a marked diminution in the number of young children suffering from hereditary syphilis, a fact which speaks for itself.[7]

Leribe. Syphilis is still very prevalent in the district . . . I believe it is being slowly stamped out. The disease is not so virulent as in some parts . . . .[8]

Moyeni. Syphilis is very prevalent here and does not seem to be on the decrease.[9]

1897. So long . . . as the inhabitants continue to hold syphilis in the same light estimation that the average European does a simple catarrh, no noticeable diminution in the spread of this disease is to be hoped for.[10]

1898. This disease [syphilis] appears to be decreasing in a most satisfactory manner.[11]

1899. In spite of the fact that such a large percentage of the patients attending the hospitals every year are suffering from syphilis, I think that disease is tending to disappear. It is now the exception rather than the rule to find a case of syphilis on the reserve at any of the Magistracies.[12]

1900. The close analogy between specific fevers and syphilis is well illustrated in the course and manifestations of the diseases as seen in Basutoland. The most interesting feature is the absence of the induration at the site of inoculation, and the consequent difficulty of demonstrating when or where the disease is contracted. The hard chancre is very rarely seen in natives, yet let a single case of syphilis be

[1] Report of Medical Officer, Mafeteng District, ibid., p. 36.

[2] Report of Medical Officer, Mohales Hoek District, ibid., p. 39.

[3] Report of Acting Resident Commissioner, ibid. *1893–4*, pp. 9–10. See also Reports of Medical Officers, Mafeteng and Mohales Hoek Districts, ibid., pp. 50–1.

[4] Report of Principal Medical Officer, Basutoland, ibid. *1894–5*, p. 45.

[5] Report of Medical Officer, Mafeteng District, ibid., p. 50.

[6] Report of Medical Officer, Mohales Hoek District, ibid., p. 53.

[7] Report of Principal Medical Officer, Basutoland, ibid. *1895–6*, p. 37.

[8] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, ibid., p. 39; see also ibid. *1896–7*, p. 49.

[9] Report of Medical Officer, Mohales Hoek District, ibid. *1895–6*, p. 47.

[10] Report of Principal Medical Officer, Basutoland, ibid. *1896–7*, p. 48.

[11] Report of Principal Medical Officer, Basutoland, ibid. *1897–8*, p. 45.

[12] Report of Principal Medical Officer for 1899, *Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1898 and 1899*, p. 9.

introduced into a previously clean village, in a few months a large percentage of the inhabitants, especially children, will be found with secondary eruptions. . . . As illustrating the rapidity with which the disease spreads, I will mention a case which was brought to my notice in 1892:—A village containing about 50 inhabitants was quite clean. A family, one member of which was suffering from a secondary eruption, joined the community, and within two months there were over 20 cases of syphilis, chiefly among children. As a result of enquiries made among the natives themselves it seems probable that the common use of eating and drinking utensils is the source of infection.[1]

In the first two decades of this century the incidence of venereal disease was discussed less fully in the official reports.

1902. Leribe. The proportion of cases of venereal diseases seems remarkably high . . . .[2]

1905. Quthing. I regret to state that a large proportion of the native community suffer from syphilis, the ravages of the disease being increased by the difficulty of persuading the patients to undergo a prolonged course of treatment.[3]

1908. Leribe. In this district venereal disease is increasing very much, and in course of time is bound to influence adversely the general health and well-being of the people. Much of the increase is due to ignorance of the virulence and far-reaching effects of such disease; but I am afraid immorality and loose living have much to answer for.

Women are the worst sufferers, in most cases innocently, and as a consequence their *potentia gignendi* is impaired. I have been struck by the number of barren women, and the mothers of one child only, who come to the dispensary for advice, but considering the prevalence of venereal disease, it is not to be wondered at.[4]

Mafeteng. Venereal disease shows no signs of decreasing, no doubt because the gravity of the nature of the disease does not appeal to the native.[5]

1918. Syphilis is still very prevalent . . . . The general difficulty in dealing with the problem of syphilis in a native territory is the indifference of the people. Most cases have a non-venereal origin (only 14 cases of chancre were seen during the year).[6]

1920. Syphilis. This is becoming an increasingly serious problem and danger to the nation.[7]

With the publication of special Medical Reports the available comments became again more ample:

1923. Venereal disease still looms large amongst the dispensary patients, and pelvic disease in women helps to fill the wards in the hospitals and to form the bulk of the abdominal surgery performed therein.[8]

1924. Syphilis though very prevalent is of a mild type, and the gross lesions that were observed twenty years ago seldom appear now, which may be accounted for by the intensive treatment that has been provided for many years, and also by the earlier stage at which treatment is begun. Syphilis was unknown amongst the Basuto until the time of the opening of the Kimberley diamond mines. It spread rapidly throughout the country, and the mildness of the disease now may in part be due to acquired immunity.

Gonorrhœa is particularly severe in the female and the wards of the hospitals are filled with sufferers seeking surgical relief from infection of the pelvic organs.[9]

[1] 'Basutoland Medical Report for the Year ended 31st December, 1900', *Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1900 and 1901*, pp. 26–7.
[2] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1901–2*, p. 50.
[3] Report of Medical Officer, Quthing District, ibid. *1904–5*, p. 54.
[4] Report of Medical Officer, Leribe District, ibid. *1907–8*, p. 38.
[5] Report of Medical Officer, Mafeteng District, ibid., p. 39.
[6] Ibid. *1917–18*, p. 9.
[7] Ibid. *1919–20*, p. 8.
[8] *Medical Report 1923.*
[9] Ibid. *1924*, p. 6.

1925. The gonorrhœal cases totalled 875. This number gives no indication of the extent of the disease in the Territory. To the average male native, gonorrhœa means nothing more than a slight discomfort for a time. He rarely goes to a dispensary for treatment, and it is only when a bubo or phagedæna or stricture supervenes that he seeks medical or surgical relief. The female native never comes for treatment for gonorrhœa. Endometritis, sterility, salpingitis and pelvic abscess drive her to the medical man. Sterility is on the increase, and where at one time a large family of five or six was the rule, a great many married women have one, or at most, two children. Most of the abdominal surgery done in our hospitals is for diseases of the uterine appendages. It will be seen that gonorrhœa, more than syphilis, presents a difficult problem when the question of combating the disease arises. It is only half medical. Tribal law and custom is slowly but surely breaking down and promiscuity is not penalised so drastically as it was in the early days.[1]

1926. Gonorrhœal cases numbered 818, but, as was indicated last year, this number gives no idea of the extent of the disease in the Territory: it is only dire necessity that sends patients to Medical Officers for treatment. Women suffer more than men, and its effects are seen in the increasing sterility of the Basuto women and the decreasing birth rate. It has been noticed that when a young woman marries she may have one child and perhaps two, but after that her complaint is: 'No more children!' . . . The medical staff is too small to conduct an intensive campaign against the disease. No opportunity is lost when cases come for treatment of pointing out the serious nature of the disease and its remote consequences, but, in a community where no social stigma is incurred by irregular sexual relationships, where twenty thousand young men are absent from their homes during the course of the year, and where promiscuity is condoned, most of the teaching falls on deaf ears.[2]

1927. Gonorrhœa is a much more serious disease [than syphilis] amongst our Natives and its effects are seen in the sterility of many of the women.[3]

1935. Syphilis continues to be widespread notwithstanding the efforts that Government has made to control it by means of free treatment. . . .

There is no appreciable reduction in the incidence of Gonorrhoea largely because the Basuto refuse to accept its infectious nature. . . .[4]

1937. Syphilis. . . . During the period of economic depression and bad agricultural crops 1931 to 1934 the number of primary cases [among outpatients] was considerably smaller than in previous and succeeding years. . . .

The explanation is that at most ports of entry into the territory and in neighbouring villages a considerable number of native women prostitutes brew and sell kaffir beer, which is generally rendered highly intoxicating by the addition of golden syrup etc. In years when food supplies are good and there is an abundance of Kaffir Corn (Millet) from which kaffir beer is made, men returning from the Mines feel that they can spend their earnings on self-indulgence and they fall easy victims to the prostitutes, most of whom have venereal disease in highly infective forms. The infected men then infect their wives and lovers at home. . . .

Vague guesses have been made as to the proportion of Basuto who have had syphilis.[5] In order to come to some estimate, enquiries were made at Leribe and Mohale's Hoek dispensaries from each of about 1,500 consecutive outpatients as to whether or not they had had or still have syphilis. At Leribe 55% stated that they had had the disease, while at Mohale's Hoek 31% admitted infection. It may therefore be assumed that the proportion of all Basuto who at one time or another have been infected is about 40%. . . .

Gonorrhoea. As with Syphilis the number of cases . . . has increased . . . . For similar reasons given in the preceding section this is no doubt explained by the increased temptations and opportunities for men returning from the mines to become

[1] Ibid. *1925*, pp. 7–8.
[2] Ibid. *1926*, pp. 6–7.
[3] Ibid. *1927*, p. 8.
[4] Ibid. *1935*, p. 10.
[5] The Pim Commission had reported that 'venereal disease . . . is believed to affect well over 50 per cent. of the population, though the figure is necessarily speculative' (*Report Basutoland*, p. 99).

infected. The incidence of Gonorrhoea shows the same susceptibility to periods of prosperity and depression as was shown for Primary Syphilis . . . .[1]

1941. Syphilis. . . . In 1936 Government introduced a campaign to control the incidence of syphilis. The result was that the number of syphilitic patients who attended Government Dispensaries rose from 5,841 in 1935 to 9,770 in 1937. For the past four years the number has remained stationary at about 7,500 per annum—while figures may not show a marked decline in the incidence, Medical Officers are agreed that the campaign is bearing fruit, and that the spread of the disease is being controlled.

Gonorrhoea. 1,853 cases of gonorrhoea in the acute or sub-acute stages were reported from the dispensaries. There is reason to believe that this figure does not reflect the true incidence, which is probably much higher. The Basuto are amazingly indifferent to the disease, and very many of them do not seek treatment unless serious complications, such as arthritis, salpingitis, etc., occur.[2]

These quotations may give the impression that the women who in 1926 had been married for more than 16 years (Group III) had suffered actually less from gonorrhoea than those who had married later, but it is possible, of course, that the Medical Officers (prior to 1924) were more interested in the spread of syphilis and had also fewer opportunities of noticing the incidence of gonorrhoea.

As regards the interpretation of the figures ascertained in 1926, the argument of the Principal Medical Officer is not convincing. Assuming that the number of women questioned was the same for each year of duration of marriage (from 0 to 24), that no woman was or became sterile, and that each woman had a child nine months after marriage and every two years thereafter, the 'normal' number of children would have been 2·125 in Group I, 6·125 in Group II, and 10·125 in Group III.[3] Assuming that there was a period of three years between each child the corresponding numbers of children would have been 1·59, 4·22, and 6·94. Since some women no doubt were sterile, and since not all the women had a child nine months after their marriage, the average number of 1·43 children in Group I does not seem small. The average number of 3·34 children in Group II would appear to be low (even taking account of the fact that fecundity, i.e. child-bearing capacity, declines with increasing age), and this may actually be due to gonorrhoeal infection within five or six years of marriage. As regards the difference between the average number of children to Group II (3·34) and Group III (5·60) it is no conclusive proof that the women who married before 1910 were on an average more fertile than those who married in 1910–18. The Principal Medical Officer points out that the women in Group II have passed their most fecund period and that the number of their children is 'therefore unlikely to increase materially'. This may be true of many women who have been married 14 or 15 years but is certainly not true of the majority of the women in Group II. It should, moreover, never be overlooked in studies of this kind that the older women—in this case those who have been married 16 years or more—have shown by the very fact of their survival that they were physically

[1] *Medical Report 1937*, pp. 8–9.
[2] Ibid. *1941*, p. 2. See also ibid. *1942*, p. 3; *1943*, p. 3.
[3] See also ibid. *1926*, pp. 29–30.

superior to those of their generation who died young.[1] The figures (ascertained in 1926) do not, therefore, indicate that 'Basuto women are not bearing the same number of children as they did, say, twenty years ago'.

The Principal Medical Officer said that 'the birth rate per marriage in Russia, which was the highest in Europe in 1888, was 5·7, compared with which the Basuto families of over sixteen years standing are 5·56'. He obviously misunderstood the meaning of the Russian figure. In Russia births in 1889 were 5·7 times as numerous as marriages,[2] and this ratio, of course, has nothing whatsoever to do with the average number of births to families of over 16 years' standing. While fertility in Russia, 50 years ago, was enormous, the fertility of the women in Group III was not at all high.[3] It was in fact so low that it is hard to believe that it was 'representative of the average Mosuto woman'. It would be surprising, moreover, in any case if the 134 women of this Group who came to the dispensary in the capital had been representative of the average elderly Basuto women.

What fertility actually was in Basutoland in earlier or in recent times it is impossible to tell, but there are some indications that fertility was formerly very high and has decreased since 1921. In his report for the year 1899 the Principal Medical Officer stated:

> There is no registration of births and deaths (except in the case of Europeans) in Basutoland, but from information obtained from a recent census of the Leribe District, the birth rate was computed to be 46 per 1000 and the death rate 20·30 per 1000.
>
> I think these figures may be fairly taken to represent the average birth and death rate throughout the country.[4]

This is the only birth-rate ever published for any section of Basutoland. But since the population of Leribe was actually obtained through an estimate[5] and not through a census, and since it is not known how this 'birth-rate' was computed,[6] it should be accepted with great reserve, though it is noteworthy that the Medical Officers considered it genuine.

At the census of 1911, 74,973 native children were returned as under 5 years of age, and 100,670 women as of child-bearing age (15–49). These figures suggest a very high fertility.

At the census of 1921, 27,271 native children were returned as under

[1] Although fertility in England certainly did not decline between 1851 and 1880, the 1911 Fertility Census showed that the women who in 1911 had been married over 50 years were more fertile than those who had been married 40 to 49 years, and that the latter were more fertile than those who had been married 30 to 39 years.

[2] In 1888 the ratio was 5·3.

[3] According to the 1911 Fertility Census in England the wives over 45 years who had married before they were 25 years had had on an average 6·59 children to their present marriage.

[4] *Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1898 and 1899*, p. 6.

[5] See 'Report of the Medical Officer, Leribe, for the Year ending 30th June, 1899', *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1898–9*, p. 22: 'The estimated population of the district is 41,043 . . . . The birth-rate is 45·9 per 1,000, and the death-rate is 20·29 per 1,000.'

[6] See in this connexion also 'Basutoland Medical Report for the Year ended 31st December, 1900' (*Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1900 and 1901*, p. 25): 'The birth-rate has been estimated at from 40 to 42 per thousand, and the death-rate at about 21 per thousand.'

1 year of age and 139,665 women as of child-bearing age. These figures again suggest a very high fertility.[1]

At the census of 1936 only 25,439 native children were returned as under 1 year of age and 161,145 women as of child-bearing age. These figures would suggest a much lower fertility than in 1921.[2]

It seems very likely that both in 1921 and 1936 a number of children over one year were counted as infants, but there is no reason to assume that the understatements of age were more numerous in 1921 than in 1936. Since, moreover, the computations of the natural increase made above[3] showed an enormous drop in the period 1921–36 there is some justification for the conclusion that fertility was actually much lower in 1936 than fifteen years earlier.

General Mortality. The only death-rate ever published for any section of Basutoland was the one of 20·3 for the Leribe District in 1898–99. But this rate which in any case would be extraordinarily low cannot be accepted as correct in view of the reported high birth-rate of 45·9. Even if only 20 per cent. of the newly born had died before the age of two these deaths would have constituted about 9 per 1,000 of the population, so that the death-rate of those over two would have been approximately 12 per 1,000, a rate which cannot have corresponded to reality.

Medical and sanitary care seems to have been most defective in earlier times and progress was slow until quite recently. Dr. E. C. Long, who was appointed to Mafeteng in 1890 and was Principal Medical Officer of Basutoland from 1894 to 1922,[4] described conditions in the 1890s and the first decade of this century as follows:[5]

> In 1890 there was practically no accommodation for in-patients, except two small rooms attached to the Maseru Dispensary and a couple of native huts at Leribe. . . .
>
> The actual accommodation at this time was of the meanest description. At Mafeteng for upwards of a year a disused stable was the only building available. There were no hospital attendants, and no water supply. If an operation was performed, the dispensary had to be cleared for the purpose, and the medical officer's writing-table of the morning was the operation-table of the afternoon. There were no beds and no bedding. Patients lay on mud floors in their own blankets, and their relatives or friends nursed them as they could.[6]
>
> In 1903 the first real advance towards providing suitable accommodation for in-patients was made by the erection at Maseru of a properly built and equipped hospital of thirty beds. . . .

[1] The total native population was 495,937 excluding absentees and 543,078 including absentees. Assuming that the 27,271 infants were the survivors of 32,000 children born in the year preceding the census, the birth-rate would have been about 60.

[2] The total native population was 559,273 excluding absentees and 660,546 including absentees. Assuming that the 25,439 infants were the survivors of 30,000 children born in the year preceding the census, the birth-rate would have been about 50.

[3] See p. 22.

[4] See Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, pp. 96–7.

[5] *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1908–9*, pp. 21–2.

[6] See also ibid. *1896–7*, p. 48, *1897–8*, p. 46, *1898–9*, p. 31, concerning the Maseru Hospital:

1896–7. 'The great need of nursing help is keenly felt. It is an impossibility to maintain wards in an aseptic condition without.'

1897–8. '. . . the provision for one nurse for the wards, has proved a great boon . . .'

1898–9. 'The plan of having a native nurse in charge of the ward at the Maseru Hospital, which has now been on its trial for some time, is found to work admirably, and, if funds admitted, could be advantageously extended to the other district hospitals.'

Some criticism has been levelled against the policy of providing first-class accommodation for natives, especially the provision of proper bedding and hospital clothing, and it has been asserted that some simpler accommodation would have met the needs of the case.

Five years' experience at Maseru has shown that such criticism is not justifiable. The accommodation and equipment are only such as are necessary to carry out modern surgical methods. There is, moreover, the great educational advantage and civilising influence of compelling all who are admitted into hospital to submit to hospital cleanliness and hospital discipline.

Although the equipment is of the best, the patients are not in any sense coddled. Strict discipline is maintained, and the diet adapted to the social condition of the inmates. Prompt eviction follows any failure to conform to the rules of the institutions.

Twenty-five years later, the Pim Commission reported:[1]

So far as Europeans are concerned the needs of the Territory are adequately met but the position is different as regards the natives.

The hospitals have 140 beds, or one for every 4,000 of the population, as compared with one for every 2,000 in Swaziland, and for 2,800 in Bechuanaland. Further they are all situated near the western border except Qacha's Nek which is on the south-eastern border, and practically serve only the fringe of the country, while even for this area the accommodation is inadequate.[2]

The great mountain area occupying four-fifths of the country has no hospital and in it the population is very scattered.[3]

There are no dispensaries or medical posts away from the various headquarters, nor do the Medical Officers visit out-centres as a part of their official duties, though two officers do so as private practice.

There is no public health organization except at the Government Camps, although enteric fever is widely prevalent; there is no child welfare work and practically no maternity work. Only maternity cases of a specially difficult character can be taken into the hospitals. The absence of any outstations prevents any real efforts to deal with the most serious medical problem of Basutoland, the wide prevalence of venereal disease . . . .

The attention of the Medical Officers—whose competence and devotion to duty is fully recognized—is concentrated on their hospitals, and on the Government Camps with a small area around them, except for the possible calls of their private practice.[4]

As regards hospitals, however, some progress has been achieved since 1936. The Missions which so far had not had a single hospital opened three in 1937 and 1938, one of which is situated in the mountain area.

The establishment by the Roman Catholic Mission of a Medical Mission at Ntaote's, equipped with a hospital of sixteen beds, in the centre of the highlands is of the greatest importance to the people of that area who are three to four days ride on horseback from the nearest doctor.[5]

[1] *Report Basutoland*, pp. 98-9.

[2] See also Basutoland, *Medical Report 1935*, p. 19: 'All medical officers report that the bed accommodation is inadequate and that many patients in need of hospital treatment have to be sent home with "a bottle of medicine".'

[3] A vivid description of the medical problem in the mountain area was given ibid., pp. 17–18. To quote only one sentence: 'The result is that the Highland population requiring medical aid but who are unable to undertake the formidable journey to the nearest doctor, are obliged to avail themselves of the native medicine man (usually a witchdoctor), such assistance as untrained European Missionaries or traders can give, or resort to itinerant quacks and proprietary medicines with which the country is flooded.'

[4] See also Hailey, p. 1156: 'The health service in rural areas is poorly developed, as the existing staff is only sufficient to deal with hospital work.'

[5] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 18.

At the same time bed accommodation in Government hospitals had been increased considerably so that the total number of beds available for natives on 31 December 1943 was 328 as compared with 148 on 31 December 1936.[1]

The Medical Report for 1943 summarized the position as follows:

> Medical services in Basutoland are very inadequate both as regards curative and preventive measures. In evidence, the ratio of doctors to population is 1 to about 35,000 and of hospital beds 1 to about 2,000; indeed in one district there is one doctor to 180,000 people and one bed to 3,600 people.[2]

Europeans who came to Basutoland a century ago seem to have been much impressed by the apparently good health of the natives. But the French missionary Casalis, after having spent twenty-three years in the country (1833–56), stated:

> The mortality in early childhood always appeared to me much greater than that of Europe. People have gone into raptures over the splendid health which in general the natives apparently enjoy, over the small number of cripples found amongst them, but the reason of this is as simple as it is distressing—only the most robust portion of the population grow beyond childhood.[3]

The first British medical officers again took a very favourable view and were inclined to attribute any deterioration in health to the impact of European civilization.

> 1878. Phthisis is almost unknown here . . . As a whole, the Basuto are a healthy race, owing to their fine climate, bracing atmosphere, out of door life, and simple diet. . . . The adoption of European clothing does not, I think, conduce to their physical well-being, and tends to render them more liable to certain forms of disease than they are at present. My experience of the past year among them has shown, that those who adopt our clothes and habits of life, have more varied and numerous complaints to bring to the doctors than their wilder brethren.[4]
>
> 1879. I am glad to call attention to the pleasing fact that not a single case of 'phthisis' has come under my notice during the whole year, a fact which bears out the remarks in my report of last year as to the splendid Sanatorium which Basutoland would afford to sufferers from that disease.[5]
>
> The steady increase in the population, and the absence of serious disease, are two facts which speak much for the habits of life they pursue.[6]

But in 1881, as shown above, venereal disease had been spread through European soldiers, in 1883 smallpox 'was brought here by Basutos returning from the Diamond Fields',[7] and in 1884 and subsequent years the natives suffered from famines which were also partly due to contact with Europeans. The Assistant Commissioner in charge of the Districts of Mafeteng and Cornet Spruit, in his report for 1884–5, stated:[8]

> During the closing months of last year there was great scarcity of food, and many

[1] See for details *Medical Report 1936*, pp. 17–18; *1937*, pp. 14–16; *1938*, pp. 18–21; *1939*, pp. 5–8; *1940*, pp. 6–8; *1941*, pp. 3–4; *1942*, pp. 4–5; *1943*, pp. 4–5.

[2] Ibid. *1943*, p. 8.

[3] Casalis, *Les Bassoutos*, pp. 202–3.

[4] Report of District Surgeon, Leribe District, for 1878, Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1879*, p. 8.

[5] Report of District Surgeon, Leribe District, for 1879, ibid. *1880*, p. 18. See also Report of Medical Officer, Thaba Bosigo District, for 1882, ibid. *1883*, p. 273: '. . . few Natives seem to suffer from Phthisis Pulmonalis . . . .'

[6] Ibid. *1880*, p. 19.

[7] Ibid. *1884*, p. 84; see also ibid., p. 92.

[8] *Further Correspondence respecting the Cape Colony and adjacent Territories*, p. 28.

of the people were reduced almost to a state of starvation.[1] This was owing partly to a bad harvest, but, in a great measure, to the reckless and improvident way in which the Basuto sold all grain over what they required for immediate use, so that they might get money to buy brandy. The traders purchased the grain and sent it to the Diamond Fields, where they could obtain a good price for it.

The inordinate use of brandy now going on in almost every village, if not checked, will inevitably impoverish the country, and ultimately ruin the nation. Most of the principal Chiefs are drunk nearly every day, and totally unfit to attend to the affairs of the tribe.

In the last twenty years there seems to have been a consensus of opinion that the Basuto is deteriorating in physique and health and that undernourishment plays an important part.

1926. The general health of the Territory for the year has been fairly good, but it was noticed that, on account no doubt of the poor harvest, many of those presenting themselves for treatment at the dispensaries and hospitals were poorly nourished. It is also becoming more apparent every year that poverty is increasing and the physical standard decreasing. One has only to work in a dispensary for a few days to appreciate this. Medical Officers are finding it more difficult, as time goes on, to pass as fit recruited labourers, who as a rule are more or less selected before coming up for medical examination. The Basuto are a pastoral and agricultural people, but over population and economic pressure have driven many from the land, and the healthy life of the land, into industrial life outside their country; and this, combined with under or bad nourishment, irregular and immoral habits and the adoption of European clothing and food, are some of the contributing causes towards this deterioration.[2]

1930. There is no doubt that the physique of the Mosutho, generally speaking, is not of such a satisfactory nature as, say, thirty years ago. This is probably due to the fact that many more natives during this period of time have left the territory for money-earning purposes, going more especially to the Rand where they do not get the fresh air and freedom that obtains in Basutoland, and this factor has a deteriorating effect on their progeny.[3]

. . . the difficulty which the population finds in nourishing itself increases as the population grows; at present in good seasons the Basuto may perhaps obtain sufficient nourishment; in bad seasons they do not.[4]

1935. Much of the ill health which exists can be attributed to dietetic and nutritional defects particularly qualitative deficiencies.[5] Lack of proper water supplies for domestic use, and lack of sanitation in native villages are also important factors in the production of the ill health that is encountered throughout the territory.[6]

1939. In the view of the Principal Medical Officer the nutrition problem will become

[1] See also Report of Inspector B.M. Police, Cornet Spruit District, for 1885–6, *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland*, p. 22: 'Towards the end of 1885 many of the people in this district were in great straits for food, and many actually starving . . . .'

[2] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 5.

[3] Memorandum of Principal Medical Officer, 22 May 1930, *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 145–6. Hodgson and Ballinger also spoke (p. 32) of 'the periodic starvation or semi-starvation which always follows a drought or bad season', and the *Report of the Education Department for 1934* stated (p. 9): 'The year 1934 opened in rather gloomy circumstances. Famine and poverty were in evidence everywhere and many people would have starved but for the efforts of the newly-created Famine Relief Department which functioned admirably. Despite this timely help, however, the people were poorly clad and underfed. The children with little to eat could not walk the long distances to school and the average attendance dropped seriously during the first two quarters while those children who did attend looked wan and pinched.'

[4] Memorandum of Director of Education, 4 June 1930, *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 146.

[5] See also Hodgson and Ballinger, p. 32; *Medical Report 1936*, p. 13.

[6] Ibid. *1935*, p. 6.

very serious unless something can be done to stimulate the natives into changing their ideas and methods in regard to food. The proportion of badly-nourished people is greater in the lowlands than in the highlands and the progressive deterioration in the physique of mine workers, who are recruited chiefly from the lowlands, is becoming a subject of comment. According to residents of long standing, the physique and health of the Basuto to-day is not what it used to be. Malnutrition is seen in every village, dispensary, school and recruiting office. Mild scurvy and sub-scorbutic conditions are not infrequent; pellagra is becoming more and more frequent[1] and lower resistance to disease increasingly apparent. . . .[2]

[1] See also *Medical Report 1935*, pp. 51–3; *1938*, pp. 15, 17. See furthermore *Basutoland Council 33rd Session 1938*, p. 54.

[2] The frequent appearance of typhus fever in the last thirty years may be mentioned in this connexion. It had been first introduced in Aug. 1917 from the Cape Colony and 'had been entirely stamped out' by 11 May 1918 after having caused 111 deaths. But a recrudescence occurred eight months later, and in 1919–24 the numbers of reported deaths were 50, 94, 93, 70, 120, and 41 respectively. The Colonial Report for 1922–3 stated: 'Typhus fever has become endemic and outbreaks have been reported from every district in the country.' But the Report for 1925 said: 'Typhus fever, which has been endemic since 1917, has almost disappeared.' The deaths in 1925–7 numbered 4, 1, and 13 respectively. They have not been recorded since 1927 but, no doubt, remained rare until 1933. The Pim Commission reported: 'Up to 1930 . . . the position was not such as to cause any special anxiety but cases increased in 1931 and 1932. . . . In 1933 the outbreak increased to the dimensions of an epidemic in the southern districts, and by 1934 this spread to the northern districts in the winter months. How great the mortality was it is not possible to say but the statements of Medical and Administrative Officers, of Missionaries and Traders, show that it was very severe, though localized in villages or groups of villages.' The total numbers of cases reported in 1923–43 were 958, 556, 51, 32, 88, 33, 38, 75, 118, 238, 2,418, 1,491, 192, 52, 16, 12, 11, 0, 69, 56, and 17 respectively. See *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1917–18*, pp. 8–9, *1918–19*, p. 9, *1919–20*, p. 8, *1920–1*, p. 10, *1921–2*, p. 12, *1922–3*, p. 14, *1923–4*, p. 15, *1924*, p. 16, *1925*, p. 19; Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, p. 99; Basutoland, *Medical Report 1924*, p. 7, *1925*, p. 6, *1926*, p. 6, *1927*, p. 7, *1937*, p. 7, *1939*, p. 3, *1940*, p. 3, *1941*, p. 1, *1942*, p. 1, *1943*, p. 1.

Tuberculosis is another disease which was practically unknown in Basutoland half a century ago and which also is very much influenced by malnutrition. The Principal Medical Officer in his Report for 1899 could still say: 'The rarity of tubercular disease is worthy of notice. The majority of cases are young adults or young children with tubercular cervical glands or joint disease, the knee being the joint most commonly affected. Pulmonary tuberculosis is rare and is chiefly met with in young men who have contracted the disease at one of the mining centres.' (*Selections from Colonial Medical Reports 1898 and 1899*, p. 8.) But a year later he wrote: 'Pulmonary tuberculosis appears to be increasing. It is spécially prevalent in the Quthing district, where the climate is very bleak and cold in the winter months. It is increasingly observed in young men who have been at the different training colleges in Cape Colony.' (Ibid. *1900 and 1901*, p. 26.) The Medical Officer of the Leribe District, in his Report for 1905–6, said: 'Phthisis is becoming more common in the district . . . Hitherto it has not been indigenous to this part, and the cases seen were boys who had been working on the mines and in Johannesburg; but now it is attacking others who have never left the country.' (*Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1905–6*, p. 55.) 'Dr. Hertig, of Morija, in a letter in 1907, quoted by Dr. Macvicar, stated that in the eight years prior to that date he had examined some 50,000 Basutos, and had found 250 cases of tuberculosis among them, and these mostly in the last four years. All these cases were pulmonary in type, and all except seven were in persons who had been out of the country.' (*Tuberculosis in South African Natives*, p. 228.) The Medical Report for 1937 stated (p. 10): 'The effect of prosperity and of good food supplies on the incidence of tuberculosis is very clearly demonstrated. In the years 1933 and 1934 owing to severe drought the crops were a failure and a considerable portion of the tribe was reduced to semi-starvation resulting in lowered resistance and a marked increase in the number of cases of tuberculosis among outpatients in 1935. From 1935 to 1937 crops were good, money earned by labourers on the mines was plentiful and as a result tuberculosis has diminished.' (See also ibid. *1938*, pp. 11–12; *1941*, pp. 1–2.) But in 1942 the number of cases reported increased again. 'This increase, following a period of four consecutive years of decreasing incidence, is disturbing, but it may be significant that in 1942 there has been an increase in the death rate from disease among Basuto working on the Mines. A possible explanation is that since 1941 a large number of Basuto Mine labourers at the end of the usual contracts of six or nine months have renewed their contracts on the Mines without returning to their homes for recuperation, and accordingly have a lowered resistance. Whilst the evidence to support such an impression is slender, the question

The root cause of the somewhat serious nutritional status of the people is over-population. . . . The problem is especially pressing in the lowlands, but even the highlands are now becoming over-populated. . . . It is surface wash or sheet erosion, particularly in cultivated areas, that has been the factor mainly responsible.[1] . . . The growing poverty of large sections of the population is repeatedly emphasized in these reports [from the Director of Agriculture and the Principal Medical Officer].[2]

But the Medical Report for 1940 strikes a more hopeful note.

Notwithstanding the prevalence of Pellagra and other signs of 'deficiency' diseases resulting from unbalanced diets, it has been observed generally and particularly by Medical Officers in their examination of recruits for labour on mines that in the past 3 or 4 years the average Basuto appear healthier and their physique has improved.[3]

Child Mortality. Apparently the only data concerning child mortality in Basutoland were obtained at the investigation of 1926. It appears that of the 751 children born to women in Group III 250, or 33 per cent., had died, of the 584 children born to women in Group II 186, or 32 per cent., and of the 301 children born to women in Group I 92, or 31 per cent.[4] If these figures were to be considered representative, they certainly would not indicate a decrease in child mortality, since the children of Group III had been exposed to death for a longer period than those of Group II, and those of Group II to a longer period than those of Group I (which must have included numerous children who had been exposed to death for less than a year). The Principal Medical Officer speaks in this connexion of 'the very high death rate among the Basuto children',[5] but the above rates do not necessarily mean a particularly high child mortality. The Pim Commission says that 'infantile mortality is recognized to be very heavy'.[6] But it is probably safer to say that nothing is known about infant mortality in Basutoland.

merits vigilance.' (Ibid. *1942*, p. 2.) The Medical Report for 1943 mentioned as a further probable cause of the increase: '. . . a certain number of Basuto soldiers developed tuberculosis while serving in the Middle East and were repatriated. The matter merits vigilance; but till the medical staff, with adequate subordinate Native staff, is available, it will not be possible to estimate accurately the incidence of tuberculosis in the territory.' (Ibid. *1943*, p. 3.)

It should be noted, on the other hand, that neither typhus fever nor tuberculosis has yet had a considerable effect on mortality as a whole and that 'Basutoland is fortunate in its freedom from tropical diseases such as Malaria, Dengue, Tropical Ulcer and Hook Worm' (*Medical Report 1938*, p. 7).

[1] See also Hodgson and Ballinger, p. 13: '. . . while the population has been . . . increasing rapidly, the land itself has been decreasing. Soil erosion in the lowlands of Basutoland is a tragedy. What fifty years ago were ditches that a man could step over are to-day ravines thirty feet deep and as many wide.' See furthermore Staples and Hudson, pp. 19, 36–8. See finally *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1943–4*, p. 15: 'The Lowland areas, comprising approximately one-third of the Territory and carrying two-thirds of the population, have been cultivated for many years and the soils are exhausted. The erosion in these areas is very severe, and the preventive measures to stabilise the soil, commenced in 1935, have been continued.'

[2] Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II, p. 48. See also Hailey, p. 1411: '. . . as a larger part of native incomes is spent upon the purchase of foodstuffs, the surplus available to buy other merchandise is reduced. Basutoland . . . was able to buy over £1,000,000 worth of general merchandise in the prosperous years 1919–20. Purchases were over £750,000 in 1923–4 and in 1927–8. They had fallen to little over £400,000 in 1932, and after reaching about £363,000 in the famine year 1933, recovered to about the 1932 level in 1934.'

[3] *Medical Report 1940*, pp. 5–6.

[4] See ibid. *1926*, p. 26.

[5] Ibid., p. 27.

[6] Pim Commission, *Report Basutoland*, p. 99.

Population Growth. Until the early years of this century the official documents suggested repeatedly that the natural increase of the natives was large. Thus the Principal Medical Officer, as shown above, stated in 1899 that the birth-rate of 45·9 and the death-rate of 20·3 ascertained for the Leribe District 'may be fairly taken to represent the average birth and death rate throughout the country'.[1] But in 1927 his successor thought that conditions had changed essentially. After having given figures which, he thought, showed a decline in fertility,[2] he said:

> One therefore concludes that the tribe is no longer increasing as it did, say, twenty years ago, and, indeed, if fuller statistics could be obtained it is not improbable that one would find that the population in the next few years will become almost stationary, especially when one takes into allowance the very high death rate among the Basuto children, which is probably not counter-balanced by the high marriage rate, and, that what increase there might be, would be accounted for by the large influx of immigrants from the surrounding provinces of the Union.[3]

It is doubtful, however, whether at that time immigration exceeded emigration, and it is very improbable that fuller statistics, could they have been obtained, would have shown that there was no excess of births over deaths in the twenty years which have since elapsed. But it seems, in fact, that the natural increase has been much smaller since 1921 than in earlier times.

2. *Bechuanaland*

Fertility. The only data concerning native births which have ever been published were those ascertained in 1940 by questioning 220 women attending the dispensary at Francistown. The results, as shown above,[4] are not conclusive. But it is interesting to note that while of the 838 pregnancies of these women 84, or one-tenth, ended in miscarriages, a supplementary investigation of 74 other women undergoing treatment of syphilis showed that of their 282 pregnancies 62, or more than one-fifth, had resulted in miscarriages.[5]

The Principal Medical Officer said in 1932 that two generations earlier there was no syphilis in the Territory.[6] But venereal disease seems to have spread enormously in the course of the last twenty-five years.

> 1917. There are fears, if not indications, that syphilis is on the increase: so far, at least, as its remote effects are concerned, the number of exemptions from payment of Hut Tax, on account of the disease, has gone up.[7]
>
> 1931. . . . most Medical men working in the country estimate that it [syphilis] affects 75% of the population.[8]
>
> 1932. Syphilis. . . . It is among the Bechuana a misnomer to refer to it as 'Venereal' disease, as a large proportion of secondary infections are seen in children, indicating that infection has been caused either by means of eating utensils or—less frequently—congenitally, and not in the generally recognised way.[9]

[1] See also, for example, *Report of the Resident Commissioner for 1887* [-8], p. 15; *Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1894-5*, p. 11, *1901-2*, p. 4, *1903-4*, p. 10.
[2] See p. 58, above. [3] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 27. [4] See p. 45.
[5] See *Minutes of the 22nd Session of the African Advisory Council*, 22 Apr. 1941, p. 21.
[6] See ibid. *13th Session*, 31 Mar. 1932, p. 27.
[7] *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1916-17*, p. 6.
[8] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 10. [9] Ibid. *1932*, p. 8.

Gonorrhoea. There is no doubt that this disease and its effects are extending throughout the Territory. . . . In time this is bound to reduce very seriously the birth rate.[1]

1933. . . . venereal disease is terribly widespread, more especially among certain tribes. Even among the apparently healthy recruits for the mines, who have passed two clinical examinations, tests made at Johannesburg on 100 Bechuana showed 22 per cent. as affected, as compared with 25·5 per cent. of Basutos, 8·5 per cent. of Pondos, and only 2 per cent. of Cape Province Natives. Estimates of the proportion of the population of the Territory affected are as high as 60 to 80 per cent., though the statistical basis is not broad enough to allow of any very confident conclusions being drawn beyond the fact that the percentage is undoubtedly a very high one.[2]

On 4 March 1938 the Principal Medical Officer said in the Native Advisory Council:

When we look back over the figures from the different dispensaries—the only guide we have—we come up against the appalling number of 20 to 25 per cent. of the population at least suffering from venereal disease. According to the last Census the population was over 200,000, and we have the unfortunate fact that approximately a quarter are suffering from syphilis.[3]

In his Report for 1938, however, he was more cautious:

The real fact of the matter is that exaggerated statements made about the number of people affected with this disease [syphilis], varying from 20% to 70%, only seem to indicate the very imperfect knowledge which is available with regard to the prevalence of this disease.[4]

General Mortality. Medical care was most defective until about ten years ago. In a Memorandum of 16 June 1930 the Principal Medical Officer stated:

With the exception of a small 8-bedded Mission Hospital at Kanye, up till the present the Territory has been entirely devoid of hospitals.[5]

But well-equipped hospitals, each with 20 beds for Natives and 4 for Europeans, were opened in 1930 and 1931 at Lobatsi and Serowe, and by 1933 altogether 70 beds were available for Natives and 8 for Europeans.[6]

This gives one bed for every 250 Europeans and for every 2,800 Natives.[7] The provision for Natives is clearly most inadequate, more especially considering the enormous area of the Territory.[8]

The Medical Report for 1938 contains a 'Short Review of Progress in the Medical Work of the Territory for the Five Years following the Presentation of the Pim Report, 1933', which says among other things:

The position now is that there is one bed to approximately every 1,300 of the population.[9]

[1] Ibid., p. 9. See also ibid. *1933*, pp. 9–10; *1934*, p. 10; *1935*, p. 14; *1936*, p. 13; *1938*, p. 9.

[2] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, p. 74; see also ibid., p. 145.

[3] *Minutes of the 19th Session*, p. 71.

[4] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 9. See also in this connexion ibid. *1933*, p. 10: 'It is noticeable that out of almost 10,000 new cases only 8 were detected in the primary stage—by far the greater proportion being in the tertiary period. The large proportion of "tertiary" cases is an indication of inefficient treatment during the infectious and early stages.'

[5] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 151. See also *Medical Report 1925–6*, p. 8.

[6] See Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, pp. 72–3.

[7] Since the census of 1936 showed a native population of 260,000, there was actually in 1933 only one bed for about 3,500 Natives.

[8] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, p. 73. See also Hailey, p. 1157.

[9] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 27. The actual number of beds is not given.

As regards hospitals, the situation, therefore, has much improved. But otherwise the medical services are still quite inadequate. On 4 March 1938 the Resident Commissioner stated in the Native Advisory Council:

> There is a great demand for medical services throughout the whole Protectorate and our present service only begins to touch the fringe of our real needs.[1]

The Bechuanas for at least a generation have had the reputation of lacking physical strength. The Government Secretary stated in 1912:[2]

> The Bechuanas are not . . . a race of much physical strength and vigour, and although they live in a climate which, except for the occurrence of malaria of a mild type,[3] is healthy and appears to be eminently suited to them, and enjoy advantages in the way of ample space, sufficiency of food, and absence of anything approaching unhealthy or laborious toil, they have not increased in the way a more virile race would have done under similar conditions. I do not fancy that they are destined to occupy the position of an important factor in the native question of South Africa.

The reasons for the bad physique and the poor health of the Bechuanas seem to have been discovered only comparatively recently. The Colonial Report for 1929 stated:

> Taken as a whole the standard of living of the Bechuanaland native is below that of most of the natives of South Africa. No doubt malaria is an important contributing factor. One of the Medical Officers, in his report, says of the natives in his district: 'The majority of the people are rotten with the infection (malaria) and chronic malarial pains are a common complaint.' Can one wonder that, with such a physical disability and its resultant mental lethargy, they only make such efforts as will supply them with the absolute bare necessities of life—this in turn lowering their resistance to malaria when it comes their way ?[4]

In his Memorandum of 16 June 1930 the Principal Medical Officer said:

> The physique of the average native throughout the Protectorate is considerably below standard, particularly among the Mangwato Tribe. There is a general lack of virility and stamina, as compared with the Zulu, Xosa, and Basuto.[5]
>
> . . . probably a considerable amount of underfeeding occurs which cannot but impair both ante-natal and post-natal nourishment of the children.
>
> The diet of the Bechuanaland natives is insufficient, both as regards quantity and quality, and the bulk of the population have a half-starved appearance. The meat diet indulged in some 30 years ago is now very restricted owing to the rapid diminution of wild game. . . . from early childhood the diet consists almost entirely of a thick porridge made from maize or kaffir-corn, supplemented during the six summer months by milk and such wild herbs and roots as can be collected.
>
> Malaria and—within the last generation—syphilis are also contributing factors to the physical degeneration of the tribes.[6]

[1] *Minutes 19th Session*, p. 67. In the ensuing debate one member of the Council complained: 'We should be treated by the doctor as a doctor and not as a white man. We should not be looked upon as natives but as patients.' (Ibid., p. 73.) On the other hand, the Pim Commission reported: 'That they [the Natives] have learned to appreciate the benefits of medical treatment is clear from such cases as that of a man from the extreme west of the Kalahari who was treated at Lobatsi and discharged. Eighteen months later he returned with a wagon load of patients who had undertaken the journey of several months across the desert.' (*Report Bechuanaland*, p. 73.)

[2] *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1911–12*, p. 11.

[3] There seems to have been a tendency to underestimate the importance of malaria. See ibid. *1908–9*, p. 11: 'Not for 12 years had malaria been so rife, and hopes were general that in some way the country was passing into a state of greater healthiness. This season has shattered them all, and has shown that it only requires a larger rainfall than usual to render the whole territory a fever-stricken land.'

[4] Ibid. *1929*, p. 29.

[5] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 149.

[6] Ibid., p. 150.

The Resident Commissioner, in a Dispatch to the High Commissioner, dated 21 July 1930, added:

I concur fully with the views expressed by the Principal Medical Officer. In particular, I may say that I have been much impressed on my tours of the Protectorate, all centres of which I have now visited, except Lehututu and Ghanzi, with the under-fed appearance of the native population. In this respect they compare unfavourably with the majority of other peoples with whom I have been brought in contact in other parts of Africa.

I attribute this especially to the lack of surface water supplies in the Protectorate, which renders it difficult for the natives to grow more in the way of foodstuffs than is absolutely necessary for their bare existence and makes it practically impossible for them to grow any vegetables at all.[1]

The Medical Report for 1930 stated:

The physique of the Bechuana, as compared with that of the South African Tribes generally, is noticeably poor. The reason for this is frequently ascribed to Malaria and Syphilis. While not denying that these are contributing factors, certain observations have led to the conclusion that the principal cause is improper dieting . . . .[2]

Altogether, the diet of the Bechuana from infancy and through adult life is so deficient in nitrogenous and vitamin content that the main reason for their poor physique is not far to seek, and it is this poor constitution that makes them easy prey to Syphilis, Malaria, Respiratory and other diseases.[3]

In an Address to the Native Advisory Council, on 19 May 1931, the Principal Medical Officer stated:

Since my arrival in the Protectorate, I have been very much struck with the thinness and poor development of children and grown-up people. From observations made when travelling through the country, there is no doubt that the Mochuana is very much smaller in build and shows less muscular development than any other South African native tribe one has seen—Pondos, Xosas, Fingos, Basutos, Zulus, etc.

In order to corroborate my observations, I made enquiries from the doctors in Johannesburg who examine all native recruits going to work in the Mines, and I find that the Bechuana tribes have a very much poorer physique than that of any other race in South Africa. The Senior Doctor in charge of the examination of recruits at Johannesburg informs me that he is more lenient with regard to the physique of the Bechuana than with that of other tribes, in order that the Bechuana may be able to obtain work and earn money for themselves and their people. But, notwithstanding this lowered standard applied to the Bechuana, he rejects as many as 25 per cent., that is, one-quarter of the total number of our recruits presenting themselves in Johannesburg; whereas the rejection for other tribes is in the region of only 5 per cent. down to 2 per cent.

This state of affairs shows that the matter is very serious and that unless something can be done to improve the physique of the Bechuana, the race will tend to deteriorate even further and eventually become incapable of maintaining a healthy physical and economic condition.

On making enquiries, I am informed that somewhere about 100 years ago, the men of the Bechuana tribes were tall and muscular, though they were always inclined to be thin.

In order to advise how an improvement can be made, one had to find out what the conditions are that have led to the Bechuana deteriorating in physique. My investigations, with which I have been helped by Medical Officers and others in the Protectorate, have led me to the conclusion that the principal reason for this

[1] Ibid., p. 148. [2] *Medical Report 1930*, p. 9. [3] Ibid., p. 10.

deterioration is the lack of proper food supplies. By that I do not mean the quantity of food, but the quality.

. . . it is the lack of correct diet during the past fifty or sixty years that has produced the poor physique which we see and know exists amongst the Bechuana.

Seventy or eighty years ago there were not so many people in the country; they had abundant opportunities of killing game and thus of obtaining fresh meat. It was possible for them to have their cattle near the villages and thus obtain plenty of milk. . . .

I am informed reliably that most of the children for eight months of the year live practically entirely on mealie meal or kaffir corn bread and porridge and that they have milk only during three or four summer months when their parents go to the lands near their cattle posts.[1]

I think I have indicated to you sufficiently that the lack of proper nourishment is undoubtedly the principal factor in the poor physique of the native tribes in this territory. It is probable that there are other contributing factors which must be taken notice of—particularly sanitation in the large villages. At present the sanitary arrangements are nil . . . .

Another cause for the deterioration of the tribes to which I would draw your attention is marriages between people closely related to each other. . . .

I am informed that in the large villages there is a great deal of immorality between the young men and women which does not exist on cattle posts. This also has a deteriorating effect on the physique of the population.

One has often been told that malaria and the hot climate of the Protectorate are the principal causes for the poor condition of the people, but I have no hesitation in contradicting this, as one sees natives from Barotseland, Nyasaland and East Africa, where the climate is as hot, if not hotter, than [in] the Protectorate and where malaria is more widely spread than in Bechuanaland, that the physique of these people is infinitely better than that of your people.

Syphilis, no doubt, plays a part in tribal degeneration, both physical and mental . . . .[2]

A year later, on 31 March 1932, he said in the same Council:

We must not be satisfied with the saying that what was good for our grandparents is necessarily good for us, for our present methods of living are far removed from those of our grandparents. They obtained plenty of fresh food by hunting and by using the wild vegetables, roots and berries of the country; water supplies, we are told, were much more abundant, and crops could be raised more easily than they are at present. Syphilis and tuberculosis were unknown to them; they did not go to work on the mines, nor did their children attend schools.[3]

The Medical Reports for 1931 and 1932 stated:

1931. From all Medical Officers reports are received to the effect that malnutrition is widespread throughout all the tribes and is handicapping the population in every direction.[4]

1932. Actual cases of Scurvy are simply one of the signs of the general malnutrition that exists generally throughout the Territory . . . .[5]

There can be no question but that Tuberculosis is on the increase . . . .[6]

No figures are available to show what the Malarial incidence was, say, 30 years ago. Old residents consider that it is now not nearly as severe or as prevalent as it was then. . . .[7]

As things are at present, it would be a very serious mistake to create an impression that Malaria in the Protectorate is disappearing for good. The experience of

[1] *Minutes of the 11th Session*, pp. 13–14.
[2] Ibid., p. 15.
[3] Ibid. *13th Session*, p. 27.
[4] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 22.
[5] Ibid. *1932*, p. 6. See also the statement of the Principal Medical Officer in the Native Advisory Council, 19 May 1931 (p. 15): 'Every year many cases of scurvy are seen by the doctors.'
[6] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 9.
[7] Ibid., p. 11.

those who saw the epidemic of 1928 makes one realise what a formidable scourge such an epidemic can be.[1]

In previous Annual Reports emphasis has been laid on the poor physique of the Bechuana generally as compared with European standards and also with those of other Native tribes in South Africa. One Medical Officer reports that of 500 adult males examined by him as to their fitness for work on the Gold Mines, the average weight was 8 stone, 13 lbs. Of these he rejected 33% on account of poor physique—this after the recruiting agent had surveyed the recruits and had rejected those who, to his layman's eye, were obviously not worth putting forward for medical examination.

There can be no doubt that nutritional defects during the years of growth are an important factor. In support of this the writer, when visiting a tribal school with the Inspector of Education, was struck with the lean and hungry look among a group of some 80 children aged from 10 to 14 years; there was a lack of keenness in their work; they were listless and apathetic. The class work was stopped and enquiries were made regarding their diet. It was ascertained that 60 out of the 80 had had no food since the previous afternoon. It appears that most of these children generally come to school without a breakfast meal and they get only the one meal of the day on their return home from school about 4 p.m., this meal generally consisting of maize or Kaffir-corn porridge, with perhaps some tea, but seldom anything else. There is no variety or balance in their diet except during three Summer months when they go with their parents to the cattle posts or agricultural lands, and can then get milk, wild spinach, green maize cobs and pumpkin. Of these 80 children only 10 had had milk in any shape or form during the previous three months. Enquiries from the other classes in the school revealed a similar state of affairs.[2]

The Pim Commission (1933) dealt very fully with the physical condition of the Bechuanas. I am confining myself to a few quotations.

With the disappearance of inter-tribal rivalries, and of the possibility of fighting, have gone the main incentives to the maintenance of discipline, and the physical exercises which helped to promote the health of the tribe. Nothing has taken the place of the old interests and excitements, and the life of the stadts [clusters of villages] is mainly one of lounging and gossip. The disappearance of game and of vegetable foods from the neighbourhood of old-established large stadts has deprived the ordinary diet of variety, and only the wealthier members of the tribe are able to obtain such valuable food as sour milk from their cattle posts. Little is left to counteract the deleterious effects of the in-breeding which is customary among some of the tribes.

The main factor in destroying the old subsistence economy has, however, been the introduction of a money economy, and more especially of taxation levied in money. . . . To pay taxes the Native has to raise money and he could do this only by selling his possessions to European traders or by going outside his reserve to earn money in European service.[3]

[1] Ibid., p. 12. In 1934 malaria affected in a portion of the Ghanzi District the whole population—140 Europeans and Eurafricans and 2,200 Natives—and caused the death of 232; in a portion of the Kgalagadi District 3,200 out of 5,000 inhabitants were affected and 121 died. See ibid. *1934*, p. 15.

[2] Ibid. *1932*, pp. 14–15. See also the statement of the Resident Commissioner in the Native Advisory Council, 18 Nov. 1932: 'We took out some of the figures about that at several of the schools recently; we examined the children and asked them questions, the Principal Medical Officer and the Inspector of Education together, and we found the following deplorable results at three big schools in three different districts. At one school 97 per cent. of a school of 640 children had not had milk during the last six months; at another important school 90 per cent. of a number of 125 children had not had milk for six months, and at the last of the three schools 50 per cent. had not had milk during the last six months.' (*Minutes of the 14th Session*, p. 11.) See furthermore ibid. *19th Session*, 7 Mar. 1938, pp. 101–6, and 'Note on Malnutrition' 18 Feb. 1938, ibid., Appendix, pp. xv–xvi; ibid. *20th Session*, 8 Mar. 1939, pp. 30–42.

[3] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, pp. 23–4.

The general physique is poor, more especially in the southern Protectorate, though boys from the cattle posts often present a striking contrast. Malnutrition plays a very large part in the low standard of health and of physique, and this is illustrated by the results of a school medical inspection lately carried out in some of the larger stadts. The medical officers and medical missionaries who carried out the inspection considered it established that (*a*) from 25 to 60 per cent. of the children get no food until the afternoon, and then only mealie meal or kaffircorn porridge, (*b*) very few of the children of school age get any milk for nine months of the year, (*c*) the average weight of the school children (aged 10 to 17), at one large stadt, was 17 per cent. below the standard of normal European children.[1]

The Medical Reports for 1933–6 said:

1933. . . . there were many cases of bad malnutrition and food deficiency diseases such as Scurvy, etc.[2]

348 Cases of Tuberculosis were diagnosed. This is a greater number than in any previous year and each of the last four years shows a progressive increase. The number in 1930 was 165, and it therefore looks as though in three years the total number of cases has doubled, a very disturbing state of affairs, particularly in tribes who are naturally susceptible and whose powers of resistance are lowered by an inefficient diet, by Syphilis and by periodic epidemics of Malaria.[3]

Enough has been said in previous reports on the subject of the poor physique of the Bechuana Tribes generally and the necessity to try and help them to overcome these defects. To a people who live in a semi-arid country which is frequently visited by really serious drought conditions (fortunately not often as severe as that of 1933) the frequent reiteration of advice to grow plenty of vegetables which need artificial watering, to use plenty of water for bathing themselves and washing their clothes, must become mere platitude and lose much of its value as they have not the means to conserve rain water on an adequate scale or to obtain water from underground sources except from the shallow wells which they excavate in the vicinity of a dry water course and from which water is drawn up by hand without mechanical aid. Indeed, for several months of the year the average Mochuana house-wife has to spend two to four hours and more each day to procure just sufficient water for culinary purposes in her home.[4]

Fortunately so far the Territory has escaped epidemics of Enteric and Typhus Fevers, but one ventures to predict that should either disease occur as an epidemic in villages of anything up to 25,000 people, with no sanitation and inadequate water supplies, the mortality would be very serious.[5]

1934. There is no doubt that Tuberculosis is spreading in the Protectorate . . . .[6]

1935. During the year, owing to the prolonged drought, scurvy became very prevalent . . . one Medical Officer reported that whole villages were unable even to carry on their domestic work owing to all the members being affected.[7]

There is no question that this disease [tuberculosis] is spreading in the Protectorate . . . .

Malnutrition, syphilis and insanitary surroundings play a very important part in the spread of this disease by lowering the vitality of the people, and, living huddled in stadts brings sufferers in close contact with a larger number of people than is, for example, the case in Basutoland.[8]

1936. There is no doubt that this disease [tuberculosis] was originally introduced from the Mines, but now cases are frequently met with in women, children, and young adults who have never been to the Mines but who, in quite a number of cases, have had relatives or friends who at some time worked on the Mines.

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Bechuanaland*, p. 74. See also ibid., pp. 144–5; *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 17–18, *1933*, p. 18.
[2] Ibid. *1933*, p. 5. See also ibid., pp. 7–8.
[3] Ibid., pp. 10–11.
[4] Ibid., p. 16.
[5] Ibid., p. 17.
[6] Ibid. *1934*, p. 11.
[7] Ibid. *1935*, pp. 8–9.
[8] Ibid., p. 11.

From figures available of Natives repatriated on account of unsuitability for Mine work the percentage of those returned for Tuberculosis is 0·95. The opinion is held by some medical men that every Native who has worked on the Mines for a certain period develops the disease in a quiescent form, but whilst at the Mines is so well fed and looked after generally that the disease lies dormant. He returns to his home and after a time, with indifferent food and insanitary surroundings, the disease flares up and he becomes a source of infection to others.

A much greater danger, however, in the spread of tuberculosis, is the Native who leaves the Territory on his own, seeking employment other than Mine work. He is not nearly so well fed or housed as the Mine boy and falls an easy prey to the disease, but, for economic reasons, continues to work until failing strength compels him to return home. Such Natives frequently arrive home in an advanced state of tuberculosis and thus infect their relatives and friends.

The spread of this disease is largely governed by conditions prevailing in the Territory itself—frequent droughts, resulting in failure of the crops; lack of milk and green foodstuffs cause marked malnutrition and, added to this, the ravages of diseases such as Syphilis, Scurvy and Malaria, it is little wonder that the vitality of the Native is so lowered that they become prone to the disease.

As this disease is of comparatively recent origin in the Protectorate, the population has not yet had time to acquire an inherited immunity as is the case with the European race, therefore, a large increase in the incidence of this disease must be expected in the future.[1]

Finally, the Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire reported (1939):

It is agreed by all observers that natives of Bechuanaland live on a very poorly balanced diet and are suffering from a serious lack of vitamins, which may show itself in frank manifestations of nutritional disease or as lack of resistance to other diseases. Poor water supplies are at the root of the evil . . . . The normal diet consists almost entirely of maize and millet (Kaffir corn). The latter, brewed as beer, offers some vitamin as does the very scanty ration of meat and milk which may be taken; unfortunately cattle posts are so far from the villages that the most valuable article of diet, milk, is only obtained intermittently, especially by children who are attending school. . . .

Besides lacking protein of good biological value the native of Bechuanaland is living on the verge of vitamin deficiency which shows itself from time to time in outbreaks of scurvy and in other symptoms of nutritional deficiency. . . . Medical officers frequently report nutritional oedemas (especially in pregnant women), anaemias, skin rashes . . . muscular tenderness, etc. . . . Susceptibility to malaria is high owing to malnutrition, and it is believed to play an important part in the spread of tuberculosis, which is becoming a matter of concern. Malnutrition is to be noticed in the children, especially in the younger children.

The problem of nutrition is made up of poverty, ignorance with consequent indifference, and agricultural conditions. . . .[2]

Sporadic cases of sleeping-sickness had been discovered in earlier years in Ngamiland,[3] but in 1942 a serious outbreak occurred. On 13 April 1942, the Resident Commissioner told the African Advisory Council:

I regret to report that there has recently occurred a serious outbreak of sleeping sickness in the Boyanke-Tsau area of Ngamiland. The number of cases admitted to the Maun Hospital is now 141, of which 21 have died[4] and 8 have been discharged

[1] Ibid. *1936*, pp. 9–10. See also *Minutes of the 20th Session of the Native Advisory Council*, 9 Mar. 1939, pp. 75–9.

[2] *First Report*, Part II, pp. 49–50.

[3] See, for example, *Minutes of the 27th Session of the European Advisory Council*, 27 Nov. 1939, p. 7.

[4] On 9 March the Resident Commissioner had stated in the European Advisory Council: 'The number of cases admitted to the Maun Hospital is now 92. Only one death from Sleeping Sickness

cured. The majority of deaths have occurred in cases where the patients are not brought in until they are in the last stages of the disease—too late to benefit from treatment. All necessary steps are being taken to inspect the population, both in the infected area and in other suspected areas; all persons suffering from the disease are being sent for treatment to Maun Hospital, and everything possible is being done to limit the further spread of the disease. Arrangements are being made to evacuate the population from the infected area and to provide food for them. Clearing operations on a large scale will have to be undertaken to clear the infected zone West of the Taoghe River, prevent the fly spreading into other populated and grazing areas, and to drive the fly back into the swamps.[1]

In 1943 the incidence of fresh infections from sleeping-sickness dropped considerably[2] and in 1944 only four new cases were reported.[3] But in the latter year there were outbreaks of epidemic malaria, smallpox, and plague. The smallpox epidemic apparently was not severe but malaria and plague claimed numerous victims.

The abnormally heavy rains which fell early in 1944 gave rise to a sharp increase in mosquito breeding and epidemic malaria resulted in the Tati Concession area. 3,216 cases were reported from all districts during 1944 and it is estimated by the Medical Officer, Francistown, that approximately 300 deaths occurred from malaria in the Tati Concession and Bokalaka areas. . . .[4]

A severe epidemic of bubonic plague occurred in the Lake Ngami, Makalamabedi and Rakops areas. The first cases were notified early in October and to date 322 cases with 177 deaths have been reported. The epidemic originated in a widespread epizootic amongst the veld rodents which coincided with an abnormal increase in the domestic rodent population. Control measures were applied immediately and consisted of a strict quarantine of all infected areas, the prohibition of all but essential traffic under permit, protective inoculation of all persons in the infected and adjacent areas, rodent destruction by cyanogas and poison bait, and deverminisation of all huts and plague contacts and persons entering clean areas from infected areas. 31,111 protective inoculations have been given so far during the campaign.

In the early stages of the campaign lack of trained staff and equipment were severe handicaps. All medical staff available for duty with the plague campaign was seconded to Ngamiland and a number of Europeans were engaged locally and trained in methods of rodent control. Assistance was obtained from neighbouring Territories . . . .[5]

Infant Mortality. The 1933 Report on Welfare Work at Serowe stated: 'Infant mortality is very high, due to Syphilis and wrong feeding.'[6] The only available data concerning infant deaths are those obtained in 1940 by questioning 220 women attending the dispensary at Francistown. It appeared that of 754 children born to these women 169 or 22 per cent. had died in the first year of life. But these figures, as shown above,[7] are not conclusive.

has occurred in the hospital but twelve deaths have been confirmed as due to this cause in the infected area and an unknown number of deaths of suspected cases has also been reported' (*Minutes of the 31st Session*, p. 12).

[1] *Minutes of the 23rd Session of the African Advisory Council*, p. 13. A year later, on 3 May 1943, the Resident Commissioner reported: 'During the year [1942] 320 cases of sleeping sickness were treated in the Maun Hospital, of which 87 died' (*Minutes of the 24th Session*, p. 8).

[2] See *Minutes of the 35th Session of the European Advisory Council*, 20 Mar. 1944, p. 16.

[3] See *Minutes of the 36th Session*, 12 Mar. 1945, p. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 12. [5] Ibid., p. 13. [6] *Medical Report 1933*, p. 41.

[7] See p. 45 above. The Principal Medical Officer expressed the opinion 'that at least 30 per cent of the children born of syphilitic mothers do die of syphilis before they are a year old' (*Minutes of the 22nd Session of the African Advisory Council*, 22 Apr. 1941, p. 25).

Population Growth. When the enumeration of 1911 showed for the natives an increase of only 3 per cent. since the estimate made seven years earlier the Acting Resident Commissioner stated that the population had been overstated in 1904 and submitted figures relating to 'the five large tribes of the Protectorate' which suggested a total increase of 25 per cent. in 1904–11.[1] But these figures, which for one tribe showed a growth of 62 per cent. in seven years, no doubt overstated the actual growth. Moreover, as shown above, the Government Secretary in the following year said that the natives 'have not increased in the way a more virile race would have done'.

Another official reference to the natural increase of the natives appears in the 1930 Memorandum of the Principal Medical Officer who some years earlier had made a sample study in Basutoland.

> No vital statistics are available from which to give any definite figures as to the increase of the population. The writer, in 1926, made certain investigations in Basutoland as to this particular subject and was able to prove conclusively that during the last fifteen years the natural increase of that tribe was rapidly declining and approaching almost to a standstill,[2] and the impression of European residents in the Protectorate is that the same state of affairs holds in Bechuanaland.[3]

But 'the impression of European residents in the Protectorate' as regards such a complicated question cannot be considered relevant, and as the official figures prior to 1936 inspire very little confidence it is impossible to say anything definite concerning population growth in Bechuanaland.

3. *Swaziland*

Fertility. The only available data concerning native births are those obtained by questioning 202 women attending the maternity and child-welfare centre at Bremersdorp in 1933. It was ascertained that these women had had 680 pregnancies of which 72 ended in abortions and 54 resulted in stillbirths.[4]

No official document seems to have discussed fertility. But complaints about the spread of syphilis have been numerous.

> 1908. Syphilis.—This disease, I regret to say, is very widespread indeed, and very many cases have been reported.[5]
>
> 1910. It is difficult to say how much syphilis there is amongst the Swazis, owing to the fact that they go to the native doctors for treatment.[6]
>
> 1911. Syphilis is very common amongst the natives . . . .[7]

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland 1910–11*, p. 4.

[2] As shown on pp. 64–5 above, this proof was by no means conclusive.

[3] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 150. Ten years later the then Principal Medical Officer, on the basis of the abortive investigation made at the dispensary of Francistown, came to the conclusion that 'so far as the population represented in these enquiries is concerned, the numbers of the coming generation are likely, at the best, only to equal the present numbers, and at the worst will be much less' (*Minutes of the 22nd Session of the African Advisory Council*, 22 Apr. 1941, p. 21).

[4] See *Medical Report 1933*, p. 10.

[5] Report of Government Medical Officer, *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1907–8*, p. 55. See also ibid. *1908–9*, p. 18.

[6] Ibid. *1909–10*, p. 20.

[7] Ibid. *1910–11*, p. 13. See also ibid. *1912–13*, p. 12.

1918. It is difficult to say to what extent this disease permeates the native community, but judged by effects on the health and vitality of the people it would not seem to be very prevalent.[1]

1925. Syphilis continues to be a most troublesome disease . . . .[2]

1926. Syphilis was very prevalent as usual.[3]

1930. There is probably an increase in the amount of syphilis . . . .[4]

1934. An increase in the incidence of syphilis is reported from the Central and Southern Districts, and unfortunately this increase is caused by a spread of the disease to the rural areas.[5] . . . Gonorrhœa is very common indeed but there is a tendency, shared by much more civilized communities, to regard this as a minor complaint and to resort to quacks, herbalists, witch doctors and all sorts of unqualified people for treatment so that only a very small percentage of the cases is seen at the hospitals.[6]

1936. In spite of the fact that there are now eight treatment centres the number of cases of venereal disease does not seem to diminish. It is likely that the opening up of the Territory and the easy means of communication as compared with say ten years ago have contributed a good deal to the spread of this disease. Formerly it was mostly confined to the urban areas but during the past few years it has spread more and more amongst the rural community.[7]

1937. Syphilis. This disease appears to be increasing judging by admissions to hospitals and attendance at V.D. clinics and Medical Outposts.

Gonorrhœa. This disease must be much more common than hospital records indicate . . . .[8]

1940. There is an apparent increase in Syphilis, but this is probably due to the increasing confidence natives have in the treatment which encourages more people to attend, rather than to any increase in the infective rate.[9]

What fertility has been in Swaziland it is impossible to tell. The recent censuses suggest that it is very high. In 1921, 6,294 native children were returned as under one year of age and 25,901 women as of child-bearing age (including absentees).[10] The corresponding figures for 1936 were 8,687 and 32,084 respectively.[11] But it is doubtful, of course, how far the age data were accurate.

General Mortality. In the first decades of British administration little medical work was done in Swaziland.

Up to the year 1925 a medical organization did not exist. There was a small mixed hospital at Mbabane with one Government doctor and a second doctor paid by the tin mines but receiving a subsidy from the Government. Another doctor was at Hlatikulu but there was no hospital. So far as natives were concerned the only action taken was to send quinine for distribution through police posts, Mission stations, settlers, and natives. No scheme of expansion had been even put forward by the Principal Medical Officer, largely no doubt because of the financial difficulties, but also, he states, because communications were so bad as to make supervision difficult, and because natives had not then become aware of the advantages of

[1] *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1917–18*, p. 8.
[2] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 2. [3] Ibid. *1926*, p. 2. [4] Ibid. *1930*, p. 11.
[5] See also ibid. *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, pp. 4, 8. [6] Ibid. *1934*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1935*, p. 8.
[7] Ibid. *1936*, pp. 11–12. See also ibid., pp. 4, 10. [8] Ibid. *1937*, p. 3.
[9] Ibid. *1940*, pp. 1–2. See also *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1938*, p. 7.
[10] The total native population was 104,305 excluding absentees and 110,295 including absentees. Assuming that the 6,294 infants were the survivors of 7,400 children born in the year preceding the census, the birth-rate would have been nearly 70.
[11] The total native population was 143,709 excluding absentees and 153,270 including absentees. Assuming that the 8,687 infants were the survivors of 10,200 children born in the year preceding the census, the birth-rate would have been nearly 60. The apparent decrease from 1921 to 1936 was due to a change in the age distribution and not to a decrease in fertility.

European medicine. The methods followed were hardly adapted to bringing home these advantages to them.[1]

However, in 1926 three hospitals were opened—by the Nazarene Mission at Bremersdorp, by the Wesleyan Mission at Mahamba, and by the Government at Hlatikulu[2]—and by 1940 there were 135 hospital beds or one for every 1,170. But 'all hospitals are overcrowded'.[3]

Apart from syphilis which has been discussed above, malaria, tuberculosis, and scurvy seem to be the most important diseases from which natives suffer.

1893. . . . malarial fever prevails badly through the whole country, worse than we have experienced in the last three years.

The Kafirs say that it is fully 20 years since the fever was so bad. The number of deaths among the Kafirs is great. At Bremersdorp old and young have suffered from it. The place was like a big hospital.[4]

1909. I am of opinion that a fair number of natives suffer from this disease [tuberculosis] in one form or another. All those treated had worked some time previously on the mines.[5]

1927. There is quite a lot of Scurvy amongst the natives, especially about the end of the winter. As a rule it is not so serious as to be dangerous to life, and disappears again in the spring, when a supply of green food becomes available.

There is also a little Pellagra to be found amongst the natives.[6]

1930. There is always a certain amount of scurvy towards the end of the Winter and cases of Pellagra crop up now and then, as is only to be expected in a country where the staple article of diet is maize.[7]

1931. The very widespread diseases of malaria, bilharzia, and amœbic dysentery are largely preventable, and tuberculosis appears to be on the increase, partly following on miner's phthisis but specially marked among children. There are also a large number of cases of enteric, both European and native, and in the townships this appears to be largely due to the character of the water-supply.[8]

Employment on the gold mines has led to a large and gradually increasing amount of disease in the Territory. The Medical Officer at Hlatikulu attributes 80 per cent. of the incapacity in adult natives to the after-effects of this class of work. There is not nearly the same percentage in the northern half of the Territory, probably largely because there has always been a larger demand for labour locally on the tin

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Swaziland*, p. 54. [2] See ibid., pp. 54–5.

[3] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 4. The preceding reports discuss in particular the overcrowding in the Mbabane Hospital.

1935. '. . . the Mbabane hospital . . . is always overcrowded. It has accommodation for 22 beds and the daily average during the year was 38. At one time the female ward which holds eight beds contained a Caesarean Section, two enterics, a Septicaemia and a woman who had been operated on for an Ovarian cyst in addition to twelve other less serious cases. A patient who was being treated for Bilharzia contracted Enteric while in hospital, such things are very hard to prevent when dealing with such primitive people in such a state of congestion. . . .'

1936. 'At the Mbabane [hospital] the average daily number of patients was 54 although, including that for venereal cases, there is accommodation for only 30. At one time there were over 80 in patients and the great majority had to sleep on the floor.'

1938. 'The accommodation in both Government hospitals has been taxed to the limit during the greater part of the year. At Mbabane, with a capacity of 25 beds the daily average was 46 and the highest daily total, 61 . . . .'

(Ibid. *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 11; *1938*, p. 8.)

[4] Dispatch from the Government Secretary, Bremersdorp, to the Imperial Secretary, Cape Town (April or May 1893), *Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland*, 1893, p. 113.

[5] Report of Government Medical Officer, *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1908–9*, p. 18.

[6] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 2. [7] Ibid. *1930*, p. 8. See also ibid. *1931*, p. 10.

[8] Pim Commission, *Report Swaziland*, p. 57.

mines, ranches, farms, small gold mines, etc., and fewer natives went to work in the deep mines of the Transvaal.

Even though the natives are returned home as soon as signs of fibrosis of the lungs are detected, a moderate degree of this disability unfits them for hard work; consequently, they are unable to earn good money, are liable to become underfed, and the lung condition becomes tubercular.[1]

A regrettable change for the worse takes place when the native begins to rise a little in the social scale and to imitate European housing conditions. He then puts up a small rectangular building of unburned brick or of wattle and daub; the walls are too low; the floor is of earth and cannot be kept clean, and is damp in wet weather. The only window is a small hole, often about a foot square, and almost invariably boarded over. This small building is divided into a living-room and a sleeping-room, both too small, and the inhabitants lie either on the damp earthen floor or on home-made wooden bedsteads with dirty bed clothing, under conditions far more liable to harbour biting insects than the polished, impervious floor of the grass hut and the sleeping-mat and blanket of the native.

Two other points in favour of the grass hut are: First, when the native, for any reason—often the occurrence of an unusual amount of sickness in the kraal—wishes to move, this is a simple matter. He simply constructs new huts in another place and burns down the old ones. And, second, as there is practically always a small fire in the sleeping-hut, there is a certain amount of smoke, and this keeps off mosquitoes.

I am quite convinced that the natives do not get malaria at their kraals; they get it in the early mornings or late afternoon in their cultivated lands, which are usually placed alongside a small stream, often at a considerably lower level than the kraal.

The fact of the whole matter is that the economic condition of the native is such that he cannot afford to build proper houses. Until he has attained such an economic condition and has learned how to build proper houses and live in them properly, he is much better off under his primitive tribal housing conditions.[2]

1932. There was about the average amount of scurvy. This disease is most prevalent towards the end of the winter and though there is practically no mortality from it, it must undermine the general health to some extent.

There is always some ordinary anæmia, the result of an ill-balanced and insufficient diet but no cases of pernicious anæmia have been observed.[3]

I feel that in the course of time tuberculosis will become a serious problem in Swaziland. All the hospitals comment on the number of cases they see and very often can do nothing for. In my opinion the most serious factors in the causation of this disease are housing and diet, and the Swazis are tending to develop along lines which are likely to lead to increase in the number of cases. I am quite convinced that his beehive hut, which is water tight and has a floor impervious to moisture, is a much healthier place than the little wattle-and-daub one or two-roomed house he often builds now in imitation of the houses of Europeans. The latter has a mud floor, no windows, no ventilation and is dark, damp and usually hopelessly overcrowded.

The diet is an ill balanced one: it contains too little proteid and is deficient in Vitamins and is too monotonous. That diet has an influence on tuberculosis is borne out by the rapid recovery of early cases of joint and gland tuberculosis under good feeding at a Hospital.

A redeeming feature hitherto was the amount of milk consumed, especially by the children, either in the natural form or as amazi (sour milk). If the native is going to live in insanitary houses of the kind I have described, and is going to depreciate still further his already defective diet by sending his milk to a creamery and either doing without it at the kraal or using it in the condensed form he will be establishing just those conditions that are most favourable for the development of the tubercle bacillus.[4]

The diet is not a satisfactory one. The proportion of carbohydrate is too high and that of proteid too low while the consumption of fruit and vegetables is far too

[1] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 8. [2] Ibid., p. 9. [3] Ibid. *1932*, p. 2. [4] Ibid., p. 3.

little, hence the tendency to scurvy and anæmia especially towards the end of winter. There is a growing tendency to supplement the proteid content of the diet by a higher consumption of beans of various kinds, but still more of these should be grown for food.[1]

1933. Tuberculosis. The position remains much the same. I think the disease has been slightly on the increase in recent years. At one time this was probably accentuated by the return of cases of lung tuberculosis from employment on the gold mines but the examination of recruits is so strict now that only those in excellent health and of first class physique are taken on, and the application of modern methods of diagnosis leads to the discovery of lung fibrosis at such an early stage and consequent repatriation that the menace from this source is nothing like what it used to be, and I repeat the opinion I expressed last year that the diet and housing conditions of the natives are now more dangerous factors than employment on the gold mines.[2]

The rough nature of a large part of the country, and the distribution of the native population, scattered as it is all over the native areas in kraals containing an average population of twelve each, and well separated from each other make concerted measures for the improvement of sanitary conditions and a generally healthier manner of living very difficult. The only place where anything on a fairly large scale is being done is Bremersdorp, where the completion of a water works scheme should result in a great diminution in the amount of enteric, schistosomiasis and dysentery which has given this township a somewhat unenviable reputation from a health point of view in the past.[3]

1934. There is no doubt that this disease [tuberculosis] is slowly but surely on the increase and there is no provision whatever for methods of dealing with it . . .[4]

Cases of marked scurvy appear every year. They are not in great numbers but undoubtedly a large percentage of the population is on the verge of scurvy in the Spring.[5]

1935. There was a lot of scurvy during the year . . . .[6]

1936. The position with regard to tuberculosis is very unsatisfactory. Though no definite evidence on the point can be produced it is the opinion of every medical practitioner in the Territory that there is a slow but steady increase in all forms of the disease. . . . No improvement is likely to take place until the economic position of the natives is raised to such a standard that they can afford to build and live in proper houses and pay for a much more liberal and varied scale of diet.[7]

1937. During the autumn of 1937 one of the severest epidemics of Malaria on record was experienced . . . .[8]

Schistosomiasis (Bilharziasis). This disease was very prevalent over a large part of the country . . . .

Bilharziasis is probably responsible for a great deal more chronic ill health than is fully realised.

Tuberculosis. All medical officers are agreed that this disease is on the increase. . . . The problem of tuberculosis is an exceedingly serious one . . .[9]

1938. The problem of tuberculosis is wrapped up with so many others; malnutrition, syphilis, malaria, and a poor standard of living, all play their part in lowering the resistance and rendering natives more susceptible to the ravages of this disease.[10]

1941. 2,772 cases of malaria were recorded as against 1,317 in the previous year. This increase does not indicate anything in the nature of an epidemic, but can be accounted for to a great extent by the increased attention which was given to the disease during the year.[11]

1942. There was a severe epidemic of malaria throughout the Territory during the early months of the year.

[1] Ibid., p. 8. See also ibid. *1935*, p. 3; *1938*, pp. 27–32.
[2] Ibid. *1933*, p. 3.
[3] Ibid., p. 6.
[4] Ibid. *1934*, p. 6. See also ibid. *1935*, p. 3.
[5] Ibid. *1934*, p. 9.
[6] Ibid. *1935*, p. 2. See also ibid., p. 7.
[7] Ibid. *1936*, p. 4.
[8] Ibid. *1937*, p. 2.
[9] Ibid., pp. 3–4.
[10] Ibid. *1938*, p. 4. See also ibid. *1941*, p. 1; *1942*, p. 2.
[11] Ibid. *1941*, p. 1.

It is impossible to give accurate figures of the number of cases, as very many natives did not present themselves for treatment.

Two facts are outstanding among the cases treated:—

(1) The severity of the disease, showing an unusually high incidence of pernicious forms (over 7% of in-patients) with a high mortality rate.

(2) The epidemic spread to the high veldt, which is usually free from this disease. Mosquito larval and adult catches were made in a number of areas, and in almost every case, the vector was found to be A. gambiæ; this mosquito was found breeding in some of the tin workings within the Mbabane urban area.[1]

One factor which obviously must have led to a deterioration of the physical condition of the natives was the growing incapacity of producing enough food on their own land.

. . . before the outbreaks of cattle disease from 1896 onwards and up to the Boer War the natives appear to have been self-supporting in normal years. The country teemed with game and they probably lived to a large extent on meat and forest produce. Certainly Europeans appear to have had no difficulty in purchasing any grain required by them.[2]

Present conditions have been described as follows:

The Swazi natives grow about one-quarter of the foodstuffs required for consumption, the remainder being for the most part produced by European farmers while a little is imported. The average yield per acre of native land is about one-half that of land owned by Europeans.[3]

Thus the fact that the major part of the country is in the hands of European farmers has resulted in the necessity for the natives of buying the major part of their food requirements from Europeans; even if the natives were in a position to produce on their less good lands as much per acre as the Europeans they could not satisfy thereby more than one-half of their food requirements.

Infant Mortality. Comments on infant mortality are scanty.

1925. Infant mortality is large owing principally to the methods of feeding.[4]

1930. The infant mortality must be high, but there is no compulsory registration and consequently no figures are available. All the medical workers in the Territory comment on the very unsuitable nature of the diet given to infants. The native mother breast-feeds her baby if she possibly can; as a matter of fact she feeds it far too long, usually up to eighteen months and even two years. If the natural food is insufficient or the mother imagines it to be so, the additional food is either thin cold porridge or sour curdled milk, the starch in the former and the masses of casein in the latter being most unsuitable for a child a few weeks or months old.[5]

1932. Gastro-intestinal diseases in infants and young children are unfortunately very common.[6]

1933. A maternity and child welfare centre was started at Bremersdorp . . . and the obstetric histories of 202 native women were investigated . . . . [It appeared that of 554 live-born children 147 or 27 per cent. had died during the first year of age.]

These figures do not paint a bright picture but it must be remembered that they were taken in an area which is intensely hot during the summer and where malaria is yearly epidemic. I feel certain that the figures from the highlands would be more satisfactory.[7]

[1] *Medical Report 1942*, p. 1.
[2] Pim Commission, *Report Swaziland*, p. 18.
[3] Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II, pp. 52–3.
[4] *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1925*, p. 4.
[5] *Medical Report 1930*, p. 2.
[6] Ibid. *1932*, p. 2.
[7] Ibid. *1933*, p. 10.

1934. . . . practically all the native children are breast-fed, but there is a pernicious national custom, followed by nearly every mother, of supplementing this from birth with thin sour porridge. This with the flies and the generally insanitary conditions in and about the kraal are the causes of so much sickness—particularly enteritis—in the first two years of life.[1]

1939. Over 80 per cent. of babies showed signs of nutritional disorder in a recent out-patient department examination. Although accurate figures are not available the consensus of medical opinion is that infant mortality during the first year approximates 40 per cent., half of which die within the first two months. This is largely due to irregular breast feeding and the custom of feeding babies on sour porridge during the first week of life.[2]

Population Growth. There are no data on which to base conclusions regarding population increase in Swaziland. The census figures suggest a very large excess of births over deaths in 1921–36. The Medical Department made the following comment:

The desire of the married native women who at some time or other have contracted the [venereal] disease to undergo treatment until they are completely cured and can bear healthy children has already been referred to. When one considers that at least two thousand of these women have been treated in the last ten years I think one is on quite safe ground in assuming that the unexpectedly large increase in the native population revealed by the last census is partly a result of the work done at the V.D. Clinics.[3]

I think one is on still safer ground in assuming that the apparently very large increase in the native population revealed by the last census was due in the first place to an understatement of the native population at the 1921 census. The Medical Reports, in any case, do not suggest a decrease in the incidence of uncured venereal disease.

VIII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics

No figures concerning births or deaths of coloured non-natives have been published for any of the three Territories, and European birth and death data are available only for Bechuanaland and Swaziland.

Bechuanaland. Although notification of European deaths has been compulsory for several decades, death data have apparently been published only for recent years, and the figures given in the various documents differ.

Source	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
Colonial Reports[1]	18	19	5	23	22	20	19	19
Medical Reports[2]	18	..	..	25	19	11	19	21

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Bechuanaland Protectorate 1931*, p. 5; *1932*, p. 6; *1933*, p. 6; *1934*, p. 6; *1935*, p. 6; *1936*, p. 6; *1937*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 7.

[2] See *Medical Report 1931*, p. 15; *1934*, p. 20; *1935*, p. 16; *1936*, p. 16; *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 13.

These data suggest a low mortality.

According to the Medical Reports the numbers of births registered in 1934–8 were 40, 29, 26, 44, and 34 respectively.[4] These figures would

[1] Ibid. *1934*, p. 10. See also ibid. *1936*, pp. 2, 10.

[2] Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II, p. 52.

[3] *Medical Report 1936*, p. 12.

[4] See ibid. *1934*, p. 20; *1935*, p. 16; *1936*, p. 16; *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 13.

suggest a low fertility but birth registration having been voluntary was probably not complete.

Birth and death registration became compulsory on 1 January 1940, and it is to be expected that in the future more adequate vital statistics for Europeans will be available.

Swaziland. Fertility of European women seems to have decreased in the course of time. Although the number of women at child-bearing age (15-49 years) increased between 1921 and 1936 from 494 to 661 the average yearly number of births rose only from 55 in 1921–30 to 59 in 1931–40. The average yearly number of deaths was 22 both in 1921–30 and in 1931–40. This indicates a yearly death rate of only 9 per 1,000 for the first period and of only 8 per 1,000 for the second.[1]

TABLE 20. *European Births and Deaths, Swaziland, 1907–40*[1]

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*
1907	30	8	1919	50	25	1931	77	21
1908	23	7	1920	49	23	1932	57	27
1909	31	12	1921	43	21	1933	46	28
1910	32	18	1922	61	15	1934	78	20
1911	58	14	1923	53	27	1935	55	19
1912	35	5	1924	55	21	1936	55	26
1913	33	12	1925	63	18	1937	42	25
1914	44	12	1926	59	22	1938	54	21
1915	42	12	1927	57	24	1939	68	24
1916	42	18	1928	54	20	1940	60	10
1917	49	18	1929	46	26			
1918	34	22	1930	57	27			

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1907–8*, p. 27, *1908–9*, p. 19, *1909–10*, p. 20, *1910–11*, p. 12, *1911–12*, p. 12, *1912–13*, p. 12, *1913–14*, p. 13, *1914–15*, p. 15; *Official Year Book of the Union* &c. *1928–9*, p. 1095, *1934–5*, p. 1155, *1940*, p. 1231; *Blue Book 1940*, p. 61.

TABLE 21. *Deaths of European Officials, Basutoland and Swaziland, 1924–38*[1]

	Swaziland				*Swaziland*			*Basutoland*	
	Number				*Number*			*Number*	
Year	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*	*Total*	*Deaths*
1924	90	84	—	1932	96	94	—	..	..
1925	87	81	—	1933	95	93	1	..	..
1926	81	76	—	1934	97	95	—	..	..
1927	83	80	—	1935	99	97	2	134	—
1928	85	80	2	1936	102	98	1	131	—
1929	88	84	—	1937	106	101	—	135	2
1930	87	85	1	1938	110	105	—	156	—
1931	87	85	1						

[1] See Basutoland, *Medical Report 1935*, pp. 5–6, *1936*, p. 6, *1937*, pp. 6–7, *1938*, pp. 6–7; Swaziland, *Medical Report 1925*, pp. 3–4, *1927*, p. 3, *1930*, pp. 4–5, *1933*, p. 5, *1935*, p. 5, *1938*, p. 4.

[1] The total number of infant deaths registered in 1931–40 was 31 (see *Colonial Reports, Swaziland 1931*, p. 6, *1932*, p. 6, *1933*, p. 6, *1934*, p. 6, *1935*, p. 6; *Blue Book 1936*, p. 77, *1937*, p. 54, *1938*, p. 53, *1939*, p. 66, *1940*, p. 62). This would indicate an infant mortality rate of only about 50.

SOURCES QUOTED

GENERAL

Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for South Africa.

Official Gazette of the High Commissioner for Basutoland, the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland.

Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope 1652–1886, edited by Joseph Foster, Hercules Tennant, and E. M. Jackson. 3 vols. Cape Town, 1887.

Statutes of the Cape of Good Hope, Passed by the Sixth Parliament, during the Sessions 1879–1883. Cape Town, 1884.

Census of the Union of South Africa 1911, Report, and *Annexures to General Report.* Pretoria, 1912, 1913.

Census of the European or White Races of the Union of South Africa 1918, Part VII. Cape Town, 1920.

Union of South Africa, *Census of the Population 1921*, Part I.

Census of the Population of the Union of South Africa, Enumerated 4th May, 1926, Part VII. Pretoria, 1929.

Sixth Census of the Population of the Union of South Africa, Enumerated 5th May, 1936, vols. v, ix. Pretoria, 1942.

Union of South Africa, Union Office of Census and Statistics, *Official Year Book of the Union and of Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, and Swaziland 1919* to *1941.* Pretoria, 1920–41.

Annual Colonial Reports, Basutoland 1890–91 to *1923–4, 1924* to *1938; Bechuanaland Protectorate 1896–7* to *1927–28, 1928* to *1938; Swaziland 1906–7* to *1920–21, 1921* to *1938.* London, 1892–1939.

Correspondence relating to Conditions of Native Labour employed in Transvaal Mines. Cd. 2025 (*Parliamentary Papers England*, 1904, vol. lxii, pp. 39–196).

'Abstract of Arrangements respecting Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in the British Dominions beyond the Seas', Appendix to *Sixty-Fifth Annual Report of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in England and Wales (1902).* Cd. 2003. London, 1904.

Abstract of Arrangements respecting Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Great Britain, Ireland, the Islands of the British Seas, and the British Dominions beyond the Seas, Issued by the Registrar-General [for England and Wales]. London, 1915.

Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations in Certain Parts of the Empire. Colonial No. 65. London, 1931.

Economic Advisory Council, Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Parts I and II. Cmd. 6050, 6051. London, 1939.

BASUTOLAND

Basutoland, *High Commissioners' Proclamations and Notices to June 30th, 1909.* Cape Town.

Basutoland, *Orders in Council, High Commissioner's Proclamations and Government Notices, Issued during the Period from the 12th March, 1868, to the 30th June, 1913.* Cape Town, 1913.

Basutoland Proclamations and Notices, 1935; 1936; 1938.

Results of a Census of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, Taken on the Night of Sunday, the 7th March, 1875. Part I, Summaries. Part II, Supplementary

Tables, with an Appendix Shewing Results of the Census of British Basutoland Taken in March, 1875. Cape Town, 1877, 1878.

Results of a Census of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, as on the Night of Sunday, the 5th April, 1891. Cape Town, 1892.

Results of a Census of the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope, as on the Night of Sunday, the 17th April, 1904. Cape Town, 1905.

Census of the Colony of Natal April 1904. Pietermaritzburg, 1905.

Census of the Orange River Colony, Sunday, the 17th April, 1904. Bloemfontein.

Census Returns for Basutoland 1891 (MS.).

Basutoland Census 17th April 1904. Maseru.

Basutoland Census 23rd April, 1911. Capetown, 1912.

Basutoland Census 3rd May, 1921. Pretoria, 1922.

Basutoland Government, *Basutoland Census 1936.* Pretoria, 1937.

Basutoland, *Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the Year ended 30th September 1944.* Maseru.

Basutoland, *Report of the Education Department for the Year 1934.* Morija.

Basutoland, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report 1923* to *1941.*

Basutoland, *Annual Medical and Public Health Report for the Year ending 31st December 1942; 1943.*

Basutoland, *Annual Blue Book 1936* to *1942* (typescripts).

Report of the Governor's Agent, Basutoland, for 1872, Cape of Good Hope, *Annexures to the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly*, 1873, G 27.

Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs* 1874 (contains Report for Basutoland 1873), *Annexures to the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly*, 1874, G 27.

Cape of Good Hope, *Blue-Book on Native Affairs 1875* to *1884* (contain Reports for Basutoland 1874–83), *Appendix I to the Votes and Proceedings of Parliament*, 1875, vol. i, G 21; *Appendix I, 1876*, vol. i, G 16; *Appendix I, 1877*, vol. i, G 12; *Appendix I, 1878*, vol. i, G 17; *Appendix I, 1879*, vol. i, G 33; *Appendix I, 1880*, vol. i, G 13; *Appendix I, 1881*, vol. i, G 20; *Appendix II, 1882*, vol. vi, G 33, G 47; *Appendix I, 1883*, vol. vi, G 8; *Appendix I, 1884*, vol. iii, G 3.

Cape of Good Hope, *Report of the Select Committee appointed to consider and report on Hostilities in Basutoland, Appendix II to the Votes and Proceedings of Parliament, 1879*, vol. i, A 6.

Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland and the Proposals of the Cape Government with respect to its Future Administration. C. 3708 (*P.P.* 1883, vol. xlviii, pp. 317–451).

Further Correspondence respecting the Cape Colony and adjacent Territories (contains Report for Basutoland 1884–5). C. 4644 (*P.P.* 1886, vol. xlviii, pp. 1–91).

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Basutoland (contains Report for 1885–6). C. 4907 (ibid., pp. 163–97).

Despatch from Sir Hercules Robinson, with Report of the Resident Commissioner, Basutoland, for the Year ending 30th June 1887, and Secretary of State's Reply thereto. C. 5238 (*P.P.* 1887, vol. lxi, pp. 99–115).

Basutoland, Report of the Resident Commissioner for 1887 [actually 1887–8]; *for the Year ended 30th June 1889; for 1889–90* (*Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions* Nos. 31, 70, 114). London, 1888–90.

Reports of the Transvaal Labour Commission, Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence. Cd. 1897 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. xxxix, pp. 283–1003).

Selections from Colonial Medical Reports for 1898 and 1899; for 1900 and 1901. Colonial Reports, Miscellaneous, Nos. 16, 19. Cd. 614, 1098. London, 1901, 1902.

Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions and Protectorates, Part XXVII, 1902. Cd. 2184 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. civ).

An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire (1937). Colonial No. 179. London, 1940.

The Dominions Office and Colonial Office List for 1940. London.

Intelligence Branch of the Quartermaster-General's Department, Horse Guards, War Office, *Précis of Information concerning South Africa: The Eastern Frontier of the Cape Colony, Kafraria, and Basutoland, with special Reference to the Native Tribes*, Nov. 1877. London, 1877.

Financial and Economic Position of Basutoland, Report of the Commission Appointed by the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, January, 1935 (Commissioner: Sir Alan Pim). Cmd. 4907. London, 1935.

Basutoland Council 33rd Session 1938 (typescript).

Basutoland Records, collected and arranged by Geo. M. Theal. 3 vols. Cape Town, 1883.

Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations 1942/44. Geneva, 1945.

The Cambridge History of the British Empire, vol. viii, *South Africa, Rhodesia and the Protectorates*. Cambridge, 1936.

E. CASALIS, *Les Bassoutos ou Vingt-trois années de séjour et d'observations au Sud de l'Afrique*. Paris, 1859.

History of the Basuto, Ancient and Modern, compiled by D. Fred. Ellenberger, and written in English by J. C. Macgregor under the Auspices of the Basutoland Government. London, 1912.

LORD HAILEY, *An African Survey, A Study of Problems arising in Africa South of the Sahara*. Oxford, 1938.

MARGARET L. HODGSON and W. G. BALLINGER, *Indirect Rule in Southern Africa* (No. 1) *Basutoland*. May 1931.

T. W. IRVINE, *British Basutoland and the Basutos*. London (1881).

C. W. DE KIEWIET, *British Colonial Policy and the South African Republics 1848–1872*. London, 1929.

— —, *The Imperial Factor in South Africa, A Study in Politics and Economics*. Cambridge, 1937.

SIR GODFREY LAGDEN, *The Basutos, The Mountaineers and their Country*. 2 vols. London, 1909.

MINNIE MARTIN, *Basutoland: Its Legends and Customs*. London, 1903.

J. M. ORPEN, *Some Principles of Native Government Illustrated, and the Petitions of the Basuto Tribe regarding Land, Law, Representation and Disarmament to the Cape Parliament Considered*. Cape Town, 1880.

R. R. STAPLES and W. K. HUDSON, *An Ecological Survey of the Mountain Area of Basutoland*. London, 1938.

GEORGE M^cCALL THEAL, *History of South Africa, The Republics and Native Territories from 1854 to 1872*. London, 1889.

Tuberculosis in South African Natives with Special Reference to the Disease amongst the Mine Labourers on the Witwatersrand (Publications of the South African Institute for Medical Research, No. XXX). Johannesburg, March 1932.

JOHN WIDDICOMBE, *Fourteen Years in Basutoland, A Sketch of African Mission Life*. London (1891).

BECHUANALAND

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Orders in Council and High Commissioner's Proclamations, together with an Appendix containing the more important Government Notices from 9th May 1891 to 30th June 1898*, edited by D. Ward. London, 1898.

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Orders in Council and High Commissioner's Proclamations and Notices issued during the Period from the 9th May, 1891, to the 30th June, 1914*, edited by M. Williams. Mafeking, Cape Province, 1915.

Bechuanaland Protectorate Proclamations 1898–1914 (Colonial Office Library).

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *High Commissioner's Proclamations and the more important Government Notices from 1st January to 31st December, 1934* to *1943*. Mafeking 1935–(1943).

Bechuanaland Protectorate Census 1904 (typescript).

Census taken in the Bechuanaland Protectorate on the 7th May, 1911.

Bechuanaland Protectorate Census 1921.

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Report of the Director of Education for the Period 1st January, 1944 to 31st December, 1944.*

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year 1925–6; 1926–7; 1927–8: 1928* to *1938*. London, (1926)–1940.

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Year 1936–7; 1937–8.*

Correspondence relative to the Visit to this Country of the Chiefs Khama, Sebele, and Bathoen, and the Future of the Bechuanaland Protectorate. C. 7962 (*P.P.* 1896, vol. lix, pp. 751–807).

The Colonial Office List for 1897 to *1905*. London.

Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, Part XXVI, 1901. Cd. 1728 (*P.P.* 1903, vol. lxxxi).

Financial and Economic Position of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, Report of the Commission Appointed by the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, March, 1933 (Commissioner: Sir Alan Pim). Cmd. 4368. London, 1933.

Minutes of the Eleventh Session of the Bechuanaland Protectorate Native Advisory Council, 19 May 1931; same *Twelfth* to *Twenty-Fifth Session*, Dec. 1931 to Apr. 1944 [from 1940 on 'African Advisory Council'].

Bechuanaland Protectorate, *Minutes of the Twenty-Fourth Session of the European Advisory Council*, 31 Jan. to 5 Feb. 1938; same *Twenty-Sixth Session*, 13 to 18 Feb. 1939, *Twenty-Seventh Session*, 27 Nov. to 6 Dec. 1939, *Thirty-First Session*, 9 to 13 Mar. 1942, *Thirty-Fifth Session*, 20 to 24 Mar. 1944, *Thirty-Sixth Session*, 12 to 16 Mar. 1945.

I. Schapera, *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate.* 1943.

SWAZILAND

The Transvaal Government Gazette.

Statute Law of the Transvaal 1839–1910 (in Force on 31st May, 1910), compiled and edited by Carl Jeppe and J. H. Gey van Pittius. 4 vols. Pretoria, 1910–11.

Transvaal Colony Proclamations from 1900–1902 (Revised to 30th November, 1902). London, 1902.

Ordinances of the Transvaal, 1904. Pretoria, 1904.

Swaziland Laws, 1927.

Swaziland Proclamations and High Commissioner's Notices, 1931.

Swaziland Orders-In-Council, Proclamations and Notices, 1935; 1936.

Census of the Transvaal, 1904, Preliminary Report of the Commissioner of the Census. Pretoria, 1904.

Results of a Census of the Transvaal Colony and Swaziland, Taken on the Night of Sunday the 17th April, 1904. London, 1906.

Swaziland Administration, *Census, 1911.* Pretoria, 1911.

Swaziland Administration, *Census of Swaziland 3rd May, 1921, Including Population, Agriculture, and Live Stock.* Pretoria, 1922.

Swaziland Government, *Swaziland Census 1936.*

Swaziland, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year ended 31st December 1925* to *1938, 1940* to *1942* (1925 and 1926 typescripts).

Swaziland, *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the Financial Year 1st April, 1936–31st March, 1937; 1st April, 1937–31st March, 1938.*

Swaziland, *Annual Blue Book 1936* to *1940* (typescripts).

Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland. C. 5089 (*P.P.* 1887, vol. lxi, pp. 319–98).

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland and Tongaland. C. 6200 (*P.P.* 1890, vol. lii, pp. 93–420).

Report on Swazieland, by Colonel Sir F. de Winton (with Appendices and Correspondence). C. 6201 (*P.P.* 1890, vol. lii, pp. 1–91).

Further Correspondence respecting the Affairs of Swaziland. C. 7212 (*P.P.* 1893–4, vol. lxii, pp. 139–316).

Financial and Economic Situation of Swaziland, Report of the Commission Appointed by the Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, January, 1932. Cmd. 4114. London, 1932.

THIRD PART

EAST AFRICA

CHAPTER VII

INTRODUCTION[1]

I. CENSUS-TAKING

CENSUSES[2] of the native population were taken in 1931 in Mombasa, Nairobi, and on non-native premises in Kenya and Uganda. Censuses of the non-native population have been taken in Kenya and Nyasaland in 1911, 1921, 1926, and 1931,[3] in Uganda and Northern Rhodesia in 1911, 1921, and 1931, in Tanganyika and Somaliland in 1921 and 1931, and in Zanzibar in 1921.

Counts[4] (all-inclusive or partial) of the native population have been made in Uganda in 1911, 1921, and 1931, in Tanganyika in 1921, 1928, and 1931, in Northern Rhodesia in 1931, in Nyasaland in 1921, 1926, and 1931,[5] and in Zanzibar in 1910, 1924, and 1931. Counts of the non-native population were made in Zanzibar in 1910 and 1931.

All native counts in Tanganyika, the Uganda enumerations (censuses and counts) of 1911 and 1921, the Zanzibar counts of 1910 and 1924, and the censuses of 1911 in Kenya and North-Eastern Rhodesia were taken without special legal enactment. All non-native censuses in Somaliland and Tanganyika, the censuses of 1921 in Kenya and Zanzibar, and the census of 1911 in Nyasaland were authorized by Ordinances or Decrees *ad hoc*. The census of 1911 in North-Western Rhodesia, the censuses of 1921 and 1931 in Northern Rhodesia, the enumerations of 1921, 1926, and 1931[5] in Nyasaland, the censuses of 1926 and 1931 in Kenya, and the enumerations of 1931 in Uganda and Zanzibar were taken in accordance with general Census Ordinances, Decrees, or Proclamations. The Census Acts, on the whole, vary greatly. But the general Census Ordinance enacted in 1925 in Kenya was adopted almost literally in Uganda and Zanzibar in 1931. I shall reproduce here the text of the Kenya Ordinance,[6] showing in footnotes the main changes made in Uganda[7] and Zanzibar.[8]

[1] This Introduction was written in 1941–2. More recent information (up to 1946) is given in footnotes and in the chapters dealing with the individual Dependencies.

[2] A census is an enumeration made by entering the name and particulars of each individual on a census form.

[3] In Nyasaland also in 1945.

[4] A count is an enumeration made either without any forms or with collective forms in which are entered particulars of groups (for example, the population of a village).

[5] Also 1945.

[6] For the text of the Ordinances governing the 1931 censuses in Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Somaliland, and Tanganyika, see the respective chapters.

[7] The changes noted for Uganda were not in the original Bill but were amendments proposed and accepted during the debate in the Legislative Council (see 'Minutes of the Proceedings', 14 Apr. 1931, *Official Gazette of the Uganda Protectorate*, 30 Apr. 1931, p. 147).

[8] I have not noted, for example, that in Uganda and Zanzibar 'Protectorate' was substituted for 'Colony' and 'Shs. 100' and 'fifty rupees' respectively for 'five pounds', and that in Zanzibar

An Ordinance to make provision for taking the Census of Kenya as and when may be required.

1. This Ordinance may be cited as 'the Census Ordinance, 1925'.

2. In this Ordinance the expression 'premises' includes also any vessel *or train*,[1] and any plantation, shamba, *mining area*[1] or other place where persons are employed.

3. The Governor in Council may by Order direct a census to be taken of the inhabitants of the Colony or of any part thereof specified in such Order at such time or times as he may think fit.

4. All expenses incurred, with the approval of the Governor, for the purposes of the census, shall be paid out of the general revenue of the Colony.

5. The Governor may appoint a superintendent of any census directed to be taken.

6. The superintendent shall:—

(1) Subject to the control of the Governor, have the general supervision and management of the census; and

(2) Subject to the approval of the Governor, appoint such enumerators and officers as may be necessary for the purpose of the census and the carrying into effect of this Ordinance.

7. The superintendent shall cause to be prepared and printed, for the use of the persons to be employed in taking the census, such forms and instructions as he may deem necessary, and in particular schedules to be filled up with such particulars as the Governor may consider necessary in order to insure as far as possible the completeness and accuracy of the census returns.

8. The occupier or person in charge of any premises shall fill up, or cause to be filled up, any schedule left at such premises to the best of his knowledge and belief in relation to all persons dwelling or being on the premises at the time when such census is taken, and shall sign his name thereto and shall deliver the schedule so filled up to the enumerator when required to do so: Provided always that when any person required to fill up such schedule is illiterate, such schedule may be filled up and signed by the enumerator.

9. The enumerators and other persons employed in the execution of this Ordinance shall have authority to ask of all persons presumably able to afford the information desired all such questions as may be necessary for obtaining any of the particulars required by this Ordinance, and every person refusing to answer, or knowingly giving a false answer to, any such question shall for every such refusal or false answer be liable to a fine of five pounds.

10. Every enumerator shall make a declaration to the effect that the returns furnished by him in pursuance of this Ordinance, or any instructions issued thereunder have been truly and faithfully taken and that to the best of his knowledge they are correct as far as may be known and such declaration shall be made before a *magistrate*.[2]

11. If any person employed for the purposes of this Ordinance makes wilful default in the performance of any of his duties under this Ordinance or makes any wilfully false declaration he commits an offence and shall be liable for such offence to a fine not exceeding five pounds.

12. Every person who:—

(*a*) Wilfully refuses or without lawful excuse neglects to fill up and sign any schedule of particulars as and when he may be required by the superintendent of the census or any officer acting on his behalf so to do; *or*[3]

'Decree' was substituted for 'Ordinance', and 'British Resident' for 'Governor' and 'Governor in Council'.

[1] Italicized words omitted in Zanzibar.

[2] Uganda, 'magistrate or a chief not below the rank of Gombolola Chief'.

[3] Uganda, italicized word omitted.

(*b*) Wilfully fills up or signs any such schedule with particulars which he knows to be false, or does not believe to be true;[1]

shall be liable[2] to a fine not exceeding five pounds.

13. Upon the completion of any census the superintendent shall prepare a report on the census and cause an abstract of the returns to be made and furnished to the Governor.

14. The Governor in Council may make rules for the carrying out of this Ordinance.

All non-native enumerations and the native counts in Uganda and Zanzibar ascertain the *de facto* population. But the native counts in all mainland Dependencies, except Uganda (and the official estimates for these territories), refer to the resident population, i.e. they attempt to exclude the people temporarily present and to include those temporarily absent. The exclusion of persons temporarily present, which anyway is not carried through thoroughly (those, for example, paying taxes being usually included), does not affect essentially the total population in any of these Dependencies. But the inclusion of those temporarily absent swells considerably the population figures of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, and as many natives considered temporarily absent never return, while others who in fact are only temporarily absent are omitted, changes in the official population figures of Dependencies which are labour-supply areas are particularly difficult to interpret.

II. Total Population

1. *Native Population*

The population figures for all British Dependencies in East Africa are quite uncertain. The partial censuses taken in 1931 covered only 0·5 per cent. of all natives. The counts made in Uganda, Nyasaland, and Zanzibar, and in small areas of Northern Rhodesia and Tanganyika, comprised about two-fifths. For three-fifths of the natives we have nothing but estimates or guesses. I shall briefly characterize the official totals for the various Dependencies, arranging them according to the order of uncertainty of the figures.

The native population of British Somaliland has been 'estimated' in the Blue Books for many years at 344,700. There is no evidence as to how this figure was obtained, and it should, I think, be treated at best as a reasoned guess with a margin of error of +200,000/−100,000.

The figures for Kenya are based on the annual counts of adult males made for taxation purposes, and on the assumption that in general females will constitute 53 per cent. and children 37 per cent. of the total population. The figure given for the end of 1939 is 3,413,371 (as against 3,024,975 at the end of 1934). The basis of the estimates, which have fluctuated very

[1] Uganda added: '(*c*) Being a person employed for the purposes of this Ordinance publishes or communicates to any person, without lawful authority, any information acquired by him in the course of his employment; or

'(*d*) Having possession of any information which to his knowledge has been disclosed in contravention of this Ordinance, publishes or communicates that information to any other person;'

[2] Zanzibar, 'commits an offence and shall be liable for such offence'.

much in the course of the last 25 years, is so uncertain that one can say hardly more than that the population at the end of 1939 was probably between 2,900,000 and 3,700,000.

In the late 1920's the population of Northern Rhodesia was probably better known than that of Kenya, but from 1930 owing to the abolition of the taxation of plural wives the names of women were omitted from the tax registers, fewer villages were visited by the district officers, and after 1934 no attempt was made even to estimate the population. When for the end of 1928 the population was put at 1,261,972 the error was probably not more than ±100,000. Since then population growth has been checked more than in former times by the migration of labourers who remained abroad. The official figures for 1931–4, which oscillated between 1,366,000 and 1,383,000, cannot have been gross understatements, but they may have overstated the population by as much as 200,000. It is likely, but by no means certain, that the population by the end of 1939 was between 1,250,000 and 1,500,000.

The 1931 'census' of Tanganyika was taken by the native authorities 'in accordance with a standard procedure laid down in instructions circulated from the Secretariat'. It seems, however, that a count was made only in exceptional cases. The total obtained, 5,022,640, was, I think, rather an overstatement than an understatement. The actual population probably was somewhere between 4,500,000 and 5,200,000. Subsequent estimates were based on the number of taxpayers, the estimate for the end of 1939 being 5,243,167. The actual figure probably was between 4,600,000 and 5,500,000.

The 1931 'census' of Nyasaland was taken by native enumerators who are said to have made actual counts. But the total of 1,599,888 obtained in 1931 cannot be reconciled with the totals found in 1926 and 1921 (1,290,885 and 1,199,934 respectively), although 'the greatest care was taken to adhere strictly to the methods employed in former censuses', and although 'in many cases the enumerators were the same'. Since the population increase shown for 1926–31 was excessive and since the estimate for the end of 1930, based on tax rolls, showed a population of only 1,392,742, it is unlikely that the census grossly understated the population, but it may have overstated it considerably. The official estimate for the end of 1939 puts the native population at 1,676,600. It probably was between 1,450,000 and 1,800,000. Since about one-quarter of the native men are reported to work abroad, the difference between the 'resident' and the *de facto* population is particularly great in Nyasaland.[1]

The 1931 count in Uganda was made by the native administrations which, on the whole, have probably a closer knowledge of the inhabitants under their control than those of other British Dependencies in East Africa. The total obtained was 3,536,327, and the margin of error, I think, must not be put at more than ±200,000. For the end of 1939 the population

[1] The African count of 1945 showed a *de facto* population of 2,044,707, and in addition 133,306 persons absent abroad. (If these figures come near the truth the native population in earlier years must have been larger than indicated above.)

was estimated at 3,769,758. It probably was between 3,500,000 and 4,050,000.

The 1931 enumeration in Zanzibar was apparently made by actual count, but the schedule adopted for the enumeration proved to be 'not suitable for use in the Protectorate'. The total obtained was 219,867, and the margin of error may have been ±20,000. For 1939 the native population has been estimated at 234,200. It probably was between 210,000 and 260,000.

According to the official estimates, the native population in the British Dependencies in East Africa amounted to about 16,000,000 by the end of 1939. The preceding discussion suggests a margin of error of +1,300,000/−1,900,000. But I do not think that for the area as a whole the margin of error must be put at more than +6/—9 per cent. If this assumption is correct, the total population at the end of 1939 would have been between 14,500,000 and 17,000,000.[1]

2. *Non-Native Population*

Since censuses of non-natives have been taken in every Dependency our knowledge of the number of Europeans and Asiatics should be more accurate than that of the number of natives. But this is probably true only for years in which censuses were taken. The numbers of non-natives living in an African Dependency vary, of course, much more from year to year than the numbers of natives, and the relative margin of error in the intercensal estimates of non-natives may be greater still than in the estimates of natives. But it is impossible to appraise it even approximately.

At the beginning of this century the Europeans in the present area of British East Africa numbered not more than 3,000. Ten years later there were about 10,000, and at the outbreak of the first World War about 15,000. At the end of the war there were rather less, but according to the censuses of 1921 they numbered 18,800 and five years later about 25,000. In the second half of the 1920's their number rose rapidly and reached at the 1931 censuses 43,200. Since then the increase was again slow. The European population may have reached 50,000 before the outbreak of the second World War but dropped thereafter. For 31 December 1939 it was estimated at 48,300.[2]

In Somaliland there are some dozens of male officials, a few with wives, but no European private residents. In Zanzibar there were, at the end of

[1] The most recent official estimates of the native population are as follows:

Kenya	*Uganda*	*Tanganyika*	*N. Rhodesia*	*Nyasaland*
31 Dec. 1944	*31 Dec. 1944*	*31 Dec. 1944*	*1944*	*Spring 1945*
3,825,533	3,926,528	5,437,069	1,544,000	2,178,013

These figures suggest a native 'resident' population of 17,500,000 for the whole of British East Africa at the end of 1944.

[2] Five years later it was possibly smaller, if refugees in camps, internees, and prisoners of war are excluded.

1939, 254 Europeans, only about as many as 35 years ago. The number of non-British has declined very much in the course of time; the number of British has risen, but largely through an increase in the number of officials. In Nyasaland the Europeans increased between 1901 and 1939 from 314 to 1,953, and in Uganda from 244 (1902) to 2,206.[1] In Tanganyika, the largest British Dependency in East Africa—both as regards area and population—the European community had a most chequered career. Under the German régime there were at the beginning of this century about 1,200 Europeans and at the outbreak of the first World War nearly 6,000. Five years later there were no Germans left in the country. According to the 1921 census the European population numbered 2,447 (including 621 officials). It began to increase again essentially after the readmission of Germans in 1925 and amounted in 1931 to 8,228. Owing to a further influx of Germans it rose by another 1,000, but dropped considerably after the outbreak of the second World War.[2] The European population of these five Dependencies was 12,550 according to the 1931 censuses and comprised about 1 per 1,000 of the total population.

In 1904 the Europeans in Northern Rhodesia numbered about 850, and on 1 April 1924, when the Territory came under British administration, about 4,200. After the discovery of rich copper deposits in 1925 the number of Europeans rose rapidly and reached 14,000 by the end of 1930. Owing mainly to the fall in the price of copper it declined thereafter and probably never reached again the level of 1930 until the outbreak of the war. It constitutes about 1 per cent. of the total population.

In Kenya there were about 550 Europeans in 1902. Planned white colonization started in 1903, and although early expectations were not fulfilled,[3] the European population increased more or less steadily. It numbered 16,812 in 1931 and 22,808 at the end of 1939.[4] It constituted about 0·7 per cent. of the total population.

Kenya's share in the total European population was about 15 per cent. at the beginning of this century; it amounted to about 50 per cent. during the first half of the 1920s but, owing to the rapid development in Northern Rhodesia and Tanganyika, dropped below 40 per cent. in 1930–1. In 1939 it again approached 50 per cent. The share of Northern Rhodesia rose

[1] On 29 Apr. 1945 the number of Europeans in Nyasaland was 1,948, and on 31 Dec. 1944 in Uganda 2,553 (excluding 6,144 refugees and 1,070 internees).

[2] On 31 Dec. 1943 there were 7,448 Europeans in Tanganyika (excluding 6,246 refugees and 3,015 evacuees).

[3] See Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire* (1893), vol. i, p. viii: 'The rapid increase of population, the closing of the hitherto available outlets for emigration and for industrial extension, as well as of the markets for our goods, and the sources of supply for our needs, indicate that the time is not far distant when the teeming populations of Europe will turn to the fertile highlands of Africa to seek new fields for expansion. It is possible, therefore, that British Central and British East Africa may be the embryo empires of an epoch already dawning—empires which, in the zenith of their growth and development, may rival those mighty dependencies which are now the pride of the Anglo-Saxon race.' Ten years later Johnston envisaged a European population of 500,000 on the Nandi Plateau in Kenya (see Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. i, pp. 298–9).

[4] On 31 Dec. 1944 the number of Europeans was 23,323 (excluding prisoners of war—in April 1944 54,684).

from about 15 per cent. during the first decade of this century to over 30 per cent. in 1930–1 but was slightly less thereafter. The share of Tanganyika, which had been about 40 per cent. during the first decade of this century, was about 13 per cent. in 1921–5. It amounted to nearly 20 per cent. in 1931 and apparently did not change until the outbreak of the second World War. The total share of the other four Dependencies was about 10 per cent.

The other non-natives are nearly all Asiatics, mainly Indians and Arabs. In 1901, when 20,000 coolies were employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway, the total number of Indians in the present area of British East Africa probably exceeded 40,000. In 1911 it was about 30,000, and in 1921 about 50,000. There was a large immigration in the second half of the 1920s, and according to the 1931 censuses the Indians totalled 92,500. In the last years before the war their number was about 100,000.[1] They were twice as numerous as the Europeans.

The number of Indians is negligible in Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Somaliland. It was also very small in Uganda before the first World War, but increased much in the course of the 1920's. It was 13,000 in 1931, and may have reached 17,000 in 1938–9. In Zanzibar there has been for many decades a comparatively large number of Indians. There were 8,300 in 1910; 12,900 in 1921; 14,200 in 1931; and about as many in 1939. Thirty years ago there were about 9,000 Indians in Tanganyika, and their number was practically the same in 1921. Ten years later there were 23,400; their number apparently did not change until the outbreak of the war. In Kenya the number of Indians has varied greatly in the course of the last 50 years. In 1897 it was hardly 7,000, in 1901 about 27,000, and a few years later possibly again only 7,000. But it rose steadily thereafter, and was nearly 40,000 in 1931, and 45,000 in 1938–9.

In addition to the Indians there were approximately 8,000 Goans[2] in British East Africa.

The figures concerning Arabs are quite uncertain. Their number is negligible in Uganda, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland, and very small also in Somaliland. There may have been in 1939 about 7,000 in Tanganyika, about 15,000 in Kenya, and still more in Zanzibar.

In the mainland Dependencies the total number of non-natives was about 50,000 both in 1901 and 1911, about 78,000 in 1921, about 153,000 in 1931, and about 170,000 in 1938–9.[3] They constituted a little over 1 per cent. of the total population.

[1] The number of Indians and other Asiatics apparently increased very much in the course of the war. The most recent estimates are:
Kenya (31 Dec. 1944) 113,211 Asiatics (74,085 Indians, 6,177 Goans, 32,949 Arabs and Others);
Uganda (31 Dec. 1944) 27,573 Asiatics;
Tanganyika (31 Dec. 1944) 46,558 Asiatics;
Northern Rhodesia (31 Dec. 1943) 819 Asiatics;
Nyasaland (29 Apr. 1945) 2,804 Asiatics.
If these figures can be trusted, the number of Indians in British East Africa may have exceeded 150,000 in 1944.

[2] The Goans are nearly all Roman Catholics of Indian or Portuguese-Indian descent.

[3] Their number may have reached 230,000 in 1944.

3. *Population Density*

'The soil of East Africa is amazingly fertile; the population is small.'[1] But the distribution of the population is extremely uneven. In Northern Rhodesia and in Somaliland there are about 5 inhabitants to the square mile, in Kenya and Tanganyika about 15, in Nyasaland and in Uganda about 45, and in Zanzibar nearly 250. In Kenya 'nearly two-thirds of the total area is inhabited at an average density of less than one to the square mile',[2] but in the three Kikuyu and the three Kavirondo districts, which comprise only 4 per cent. of the total area and about one-half of the total population, there are about 180 inhabitants to the square mile. In Tanganyika again nearly two-thirds of the Territory are entirely uninhabited, and the well-watered parts of the country which cover one-tenth of the total area contain two-thirds of the total population.

III. Composition of the Native Population

Figures concerning the total number of males and females in 1931 have been published for each Dependency. The ratio of females to 100 males was stated to be 133 in Somaliland, 116 in Northern Rhodesia, 113 in Kenya and Nyasaland, 108 in Uganda, 107 in Tanganyika, and 95 in Zanzibar. But the figures for Somaliland and Kenya are mere guesses, and those for some other Dependencies, particularly Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland, are likewise not trustworthy. All that can be said with some degree of certainty is that there is an excess of females in every Dependency except Zanzibar, where the preponderance of males is due to immigration from the mainland.

Data concerning the number of boys, girls, men, and women in 1931 have been published for Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. But even where the natives were actually counted, the distinction between children and adults was evidently made by many enumerators in a most haphazard fashion. Our knowledge of the age composition, therefore, is practically nil.

Figures concerning the conjugal condition in 1931 have been published only for Uganda and Nyasaland. The data for Uganda are of little value as the census returns subdivide the population merely into single persons (including children) and married persons, and as it is impossible to tell to which group were allocated the widowed and those for whom the conjugal condition was not stated. The data for Nyasaland will be analysed in Chapter XII.

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population

The distribution of the non-native population by sex is known for each Dependency, but data concerning birthplace, nationality, age, and conjugal condition are lacking for Zanzibar. The omission is irrelevant for Europeans as more than 99 per cent. live on the mainland, but the gap is

[1] *Report of the East Africa Commission* (1925), p. 53.
[2] *Report of the Kenya Land Commission, September 1933*, p. 350.

serious for Asiatics as they are very numerous in Zanzibar. It should be realized, therefore, that most of the information I am summarizing in this section for Asiatics conveys a picture only of those on the mainland.

Birthplace. The classification of birthplaces is defective in some of the 1931 census reports. In Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika persons born in Egypt were counted as born in a British Possession, while in Kenya all persons born in Palestine, and in Tanganyika Europeans (but not 'Coloured' and 'Others') born in Palestine were counted as born in a Foreign Country. I have re-computed the official figures by allocating Egypt to Foreign Countries and Palestine to British Dependencies.

Of the 42,930 Europeans enumerated in 1931 on the mainland, only 5,901 were born in British East Africa, 9,266 in the Union of South Africa, 954 in Southern Rhodesia, 301 in other British Possessions in Africa, 203 elsewhere in Africa, 17,615 in British Europe, 2,277 in Germany, 3,535 elsewhere in Europe, 1,051 in British Possessions in Asia, 82 elsewhere in Asia, 333 in British America, 494 in the United States, 133 elsewhere in America, and 673 in British Oceania. The proportion of those born in Africa was 39 per cent., while 55 per cent. were born in Europe and 6 per cent. in other continents. Of the Europeans in Uganda only 16 per cent. were born in Africa, of those in Northern Rhodesia, on the other hand, 59 per cent. The proportion of Europeans born in the British Empire was 84 per cent.

Of the 110,000 Asiatics[1] enumerated in 1931 on the mainland, 43,291 were born in British East Africa, 1,052 elsewhere in British Africa, 402 elsewhere in Africa, 50,699 in India, 772 in other British Possessions in Asia, 8,159 in Arabia,[2] 5,123 in Goa, 279 elsewhere in Asia, and 39 in Europe or America. Two-fifths were born in Africa and three-fifths in Asia. The proportion of Asiatics born in the British Empire was 87 per cent.

Nationality. For some Dependencies the collected information has been published in detail, but in others only a few groups have been distinguished. I have summarized the results for 1931 in Tables 2 and 3.

It appears that of the 42,930 Europeans enumerated on the mainland 36,090 or 84 per cent. were British and 6,840 or 16 per cent. foreigners. In Somaliland all Europeans were British. In Tanganyika, on the other hand, only one-half were British, while one-quarter were Germans[3] and one-quarter of another nationality.

The Indians are almost all British subjects while the Goans are nearly all foreigners. In Kenya nearly one-half of the Arabs are British subjects while in Uganda and Tanganyika they are mostly foreigners, the difference being due to the fact that birth in a British Protectorate or Mandated Territory does not necessarily confer British nationality. Of the 110,000 non-European non-natives 88,126 or 80 per cent. were British and 21,874 or 20 per cent. foreigners.

[1] This figure includes a few thousand non-natives who are neither Europeans nor Asiatics.
[2] A number of Arabs actually born in Africa have probably been returned as born in Arabia.
[3] By 1938 the proportion of Germans exceeded one-third.

TABLE 1. *Non-Native Population by Birthplace, British Mainland Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*

Dependency	Africa					Europe			Asia					America				
	British				Foreign	British	Foreign		British		Foreign			British	Foreign	Oceania British	Unknown, at sea	Total
	Dependency itself	Elsewhere E. Africa	Union of S. Africa	Elsewhere			Germany	Elsewhere	India	Elsewhere	Arabia	Goa	Elsewhere					
EUROPEANS																		
Kenya	2,908	117	2,475	174	39	8,507	304	845	561	81	2	1	31	112	228	355	72	16,812
Uganda	131	47	93	32	11	1,167	21	309	64	18	1	2	9	45	26	20	5	2,001
Tanganyika	984	127	632	46	68	2,522	1,828	1,547	135	46	6	1	20	59	132	70	5[1]	8,228
N. Rhodesia	1,291	46[2]	5,776	1,002	74	4,225	114	678	60	31	—	—	9	92	227	203	16	13,846[3]
Nyasaland	226	24[4]	290	1	11	1,138	10	156	39	16	—	—	—	25	14	25	—	1,975
Total	5,540	361	9,266	1,255	203	17,615[5]	2,277	3,535	859	192	9	4	69	333	627	673	110[6]	42,930[7]
ASIATICS AND OTHERS																		
Kenya	21,680	919	44	643	133	1	—	14	25,841	363	4,414	2,898	110	3	1	—	71	57,135
Uganda	3,986	734	5	30	32	—	—	—	9,223	84	255	810	47	2	—	—	58	15,266
Tanganyika	11,794	2,294	19	142	157	7	—	6	13,861	322	2,709	1,351	119	1	1	—	9[8]	32,792
N. Rhodesia	270	13	101	55	9	—	—	—	128	3	—	—	3	3	—	—	16	601
Nyasaland	105	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	1,412	—	—	58	—	—	—	—	11	1,591
Somaliland	1,294	202	—	13	66	—	—	—	234	—	781	6	—	—	—	—	19	2,615
Total	39,129	4,162	169	883	402	8	—	20	50,699	772	8,159	5,123	279	9	2	—	184	110,000

[1] British Possessions not stated.
[2] Includes possibly some other British Possessions in Africa.
[3] Including 2 foreign Possessions in Oceania.
[4] Including Southern Rhodesia.
[5] Including 56 in Somaliland.
[6] Including 12 in Somaliland.
[7] Including 68 in Somaliland.
[8] Including 5 British Possessions not stated.

TABLE 2. *European Population by Nationality, British Mainland Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*

Dependency	British						Foreigners				
	By birth		By naturalization						Total		
	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	'South African Dutch'	Total	German	Others	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	Total
Kenya	14,328	228	52	101	813[1]	15,522	314	976	162	1,128	1,290
Uganda	1,594	31	1	7	12	1,645	18	338	15	341	356
Tanganyika	3,344	85	41	32	582[2]	4,084	2,139	2,005	661	3,483	4,144
N. Rhodesia	12,249		385[3]		394	13,028	78	729	..	..	818[4]
Nyasaland	..	..	..	..	..	1,743	8	224	..	..	232
Somaliland	67	1	—	—	—	68	—	—	—	—	—

[1] Including 1 not born in Empire.
[2] Including 2 not born in Empire.
[3] Including 180 British by Annexation.
[4] Including 6 Hebrew Jewish and 5 Nationality not specified.

TABLE 3. *Non-European Non-Native Population by Nationality, British Mainland Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*

	British						Foreigners			
	By birth			By naturalization						
	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	Not stated	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	Total	Born in Empire	Born elsewhere	Total	Total
KENYA										
Indians	39,530	66	32	--	—	39,628	—	16	16	39,644
Goans	198	8	5	—	—	211	912	2,856	3,768	3,979
Arabs	4,896	590	6	20	72	5,584	2,747	3,835	6,582	12,166
Others	1,152	8	9	2	3	1,174	53	119	172	1,346
UGANDA										
Indians	12,934	13	52	-	—	12,999	—	27	27	13,026
Goans	5	—	—		—	5	304	815	1,119	1,124
Arabs	36	3		—	—	39	214	262	476	515
Unclassified	362	-	1	—	—	363	209	29	238	601
TANGANYIKA										
Indians	23,124	100	—	55	1	23,280	69	73	142	23,422
Goans	6	—	—	3	1	10	415	1,297	1,712	1,722
Arabs	142	70	—	8	10	230	4,183	2,646	6,829	7,059
Others	337	16	—	6	1	360	97	132	229	589
NORTHERN RHODESIA										
Asiatics	..	..	..	..	..	170	..	..	6	176
Coloured	..	..	..	..	..	424[1]	..	..	1	425
NYASALAND										
Asiatics	..	..	..	..	..	1,514	..	..	77	1,591
SOMALILAND										
Indians	512		—	—	—	512	..	..	8	520
Coloured	1,237		—	2		1,239	..	..	405	1,644
Black	384		—	—	—	384	..	..	67	451

[1] Including 8 Nationality not stated.

Sex. Among the Europeans enumerated in 1931 the ratio of females to 100 males was 66. The proportion of females has been increasing in the course of time, but fluctuates considerably in such Dependencies as Northern Rhodesia where in times of prosperity numerous men immigrate who leave the country in times of depression. Among the non-Europeans enumerated in 1931 the ratio of females to 100 males was 56; it is particularly low among the Goans.

TABLE 4. *Non-Native Population by Sex, British Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*

Sex	*Kenya*	*Uganda*	*Tanganyika*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*Nyasaland*	*Somaliland*	*Zanzibar*	*Total*
				EUROPEANS				
Males . .	9,404	1,243	5,226	8,766	1,168	55	183	26,045
Females . .	7,408	758	3,002	5,080	807	13	95	17,163
Females to 100 males . .	79	61	57	58	69	24	52	66
				ASIATICS AND OTHERS				
Males . .	36,747	10,061	20,470	352	1,371	1,537	9,955	80,493
Females . .	20,388	5,205	12,322	249	220	1,078	5,291	44,753
Females to 100 males . .	55	52	60	71	16	70	53	56

Age. The census report for Somaliland distinguishes merely persons under 20, 20 to 40, 40 to 60, and over 60, and, therefore, shows neither the number of children nor the women at child-bearing age. The principal results for the other mainland Dependencies are summarized in Table 5.

TABLE 5. *Non-Native Children, Women at Child-bearing Age, and Old People, British Mainland Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*[1]

Dependency	*Europeans*				*Asiatics and Others*			
	Under 15	*Women 15–49*	*60 and over*	*Total*[2]	*Under 15*	*Women 15–49*	*60 and over*	*Total*[2]
Kenya . .	3,737	4,788	600	16,812	19,361	10,324	1,758	57,135
Uganda . .	233	573	43	2,001	4,986	2,650	164	15,266
Tanganyika .	1,414	2,066	221	8,201	11,707	5,980	868	32,743
N. Rhodesia .	2,945	3,241	356	13,837	230	109	14	585
Nyasaland . .	295	587	46	1,975	185	146	14	1,591
Total . .	8,624	11,255	1,266	42,826	36,469	19,209	2,818	107,320

[1] Excluding Somaliland. [2] Excluding Age not stated.

In 1931 the proportion of children (under 15) among the European population was 20·1 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age (15–49) 26·3 per cent., and the proportion of old people (60 and over) 3·0 per cent. The percentage of children was low, and particularly so in Uganda (11·6) and Nyasaland (14·9) where there are few settlers. The percentage of women at child-bearing age was about the same as in European countries, and as these women are mostly young the composition of

TABLE 6. *Non-Native Adult Population by Conjugal Condition, British Mainland Dependencies in East Africa, 1931*[1]

Dependency	*Males over 15*						*Females over 15*						*Total*
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	
						EUROPEANS							
Kenya . .	3,172	4,115	157	41	16	7,501	1,547	3,627	360	30	10	5,574	13,075
Uganda . .	616	485	15	1	2	1,119	260	369	19	1	—	649	1,768
Tanganyika .	2,385	2,009	75	35	—	4,504	724	1,477	87	16	—	2,304	6,808
N. Rhodesia .	3,403	3,540	194	114	2	7,253	799	2,653	158	33	1	3,644	10,897
Nyasaland .	444	555	16	3	—	1,018	174	463	22	3	—	662	1,680
Total . .	10,020	10,704	457	194	20	21,395	3,504	8,589	646	83	11	12,833	34,228
						ASIATICS AND OTHERS							
Kenya . .	7,480	17,393	765	89	576	26,303	949	9,139	1,117	182	84	11,471	37,774
Uganda . .	2,136	5,073	259	6	48	7,522	94	2,513	148	1	2	2,758	10,280
Tanganyika .	4,800	9,107	480	86	—	14,473	509	5,308	694	79	—	6,590	21,063
N. Rhodesia .	107	129	9	1	—	246	53	67	5	—	—	125	371
Nyasaland .	431	807	17	2	—	1,257	2	144	3	—	—	149	1,406
Total . .	14,954	32,509	1,530	184	624	49,801	1,607	17,171	1,967	262	86	21,093	70,894

[1] Excluding Somaliland.

the population tends to swell the birth-rate. The percentage of old people is very small.

Among the Asiatics (including Others) the proportion of children was 34·0 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age 17·9 per cent., and the proportion of old people 2·6 per cent. The percentage of children is high (except in Nyasaland). The percentage of women at child-bearing age is very low (and particularly so in Nyasaland). The percentage of old people is very small.

Conjugal Condition. The census report for Somaliland does not reveal the distribution of the adult population by conjugal condition. The principal results for the other mainland Dependencies are summarized in Table 6 (p. 107).

Of the male adult Europeans enumerated in 1931, 46·9 per cent. were bachelors, 50·1 per cent. husbands, and 3·0 per cent. widowers or divorced. The percentage of husbands was highest in Kenya (55·0) and lowest in Uganda (43·4). Of the female adult Europeans 27·3 per cent. were spinsters. 67·0 per cent. wives, and 5·7 per cent. widows or divorced. The percentage of wives was highest in Northern Rhodesia (72·8) and lowest in Uganda (56·8). Of the male adult Asiatics (and Others) 30·4 per cent. were bachelors, 66·1 per cent. husbands, and 3·5 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female adult Asiatics only 7·7 per cent. were spinsters, 81·7 per cent. wives, and 10·6 per cent. widows or divorced.

The ratio of the number of wives to 100 husbands was 80 among Europeans (in Kenya 88), and only 53 among Asiatics. The proportion of European husbands whose wives reside in Europe has decreased considerably in the course of time.

European Officials. Officials have constituted for three decades somewhat more than 10 per cent. of the European population. Figures concerning the distribution by quinquennial age-groups have been published from 1930 on. The results are summarized in Table 8. Unfortunately they are not conclusive as the number of officials whose age is 'unknown' is very large and has even increased in recent years.

TABLE 7. *European Officials in British Dependencies in East Africa, 31 December 1910–41*[1]

Year	*Number*	*Year*	*Number*	*Year*	*Number*	*Year*	*Number*	*Year*	*Number*
1910	915	1917	1,357	1924	2,759	1931	5,611[2]	1938	5,393
1911	1,019	1918	1,404	1925	3,155	1932	5,128	1939	5,609
1912	1,135	1919	1,690	1926	3,562	1933	4,786	1940	4,405[4]
1913	1,322	1920	2,401	1927	3,805	1934	4,734	1941	4,380
1914	1,518	1921	2,683	1928	4,589[3]	1935	4,880		
1915	1,496	1922	2,647	1929	5,064	1936	4,938		
1916	1,392	1923	2,674	1930	5,542	1937	5,090		

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1941*, p. 3. The figures include the officials of the Kenya–Uganda Railway.

[2] 'King's African Rifles included with effect from 1931.'

[3] 'Figures for Northern Rhodesia included with effect from 1928.'

[4] 'King's African Rifles and Somaliland Protectorate excluded with effect from 1940.'

TABLE 8. *European Officials by Sex and Age, British Dependencies in East Africa, 1930–41*[1]

Date 1 Jan.	15–19 years		20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
1930	61	34	298	63	776	53	913	83	833	79	698	74	467	32	226	15	119	7	244	38	4,635	478
1931	64	31	340	64	947	53	945	98	917	80	752	66	478	34	256	14	123	9	340	53	5,162	502
1932	48	30	306	66	892	71	914	94	882	98	738	74	497	47	253	16	142	9	355	79	5,027	584
1933	39	23	215	65	758	73	839	82	819	102	740	81	458	52	254	18	80	10	327	83	4,529	589
1934	37	19	144	55	656	66	814	74	808	97	716	66	468	59	245	11	66	5	258	76	4,212	528
1935	33	17	143	59	553	69	838	79	793	79	716	73	508	66	234	19	98	2	291	96	4,207	559
1936	44	25	163	52	512	77	831	71	782	85	754	73	502	58	262	30	124	5	311	119	4,285	595
1937	42	19	175	49	463	75	782	85	777	74	728	73	567	67	268	36	141	3	381	132	4,324	613
1938	46	28	166	45	440	85	763	93	814	71	732	68	615	69	274	34	186	4	428	133	4,464	630
1939	60	26	174	51	436	85	737	107	838	66	759	72	598	70	321	43	206	8	563	171	4,692	699
1940[2]	21	14	154	29	448	52	592	63	765	56	667	40	504	51	250	31	78	3	426	161	3,905	500
1941[2]	22	8	147	32	443	50	550	67	763	53	662	47	523	51	266	30	93	4	440	154	3,909	496

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1. The figures include the officials of the Kenya–Uganda Railway.

[2] Excluding Somaliland.

V. Birth and Death Registration

The Birth and Death Registration Ordinances enacted in the mainland Dependencies provide compulsory registration of European births and deaths; most of them provide also compulsory registration of Asiatic births and deaths but merely optional registration of native births and deaths. In Zanzibar registration is compulsory for all births and deaths. The years in which the British administration introduced compulsory registration in mainland Dependencies were as follows:

Dependency	*Europeans*		*Asiatics*		*Natives*	
	Births	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*
Kenya . . .	1904	1906	1929	1906[1]	—	1906[2]
Uganda . . .	1905	1907	1915	1907	—	—
Tanganyika . .	1917	1917	—	1923	—	—
N. Rhodesia . .	1905[3]	1905[3]	1909[4]	1909[4]	—	—
Nyasaland . . .	1905	1905	1912	1905	—	—
Somaliland . . .	1904	1912	—	—	—	—

[1] Indians; from 1929 on Asiatics.
[2] In townships.
[3] North-Eastern Rhodesia; North-Western Rhodesia 1906.
[4] North-Eastern Rhodesia; North-Western Rhodesia 1914.

In Zanzibar death registration became compulsory for all British subjects and protected persons in 1900, birth and death registration for all subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar in 1904, and birth registration for all British subjects and protected persons in 1909.

The Ordinance for Northern Rhodesia and still more so the Decrees for Zanzibar differ essentially from the Ordinances in force in the other Dependencies. But, leaving out of consideration the somewhat varying scope, the Ordinances of Kenya and Uganda are practically identical and are very similar to those of Nyasaland, Tanganyika, and Somaliland.

Notice of a birth has to be given to the Registrar in each mainland Dependency by (1) the father and mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred, each person present at the birth, and the person having charge of the child. In Zanzibar the persons responsible for notification are (1) the father and mother, or persons having charge of the child; (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred.

The notification has to be made in Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Somaliland within three months, in Zanzibar within seven days. No time limit seems to be prescribed in Kenya.[1]

The birth registration forms in each Dependency ask for date and place of birth; sex; names of parents; occupation of father. The forms in all Dependencies except Zanzibar ask in addition for the name of the child, the forms in all Dependencies except Northern Rhodesia for occupation of mother and nationality of parents, the forms in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika for date of registration, the forms in Uganda, Tanganyika,

[1] The time limit was fixed in 1943 at three months.

Nyasaland, Somaliland, and Zanzibar for residence of parents, the form in Uganda also for time of birth.

Notice of a death has to be given to the Registrar in Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Nyasaland, and Somaliland by (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) each inmate of such house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried. In Northern Rhodesia notice has to be given by (1) every relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier and every inmate of the house in which the death occurred, and any person who has buried or caused to be buried the body. In Zanzibar notice has to be given by the nearest male relative over the age of 18 years resident in the Protectorate, some person present during the last illness of the deceased, or the person or persons conducting the burial or funeral rites.

The notification has to be made in Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Somaliland within one month, in Zanzibar before the burial of the deceased. No time limit seems to be prescribed in Kenya.[1]

The death registration forms in each mainland Dependency ask for date, place, and cause of death; name; age; sex; occupation. The forms in all mainland Dependencies except Northern Rhodesia ask in addition for residence and nationality, the forms in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanganyika for date of registration, the form in Uganda for time of death, and the form in Nyasaland for length of residence in Protectorate. A supplementary form in Northern Rhodesia asks furthermore for birthplace; names of parents; conjugal condition; name of surviving spouse; name or names and approximate date of death of previous spouse or spouses; names of children of deceased and whether of full age or minors; whether deceased left any property, and of what kind; whether deceased left a will. The form in Zanzibar asks for date and cause of death; name; age; sex; occupation of deceased or his family; abode of deceased; duration of residence in district (or town) where death occurred; race or caste; birthplace; duration of disease.

The maximum penalty for failing to notify a birth or death is:

£25 and imprisonment for six months in Kenya;
£10 and imprisonment for one month in Northern Rhodesia;
Shs.200 and imprisonment for one month in Uganda and Tanganyika;
Rs.100 and imprisonment for one month in Somaliland;
Shs.150 and imprisonment for one month in Zanzibar;
£2 in Nyasaland.

Registration of a birth or death (if effected in due time) is free of charge in Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, and Zanzibar. The fee is 2*s.* 6*d.* in Nyasaland and Rs. 2 in Somaliland.

[1] The time limit was fixed in 1943 at one month.

Registration of European births and deaths was made compulsory in all Dependencies many years ago, but it is not enforced everywhere. For Kenya, which comprises nearly one-half of the European population of British East Africa, the annual Blue Books have stated from 1932 on, year in, year out, that 'any data relating to Births and Deaths must be accepted with reserve as the figures shown only represent those Births and Deaths that are recorded and not those actually occurring'. For Northern Rhodesia—to quote only one other example—the birth and death figures are apparently likewise untrustworthy.

Registration of Asiatic births and deaths is compulsory in Kenya, Uganda, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, and Zanzibar, and registration of Asiatic deaths also in Tanganyika. The published figures indicate that registration is incomplete everywhere. For Northern Rhodesia it is even doubtful whether any birth or death has ever been recorded.

Registration of native births and deaths in Zanzibar and registration of native deaths in the townships of Kenya was made compulsory by the British administration more than 30 years ago. The areas in which such compulsory registration has been introduced comprise less than 2 per cent. of the total native population of British East Africa. Moreover, registration is quite incomplete in many districts of the Zanzibar Protectorate, and the provisions in Kenya have remained a dead letter.

I have dealt so far only with registration imposed by the British administration. But East Africa presents the most outstanding example of birth and death registration established by native authorities. As far back as 1904 a law was enacted in the Kingdom of Buganda which introduced compulsory registration of native births and deaths, and similar provisions were made shortly thereafter in four other administrative units. By 1910 the area of compulsory birth and death registration comprised one-half of the population of Uganda. By 1930 the system covered the whole territory of the Protectorate, except Karamoja, and nearly one-quarter of the total native population of East Africa. The Gombolola (sub-county) Chiefs, who number about 600, keep the registers and also tabulate the results. They forward these results each quarter to the Saza (county) Chief who sends them through the District Commissioner to the Director of Medical Services. The latter publishes each year a summary by Districts. The figures show clearly that the records are incomplete in a number of Districts, and the totals, therefore, convey a wrong picture of fertility and mortality in the Protectorate as a whole. But it may well be that registration is strictly enforced in the majority of the Gombololas. Nothing definite can be said in this respect as long as the results are not published by sub-counties or at least by counties. The comments of the Medical Department are not helpful, as for quite a time they have been based on the assumption that the records in general are fairly complete and accurate. Thus, when the returns from the Teso District in 1938 showed an infant mortality rate of 54 (and a lower ratio of stillbirths + infant deaths to total births than in any other country in the world) the

Medical Department concluded that this rate 'compares quite favourably with some European countries' instead of drawing the much more obvious conclusion that the majority of infant deaths had not been reported. Nor did the Department challenge the accuracy of the returns when it appeared that between 1926 and 1938 the infant mortality rate in Bunyoro had dropped from 535 to 62, while that of Chua had risen from 120 to 564! Ten years ago the Medical Department viewed the returns with much more scepticism. The report for 1930 stated:

> It is clearly recognised that the returns are not and will not be accurate for many years to come. The accuracy could be greatly improved by regular scrutiny, gombolola by gombolola, of the quarterly forms in which fallacious returns are often readily noticeable, but it is beyond the capacity of this department at present to undertake this scrutiny. It is felt that by accustoming the chiefs to render returns of Vital Statistics, the task of presenting accurate returns will be made easier at the time at which it becomes possible to undertake regular scrutiny and check.

Any person with some experience in handling statistical returns could have told the Medical Department that this was an illusion and that nothing is so apt to deteriorate the accuracy of returns, no matter whether they are prepared by natives of Uganda or of England, as when the responsible official realizes that forms in which fallacious returns are readily noticeable will not be challenged at headquarters. A scrutiny, district by district, suggests in fact that such a deterioration has occurred in recent years. It would not require more than one competent native official to scrutinize regularly gombolola by gombolola the quarterly forms received by the Medical Department and to send back with queries those in which fallacious returns are readily noticeable. It may well be that even then the returns from some remote areas would remain defective, but it is certain that by untiring pressure many of the Gombolola Chiefs who have so far been neglectful could be compelled to prepare as accurate returns as those who have performed their duties properly.

It should be possible furthermore to apply the Uganda system in the more advanced areas of Kenya, Tanganyika, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland. It is true that in each of these Dependencies local native authorities have been granted the power to prescribe the reporting of births and deaths occurring within their jurisdiction, that only few authorities have made use of this power, and that the results obtained so far are of little value. But this is no proof that a competent person with a long experience of collecting vital statistics, say, in India, and after a thorough study of the registration system in Uganda, would not be able to establish proper native registration on an adequate scale in each of those four East African Dependencies. He may have to spend a year or two in each Dependency, he will need one or two full-time assistants, the initial results will be meagre, and if the scheme were to cover, say, one-third of the 10 or 12 million native inhabitants of these Dependencies, the permanent annual cost (including the expense of checking the returns and of preparing and publishing a thorough report) would probably not be less than £300 per each 100,000 natives, but the apparatus thus established could be used,

without much additional expense, for demographic surveys and in connexion with native censuses.

In Uganda, where current native birth and death registration is considered fairly complete, no attempt has been made to supplement the results thus obtained by other demographic investigations. But in Zanzibar, where registration, particularly of infant deaths, has proved to be a failure, and in the other Dependencies, none of which has established compulsory registration, many devices have been used for obtaining some sort of local vital statistics. I have described in this Survey, as fully as I was able, the method applied in each case, and must confine myself at this place to stating that by far the most numerous investigations were sample studies which consisted in asking a small number of women how many children they had borne and how many of these had died during the first year of life.

VI. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Introduction. In order rightly to appraise the value of opinions on fertility, mortality, and population growth in British East Africa it seems necessary, first of all, to examine briefly the foundations of opinions on these matters in such countries where population and vital statistics are available. In England there is a consensus of opinion regarding the total population increase and also regarding the natural increase, as the census returns and the birth and death records unquestionably show the actual position. There is also a consensus of opinion that fertility and mortality have declined in the course of the last 60 years. But opinions about the size of the decrease vary. The official crude and standardized death-rates which are published every year have convinced many people within and outside the administration that the reduction of mortality has been enormous while the few who base their opinion on the less easily accessible official life tables know that the decline of mortality has been very much smaller. Conversely, the official birth-rates have led many people to underestimate the decline of fertility which can be ascertained only by computing the gross reproduction rate. Prevailing opinion is, of course, still less trustworthy when it is based on investigations made in a remote past. The 1911 census showed beyond any doubt that women of the working class had borne more children than women of the middle and upper classes. Although there is no statistical evidence that this is still true to-day, and although foreign statistics have revealed considerable changes in this respect, prevailing opinion on differential fertility in England is about the same as it was a generation ago. Finally, if we turn to demographic questions which have never been investigated in England on an adequate scale, such as the proportion of children born in the first seven months of marriage (ante-nuptial conceptions),[1] opinions are based exclusively on small sample studies, haphazard impressions, or preconceived ideas. But it should be noted that the expression of any opinion on such a matter would be received here with the utmost scepticism, and if a medical or

[1] These statistics were published for the first time in 1944.

administration officer would say that he found such and such a percentage by questioning two thousand women in such and such a borough and that his results agree with statistics compiled in Denmark or Australia he would be told that this does not prove anything for England as a whole. If he found, for example, that 35 per cent. of the mothers he questioned had had their first child within seven months after marriage, people would rightly say that the proportion for England as a whole might be 10 or 30 or 50 per cent. But for British East Africa opinions on fertility and mortality are based on exactly the same foundations as opinions on the frequency of ante-nuptial conceptions in England, i.e. on small sample studies, haphazard impressions, or preconceived ideas. If there is any difference it works in favour of opinions concerning England, because the medical and administration officers in an English county are more likely to have the advice of an expert in selecting the samples and in formulating the questions, and because they have a more thorough knowledge of the language and the customs of the people. Moreover, the differences between the customs of the various 'tribes' in England are smaller than between the various tribes in most East African Dependencies so that a generalization of the results obtained in England is less risky.

Yet, if a medical or administration officer in East Africa asks two thousand, or, may be, only a few hundred women how many children they have borne, the average obtained is likely to be taken as representing fertility of millions of natives even if the officer, as is usually the case, has made the fundamental mistake of including indiscriminately young and old women. Or, to mention one concrete example, when 2,591 married women questioned in 1922 in the Central Kavirondo District stated that they had borne 7,843 children of whom 3,241 or 413 per 1,000 had died in the first year of life, this rate was taken as representing infant mortality in 1922 not only in Central Kavirondo but in the whole of Kenya, and this although a probably considerable proportion of those infants had died in the nineteenth century.[1] All subsequent investigations in Kenya—they were, it is true, on a smaller scale—showed a much lower infant mortality, but the medical and administration officers questioned by the Kenya Land Commission were all so firmly convinced that infant mortality was excessive that they took the results of that Central Kavirondo investigation as still in 1932 representing conditions in Kenya. This is just one of many examples showing the prestige enjoyed by sample studies which confirm general impressions or support preconceived ideas. That this happens so frequently is neither surprising nor shocking. If the next census in Wales should be taken with the same forms and by about the same number and class of enumerators as the census of 1931, the returns would have to be

[1] The same mistake has been made over and over again in other East African Dependencies. The erratic changes in the official estimates of infant mortality in Zanzibar, for example, which vary for 1934–8 between 100 and nearly 400 per 1,000 live births, are mainly due to the fact that the returns from sample studies, covering in each year at best a few hundred women and showing the mortality of the infants they had borne in the course of their lives, were taken as representing infant mortality in the whole Protectorate for the year in which those women were questioned.

accepted as conclusive even if they showed an age distribution which would be contrary to all expectations. On the other hand, there has not yet been made in East Africa a single sample study on fertility or mortality which, in view of its scale, the method used, and the presumable trustworthiness of the answers, must be accepted as conclusive. It is, therefore, quite natural that when a medical or administration officer is convinced that infant mortality is high he does not distrust the results of a sample study which confirm his opinion, while he will honestly believe that many mothers failed to state the full number of their children who died very young if the returns show a low infant mortality. When, on the other hand, he is convinced that infant mortality, owing to the extension of medical services and child-welfare work, is low, he will be ready to say that the infant deaths include a number of deaths of children over one year if the returns show a high number of infant deaths.

A danger arises that when statistical evidence appears to contradict the generally received results of mere casual observation, the tendency is to brush aside the statistics and continue to accept as finally established facts the impressions of people who have had a long experience of natives. Long experience of natives and trained powers of observation are not inseparable. One hears it said, for instance, that the birthrate must be extraordinarily high because native women always seem to have babies at back and because of the numbers of children seen playing in the villages. It is perhaps forgotten at the moment that native women carry their babies for two or even three years before weaning them, and that children congregated together in play always seem numerous because the majority of the houses to which they belong are out of sight. A similar impression of numbers is given by city children at play in a quiet bye-street, especially in the vicinity of a school.[1]

Long experience of natives and trained powers of observation are indeed not inseparable. Nor are high competence in medical, administrative, or educational matters and a capacity for dealing with demographic questions inseparable. Let me illustrate the latter statement by a few examples:

1. Commissioner Sir Alfred Sharpe included in his *Report on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate for 1903–4* a report by the Acting Principal Medical Officer who said: 'Natives. The majority of births appear to take place about the month of November.'[2]

2. The missionary C. T. Wilson stated in 1878 as regards Buganda: 'Careful observation has established the fact that there are a good many more female births than male.' The doctor and anthropologist R. W. Felkin, in a paper read at the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1886, said: 'Of 500 women who had been captured, 18 only, or 3·6 per cent., appeared to be sterile; and the number of male first births was 79, of female 403. In the subsequent births, however, male and female children born were nearly equal in number, the females being only slightly in excess.' The fairy tale that female very much exceeded male births has since been retold over and over again. As recently as 1921 John Roscoe wrote: 'According to the most reliable information obtainable, the females outnumbered the males; the birth-rate is said to have been two females to

[1] Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Census of 1926*, p. iv.

[2] This was a time when some Europeans considered the natives in other respects also more similar to animals than to white people.

one male . . .', but 'the proportion of males and females among the infants, we are assured, is becoming equalised.'

3. Commissioner Sir Harry Johnston, who probably knew more about Uganda than any of his contemporaries, related in several of his reports and books published at the beginning of this century that the Baganda women were very poor breeders and that a second child was such an unusual occurrence that the wife in consequence thereof was given a new and honorific title and that the father had to announce the birth of a second child by beating a special drum and singing a special song daily for a fortnight at his doorway. What is remarkable is not so much that Sir H. Johnston did not know that all these ceremonies took place only in the case of twins, but that he who for years had so thoroughly and so devotedly studied the life of the Baganda did not once stop to wonder how it came that he found any Baganda at all considering that a second child was such a rare occurrence.[1]

4. The Senior Health Officer of Nyasaland, after having shown the age distribution according to the 1931 count, stated: 'It is therefore a fair deduction to make from the census figures that an enormous wastage of life occurs in the first quinquennial period: of 100 infants born probably not more than 30 survive the first year of life and not more than 10 live to be 6 years old.' He adds that a considerable proportion of the survivors become invalid and succumb to some ailment, but that there was nevertheless a notable excess of births over deaths. The Senior Provincial Commissioner in his capacity as Superintendent of Census incorporated this statement almost literally in his own report. Neither of them realized that if only 10 out of 100 infants born live to be 6 years old, the Nyasaland women, in order to reproduce themselves, would have to bear on an average 10 girls or 20 children even if none of the girls who survive the age of 6 died before the end of the child-bearing period.

In cases like the last one quoted mere common sense shows that the official estimate of child mortality was wrong, either because the census returns were inaccurate or because erroneous conclusions were drawn from those returns. In other cases where the opinion expressed in a public document may be accurate but is in contradiction with the opinion expressed in another public document I have pointed out the position, indicating, if possible, which opinion seems to be the more plausible. But in many cases I could do nothing else but to quote or summarize the official opinion without being able to suggest whether it is right or wrong. At this place I shall try to summarize the situation concerning fertility, mortality, and population growth in British East Africa as a whole.

Fertility. The first British in East Africa, who came at a time when fertility of women in England was high, saw no reason to assume that fertility of native women was higher still and were rather inclined to emphasize the factors which tended to reduce the number of native births.

[1] The reader can easily figure out for himself how rapidly a tribe such as the Baganda, which certainly needed at least four births to each wife in order to maintain itself, would dwindle if the wives (including the barren ones) had on an average only one child.

R. W. Felkin, for example, listed among the 'causes that limit population' polygamy, owing to which 'a large number of the poorer men are unable to marry', and 'separation of husband and wife from the time of her pregnancy until she has weaned her child'. The missionary R. P. Ashe said: 'The practice of taking child wives is common in most African tribes, and this may possibly be one of the causes of the few children which African women bear.' But officials and others who came towards the end of the century, when fertility in England had declined considerably, usually characterized every tribe for which they had no evidence to the contrary as 'prolific', and considered those tribes which gave the impression of having few children as exceptions to the rule. This tendency still prevails to-day among medical and administration officers. The statement by the Superintendent of the 1931 native count in Tanganyika, 'The fecundity of African women is well known', is certainly ill founded; but if he had said that the fertility of African women is generally believed to be great, he would have described the position correctly.

The fact that sample surveys showing a low fertility are usually dealt with as revealing abnormal conditions while surveys showing a high fertility are usually taken as representing normal conditions and are quoted over and over again as evidence that fertility, on the whole, is high, has probably led to an overestimating of fertility in general. It is certain that fertility among the native women in British East Africa is higher than it is in western Europe. On the other hand, that it is lower than it was in eastern Europe around 1900 is certain. But whether it is higher or lower than in England 60 years ago it is impossible to tell. Since, however, there is no conclusive evidence that fertility is extraordinarily high anywhere, while there is conclusive evidence that fertility is low among some important tribes, it seems unlikely that fertility as a whole is higher than it was in England 60 years ago.[1]

General Mortality. The early administrators of East Africa reported that, in the decades preceding the arrival of the British, mortality had been excessive owing to the slave trade, intertribal wars, and famines. They believed that 'normal' mortality was low, that once the British administration became firmly established those three factors would cease to operate, and that mortality, therefore, would soon be favourable. That their expectations have not yet been fulfilled is due to various factors. (1) Those early administrators had overestimated mortality caused by slave-raids and intertribal wars and had underestimated mortality from other causes. (2) The impact of European civilization tended rather to increase than to reduce 'normal' mortality. (3) Some diseases such as sleeping-sickness which apparently were quite unimportant in former times became a terrible scourge at the beginning of this century, while others, such as syphilis, which by the end of the nineteenth century had apparently affected only a small minority of the people, have since undermined the general health of numerous tribes. (4) The enrolment of an excessive number of carriers during the first World War and the influenza

[1] The gross reproduction rate was then about 2·3. In the 1930s it was below 0·9.

epidemic of 1918–19 nearly decimated the population and killed off a particularly large proportion of the fittest men. There has been an improvement in the last two decades as compared with the first three decades of British administration, because events making for an excessive mortality had become less frequent and less formidable, but it is doubtful whether the general standard of health among natives is any better to-day than it was 50 years ago,[1] and there is a consensus of opinion that mortality is high practically everywhere.[2]

Infant Mortality. The first British in East Africa were inclined to think that mortality in early childhood was low. Thus Dr. Felkin related in 1886 concerning the Baganda that 'infant mortality is very slight'. Dr. A. R. Cook of the Church Missionary Society Hospital in Mengo said in 1931:

> When I went out to Africa for the first time in 1896 I shared the opinion of most educated men, that except for tragic happenings like a slave raid, or an occasional famine due to a failure of the annual rains, the average Native child was born and bred up in the naturally healthy surroundings of a Native village, blessed with abundant sunlight, wearing a minimum of clothing, given the maximum of easily obtained food,—on the whole, rather to be envied than pitied when compared with the slum child of our own large cities.[3]

But the early British administrators seem already to have taken for granted that infant mortality was excessive. Sir Harry Johnston, for

[1] See in this connexion, for example, the Report of the Bledisloe Commission (1939):

'The physically sub-normal condition of the majority of the Natives in South Central Africa is unchallengeably traceable to these factors [severance of the Native from the soil of his country] and to the tendency of the impact of Western civilisation and industrialism to disrupt old-established conditions of domestic economy and environment, without their systematic replacement by others of a definitely improved and enduring character.' (Note by the Chairman and Mr. P. Ashley Cooper, p. 246.)

'Far-reaching changes have taken place during the past 30 or 40 years, changes which have deprived the natives of customary and valuable food items. Game is not available as once it was, and tribes that at one time maintained large herds of cattle are no longer able to do so. Tsetse fly and animal disease have destroyed herds over wide areas and have impoverished the natives and contributed to their marked physical deterioration.' (Note by Mr. W. H. Mainwaring, *ibid.*, p. 255.)

See, furthermore, Joint East African Board, *Memorandum on Post-War Problems in East Africa* (1943), p. 14:

'The greatest contribution which the Administration can make to the native tribes of Africa lies in the improvement of health through the elimination as far as possible of the more virulent tropical diseases. Malaria, blackwater fever, hookworm, bilharzia, yaws, leprosy, sleeping sickness and venereal diseases are endemic. They lower the vitality to such a degree that it has been estimated that one half of the efficiency of the native population is lost. This, in some degree, applies to the European and Asiatic populations.

'Poor diet, bad housing, insufficient clothes, and insanitary habits all contribute to ill health and much could be done by the Administration to improve conditions. Success in this sphere would be a first step towards maintaining a higher standard of living. Medical care is still very backward, and it could be strongly fortified by certain reforms, which are earnestly desired by all races.

'The Joint Board is doubtful whether in Africa malaria has been so successfully controlled as in Panama, Singapore, Bombay, or many other towns that could be mentioned, work in some of which was completed about a quarter of a century ago. It is equally open to doubt whether, by comparison, malaria control in East Africa has more than begun.'

[2] It is impossible, of course, to estimate mortality in British East Africa, but it is, I think, safe to assume that the mean expectation of life at birth does not exceed 35 years. (It was, for example, 32 years in Austria 1866–80, and in European Russia 1896–7, 34 years among Negroes in the United States 1901–10, 35 years in Italy 1876–87, and 37 years in Germany 1871–81. It was officially stated to be 27 years in India 1931, but the basic data there are quite uncertain.)

[3] Cook, *Still-birth and Infant Mortality*, p. 3.

example, said in 1902 of the Baganda: 'There is, of course, an enormous death-rate among the children, who are very badly looked after by their mothers'; and of the Basoga: 'Among the peasants infant mortality is terrible, it is rare that a peasant woman succeeds in rearing more than one child.' Such obviously exaggerated statements have been made over and over again in the various Dependencies. For Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland the infant mortality rate has been officially estimated at 700 per 1,000, and estimates of something like 400 are quite common still to-day. There has been a change of opinion in recent years in Uganda and Northern Rhodesia, but elsewhere it is still generally believed that infant mortality is excessive. It is noteworthy, however, that the available material contains few data to support this view.

Population Growth. There is a general impression to-day that the estimates made in the nineteenth century grossly overstated the population in British East Africa. I do not think that this impression is correct. Some estimates, such as those by Wilson and Lugard, were certainly wide overstatements, but Stanley, Ashe, Portal, and others probably came near the truth and even possibly underestimated the number of natives. However, the overstatements enjoyed a greater publicity because by the end of the nineteenth century there was a consensus of opinion that the population had decreased enormously in the period preceding the establishment of British administration, and the earlier estimates which exaggerated the size of the population were quoted as evidence of such a decline.[1]

One reason why people believed that the population had decreased was that the number of natives actually was not large. When they found a population density similar to the one prevailing in those areas to-day, they considered such sparse settlement quite abnormal and concluded that these regions had become depopulated. Depopulation, moreover, fitted very well in the general picture they had of conditions in those countries. Men like Sir Charles Eliot, who in the early years of this century declared that 'modern East Africa is the greatest philanthropic achievement of the later nineteenth century' because 'it is only ten or fifteen years ago that slave traders raided the whole country and took about two-thirds of the children as slaves'; men like Ainsworth, who said of Ukamba that 'the country was inhabited by tribes whose everyday occupation had been for generations one of raiding and killing one another and enslaving and selling women and youths', had no difficulty in believing that the population had dwindled prior to the abolition of the slave-trade and the establishment of the Pax Britannica. But with our present, better knowledge of native agriculture and native habits in general we have no reason to assume that population density was at any time much higher than in 1900 (or in 1940), and while our knowledge of the demographic effects of the slave-trade and intertribal wars is still most imperfect, we are less inclined to lose all sense

[1] See, for example, Sir Harry Johnston: 'The Kingdom of Uganda in the time of Mutesa, though then of smaller extent politically than at the present day, probably numbered 4,000,000 people. In 1901 I was not able to estimate the population at much over 1,000,000.' Stanley had estimated the population in the time of Mutesa at 750,000.

of proportion in dealing with these topics which are now no longer 'problems'.

As regards slave-raids it should be realized first of all that there was 'in East Africa comparatively little internal slavery among the purely savage tribes' (Lugard), and that in so far as the slaves remained in the country their capture probably did not reduce essentially either their expectation of life or their chances of reproduction. Slave-trade for exportation, on the other hand, reduced the population of the country no matter whether the captured natives survived the march to the coast or not. But slave-trade for exportation, if related to the total number of natives in British East Africa, seems to have been small. This appears even from documents which emphasize the 'enormous proportions' of the slave-trade.

> The Traffic on the East Coast has increased in an alarming manner. We knew nothing of it until the revelations of explorers in the middle of this century. But we are assured that the whole of the East Coast Traffic, which was not very brisk in the last century, has since then grown into its present enormous proportions. For a long time the Eastern Traffic was slight; the Arabs were content to wait for the arrival of caravans on the Coast; but at the present day it is more extensive than any other in Africa. It has been variously estimated that from 20,000 to 40,000 slaves annually reach the Coast, where a certain number are retained as domestic and agricultural servants; the remainder are exported in dhows to the islands of Pemba (5000 to 6000 annually), Zanzibar, Madagascar, Comoro, Réunion, and to the Persian Gulf. The death-rate of slaves marched to the East Coast is estimated at one in ten.[1]

A very large number of these slaves came from German and not British East Africa,[2] and some came from the Belgian Congo. But even if for some time as many as 20,000 slaves had been exported annually from the area which in 1900 constituted the mainland Dependencies of British East Africa,[3] this would not have meant more than 2 per 1,000 of the total native population. The export of slaves from East Africa rightly attracted enormous attention because it began to flourish when the slave-trade from West Africa had been nearly exterminated, but this should not make us lose sight of the fact that the traffic from East Africa, except for a few decades, was numerically absolutely irrelevant, that even at its worst it was smaller than it had been from West Africa for fully two centuries, and

[1] White, *The Development of Africa* (1890), pp. 169–70.

[2] Dundas, for example, says that in German East Africa 'slave-raiding by Arabs and others was conducted on a much more extensive scale than in British East Africa' ('Native Laws of Some Bantu Tribes in East Africa', p. 263).

[3] Data concerning the numbers of slaves exported are very scanty. Felkin stated in 1886 that 'about 1,000 slaves are exported annually from Uganda' ('Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 746). Mackay, who had warned the King of Uganda that his 'country was being depopulated by the exportation of children and women', estimated in 1889 that every year some 2,000 slaves were purchased by Arab traders in Uganda for transportation to the coast and probably an equal number from Unyoro (see Mackay, pp. 432–5). Commissioner Johnston reported in 1894: 'I should say that possibly, before my Administration took active steps to stop the Slave Trade, at least 2,500 slaves were exported annually from the eastern half of British Central Africa', i.e. from Nyasaland and North-Eastern Rhodesia (*Report of the First Three Years' Administration of the Eastern Portion of British Central Africa*, p. 25). Exports from Kenya were certainly less important than from Nyasaland and Uganda. If, therefore, the above estimates are not understatements it seems out of the question that as many as 20,000 slaves were exported annually from British East Africa.

that it is therefore a gross exaggeration to say that it caused depopulation in British East Africa.

As regards intertribal wars the reports of Lugard, Portal, Eliot, Johnston, Ainsworth, and others which convey the impression that in East Africa 'every tribe was at war with its neighbours' (Eliot) and that whole tribes were *constantly* fighting each other are certainly exaggerated. Times of peace alternated with times of war as everywhere else in the world. The object of these 'wars' was usually plunder, the stealing of cattle and women; the numbers of warriors engaged in those raids were seldom large, and the casualties as a rule were not very heavy.[1] There is no doubt that intertribal warfare caused an enormous amount of distress, it may even be that for East Africa as a whole as many as 5 per cent. of all deaths were due to such warfare, and there is no doubt that the establishment of the Pax Britannica was a boon to the natives, but if there was a depopulation of the country in the decades preceding British administration intertribal warfare cannot have been one of the main causes.

An unbiased appraisal, therefore, leads to the following conclusions. There is no evidence that population decreased essentially in the decades preceding the advent of the British. But mortality was no doubt high owing to famines, epidemics (small-pox), unsanitary conditions, and intertribal wars, and since there is no reason to assume that fertility was very high or that immigration notably exceeded emigration, it is quite possible that the population did not hold its own.

After having stated that the whole Protectorate of Uganda had in 1900 at best as many inhabitants (4,000,000) as its nucleus the small kingdom of Uganda had 25 years earlier, Sir Harry Johnston said:

> The lands of the Protectorate—exceptionally fertile as they are, and well watered by innumerable streams, lakes, and lakelets—should easily support a native population of 20,000,000. The increase in times of peace and plenty goes on so rapidly that, unless any rude check occurs to the prosperity of Uganda, we may look to see, I believe, an extraordinary development of the native population under British rule.

Sir Charles Eliot reported likewise that since the abolition of slavery and intertribal wars the population in the East Africa Protectorate had increased considerably, and Ainsworth related that the Kikuyu and

[1] The more bellicose tribes, such as the Masai, quite naturally, got more publicity than the more peaceful ones, but the vast literature on the Masai contains, so far as I am aware, no attempt to appraise their position numerically. Lugard tells us that 'in East Africa the population is restricted to certain areas, mainly through tribal wars and Masai raids', that the Wakamba 'are at constant war with the Masai', and that the Kikuyu 'are at constant war with the Masai' (*The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, pp. 283, 327, 487–8). The total number of Masai now living in Kenya and Tanganyika seems to be approximately 80,000. Before the cattle plagues and famines of 1884 and 1890–1 which apparently reduced their numbers to something like 150,000 or 100,000 there may have been as many as 400,000 or 500,000 scattered over an enormous territory. Their warriors were the young bachelors; they lived with their girl-friends (in many cases at a month's walking distance from the nearest Wakamba or Kikuyu), and they ceased to be warriors when they married, which they were not allowed to do until they had been on several raids. There were probably never more than 50,000 warriors at the utmost, and the number who took part in a raid probably seldom exceeded 500. The Masai, though they constituted only about 3 per cent. of the total native population, were a terrible nuisance, but they had not the power to restrict the population in East Africa to certain areas.

Wakamba had a yearly natural increase of 4 per cent.! During the first decade of this century the official population estimates rose, and when computations of the native population made in connexion with the 1911 non-native censuses yielded much smaller figures, it was argued that either the earlier estimates had been too high or the 1911 returns too low. But I do not think that any of those figures permit the drawing of final conclusions. There can, however, be no doubt that the population in 1895–1920 was decreasing. From 1895 to 1910 famines and smallpox probably claimed as many victims as ever, and the beneficial effects of the abolition of intertribal warfare were more than offset by the devastating effects of sleeping-sickness and other new diseases, the spread of syphilis, and the disintegration of tribal life. The progress which was achieved in the early years of the second decade of this century by administrative and sanitary measures, in particular against smallpox and famines, was more than offset by 'war, pestilence, and famine' in 1916–19. As regards the years 1921–39 the position is somewhat puzzling. The extension of medical and sanitary services and above all the fact that no great famine, no great epidemic, and no great war occurred in this period tended to improve the situation considerably. Most official reports say that the natural increase was great and some indicate that it was enormous. But while such statements are frequently supported by quoting the returns from tax rolls and other 'censuses' no one has ventured to explain how this natural increase came about.[1] I have mentioned already the example of Nyasaland, where the quinquennial natural increase was computed at 8 per cent. in spite of a mortality rate in early childhood of 900 per 1,000! But let us consider a less absurd case. The Kenya Land Commission (1933) rightly said: 'All the evidence before us points to a high rate of increase among the native population.' All the 'evidence' before them indicated indeed a yearly natural increase of at least 1·5 per cent.[2] but it indicated also that one-half of the children died in the first two years of life. The death-rate of adult males which was formerly estimated at 20 per 1,000 is now believed to be rather 35 per 1,000. Let us assume that the birth-rate is enormous, let us assume it is 50 per 1,000. If 500 per 1,000 of the newly born die before the age of 2, these deaths would constitute about 25 per 1,000 of the population; if the death-rate of those over 2 is 20 per 1,000, their deaths would constitute about 19 per 1,000 of the population. We would thus obtain a death-rate of 44 per 1,000 and a natural increase of 0·6 per cent.

[1] It may be mentioned incidentally that the same is true of some statements concerning the natural increase of the non-native population. From 1932 on the Annual Colonial Reports for Kenya have stated, year in, year out, that the official population estimates 'are based on an assumed natural increase of 6 per cent. per annum for Europeans and 10 per cent. per annum for Asiatics', but they have never explained how this natural increase came about. (An explanation is, of course, not possible because the assumptions are perfectly fantastic. Even if not a single Asiatic died, a natural increase of 10 per cent. per annum would presuppose a yearly birth-rate of 100.)

[2] The 'evidence' before the Kenya Development Committee (1946) suggested an even larger natural increase! 'Some authorities state that the yearly population increase can be taken as two per cent, but figures obtainable from some districts suggest that this is too low for the African population of Kenya. For the purpose of this [development] plan it has therefore been assumed to be 2½ per cent.' (*Report*, vol. i, p. 44.)

If we raise the birth-rate to 60 per 1,000, the death-rate would rise to about 49 per 1,000, and the natural increase to 1·1 per cent. It is obvious, therefore, that either the natural increase must have been smaller than 1·5 per cent., or mortality in the first two years of life lower than 500 per 1,000, or (which is quite unlikely) the death-rate of those over two lower than 20 per 1,000. In England and Wales fertility was highest in the 1870s. The net reproduction rate then was 1·5 which indicates a yearly natural increase of about 1·5 per cent. in the 'stable' population, and this was also approximately the actual natural increase at that time. But in the 1870s not fewer than 725 out of 1,000 newly born girls reached the age of 15. If 500 per 1,000 had died before reaching the age of 2, the population would have decreased even if mortality over two had been as low as it was.

The yearly natural increase in East Africa cannot possibly be anything like 1·5 per cent. if mortality is as high as it is generally believed to be, even if fertility should be very high. It could, of course, be 1·5 per cent. if mortality were favourable, particularly in early childhood, but there will be, I suppose, a consensus of opinion that this possibility has to be ruled out. It could also be 1·5 per cent. with a moderately high mortality and an enormous fertility, but this would presuppose among other things that all the data indicating a low fertility among some important tribes are wrong. A simple solution would be to accept the general opinion that mortality is very high, to assume that fertility is high (but not higher than in England sixty years ago), and to conclude that deaths have been at least as numerous as births. But I do not think that one need go as far as that. I am inclined to believe that there was a small natural increase amounting to something like, say, 0·5 per cent. yearly and that mortality was lower than is usually believed. In view of the unanimous opinion of local experts concerning the prevalence of malnutrition, the spread of syphilis and other diseases, and the unsanitary conditions under which practically all natives live, I dare not venture to suggest that official opinion on mortality above the age of 2 is exaggerated. But in view of the fact that infant mortality has been greatly overestimated in some cases, I am inclined to think that it has been overstated somewhat in other cases, and that as a whole it may not exceed 250 per 1,000 in the first year or 300 per 1,000 in the first two years. But I do not claim that all this is more than a reasoned guess.[1]

When for an article in the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* I had to summarize the demographic position of Europe in earlier times I said: 'Practically nothing is known of the trend of the total population of Europe prior to the eighteenth century; there is no reason to assume that the population in 1700 was any larger than in 1600 or that the population in 1600 was much larger than in 1300.' If one wanted to summarize the demographic position of British East Africa in recent times all that one

[1] In view of the lack of any data concerning the age composition of the native population any suggestion as to what might be the birth- and death-rate would be nothing but a wild guess. But it may help the reader if I say that a natural increase of 0·5 per cent. with a mortality of 300 per 1,000 in the first two years and a high mortality over two may coincide with a gross reproduction rate of 2·3 and a mean expectation of life at birth of 35 years.

could say would be: Practically nothing is known of the population trend in any of the seven Dependencies or in the whole of British East Africa; there is no reason to assume that the total population in 1940 was any larger than in 1895 or that the total population in 1895 was much smaller than in 1875.

VII. Non-native Birth and Death Statistics

The vital statistics for Europeans are in a chaotic state. In Kenya no data have been published for 1925–8, and the figures for all subsequent years are very incomplete. In Uganda, where apparently complete statistics were published until 1914, no birth data are available for 1914–31, 1933–5, and 1939, and no death data for 1914–18 and 1924–8. In Tanganyika no birth figures covering the whole Territory have been published since 1923, and for recent years not even birth data for single districts have been made available. In Northern Rhodesia the Medical Department doubts the completeness of birth registration, and the death figures are suspiciously low. In Zanzibar no separate data are given for Europeans. Our knowledge of fertility and mortality of the general European population in the British Dependencies in East Africa is therefore practically nil.

Mortality of European officials has been low since 1919.

Table 9. *Deaths and Death-rates of European Officials in British Dependencies in East Africa, 1910–41.*[1]

Year	*Deaths*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Death-rate*
1910	14	14·9	1918	14	10·3	1926	19	5·6	1934	16	3·4
1911	13	13·4	1919	16	10·3	1927	23	6·2	1935	19	3·9
1912	10	9·4	1920	15	6·8	1928	30	6·8	1936	24	4·9
1913	10	8·1	1921	13	5·6	1929	24	5·0	1937	22	4·4
1914	10	6·9	1922	19	7·1	1930	23	4·3	1938	21	4·0
1915	12	8·0	1923	16	6·0	1931	24	4·2	1939	16	2·9
1916	13	9·2	1924	11	4·1	1932	16	3·0	1940	22	5·0
1917	17	12·5	1925	20	6·7	1933	18	3·6	1941	12	2·7

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1941*, p. 3. Deaths exclude direct war casualties in 1914–18 and 1940–1. The totals in this table do not agree with the figures given in the Medical Reports of the various Dependencies, the main reason probably being that deaths occurring on leave or under other such circumstances are dealt with differently. See also footnotes to Table 7.

The available vital statistics for Asiatics are more scanty and more defective still than those for Europeans.

CHAPTER VIII

KENYA[1]

I. CENSUS-TAKING

1. *Censuses taken so far*

No census of the whole population has as yet been taken. All censuses effected prior to 1931 comprised only the non-native population, while the census of 1931 included also a small fraction of the native population.

The census of 24 April 1921 was authorized by an enabling Ordinance *ad hoc*.[2] But in 1925 there was enacted a general Census Ordinance[3] under which censuses have been taken on 21 February 1926 and on 6 March 1931. The census of 1931 was authorized by the following Order made on 11 October 1930:[4]

> In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by section 3 of the Census Ordinance, 1925, His Excellency the Acting Governor in Council has been pleased to direct that during the month of March, 1931, a census shall be taken—
>
> (*a*) of all the non-native inhabitants of the Colony;
> (*b*) of all persons residing within the jurisdiction of the Municipality of Nairobi; and
> (*c*) of all persons residing within the jurisdiction of the Municipal Board of Mombasa.

The Statistical Department of the Conference of East African Governors was entrusted with the general organization work, and in pursuance of section 5 of the Census Ordinance the Statistician of the Conference was appointed Superintendent of Census on 14 October 1930.[5]

The scope of the census was finally somewhat extended beyond that envisaged by the Order of 11 October 1930.

Although it was considered impracticable to take a complete census of the population, both native and non-native, it was decided to enumerate all persons in the towns of Nairobi and Mombasa on the night of the census, and, as a record of natives working for non-native employers, to enumerate as many natives as possible residing on non-native premises and farms.

The latter decision was taken in order to secure particulars of at least a small sample of the native population, the details of which could be controlled by an educated section of the community. In this way, particulars of 8,345 natives were secured, exclusive of the 62,103 enumerated in the two towns, making a total of

[1] 'Kenya Colony and Protectorate', previously known as the East Africa Protectorate, consists of the Kenya Protectorate, a strip extending 10 miles inland along the coast (the mainland dominions of the Sultan of Zanzibar), and the Kenya Colony which comprises all the rest of the Dependency. As in *An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire*, the word 'Colony' will be used here to describe the whole territory and not only the Colony proper.

[2] No. 8 of 1921 (15 Feb.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Kenya 1921*, pp. 8–10, and in *Census Report 1921*, pp. 11–12. 'No legislation was adopted in 1911 to make compulsory the rendering of the information required, which, especially as regards Asiatics, was not extensive' (ibid., p. 1).

[3] No. 31 of 1925, reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1925*, pp. 133–5, and in *Census Report 1926*, pp. 163–4. The text of this Ordinance is given pp. 96–7 above.

[4] Government Notice No. 592, *Official Gazette of Kenya*, 21 Oct. 1930, p. 2547.

[5] See Government Notice No. 593, ibid.

70,448 natives enumerated. Tables showing the result of this native enumeration are not included in this report, which deals solely with the non-native population. The results of the native enumeration will be the subject of a separate memoir of the Statistical Department of the Governors' Conference.[1]

The schedule adopted for the non-native census showed the following main heads of enumeration: Relationship to head of family; Sex; Age; Civil condition; Birthplace; Nationality or race; Religion; Education (of juniors); Occupation and nature of employment; Place of permanent residence; Years of residence.[2]

The same form as that used for the non-native census was used for the enumeration of natives residing in the towns or employed on European premises. For the town natives, the enumerators were instructed to omit the names and concentrate on the following items of information: Age last birthday; Sex; Race; Tribe; Religion; Occupation.

A special house schedule was drawn up for use in preliminary house-to-house work. But this preliminary enumeration was effected only in the towns of Nairobi and Mombasa. The main heads of information collected in Nairobi were: Name of occupier; Whether tenant or owner; Material in which building is constructed; Number of rooms; Rent paid by tenant; Particulars of outhouses; Number of persons living on premises; Use to which building is put. The Mombasa schedule differed in some respects from that used in Nairobi, as the Sanitary Authorities in Mombasa desired to secure certain specific details in the native areas of the town.[3]

The census reports discuss the accuracy of the enumeration mainly in so far as Arabs are concerned. I shall discuss this special question in Section IV of this chapter. The author of the 1926 report made the following general comment on the completeness of the non-native census:

> Some complaints of omissions were made, but on investigation they were proved to have been frivolous and merely instances, now happily rare, of that lack of co-operation which makes it so difficult for an understaffed Administration to cope with its manifold duties. I accept the assurance of the District Commissioners that the returns are complete, and I am confident that they have carried out this work thoroughly and accurately and that all good citizens of every race have done their utmost to help them.[4]

All compilation work for the 1931 census was performed on Hollerith machines.[5]

The cost of the census was given as £2,323 1 sh. 68 cts.,[6] or £16. 1*s*. 9*d*. per 1,000 enumerated persons.[7]

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 1. This memoir has apparently not been prepared.
[2] See ibid., p. 1. [3] See ibid., p. 2.
[4] Ibid. *1926*, p. 3. It should be noted, however, that at least in Mombasa and in one other district the method of taking the census was rather unsafe. 'In Mombasa the difficulties were regarded as so great owing to the number of illiterates that the delivery of schedules to each householder was not attempted. The Resident Commissioner decided to work through the heads of the different communities, who made themselves responsible for the enumeration of their people'. (Ibid., p. 6.) 'In one settled district owing to the shortage of staff and the difficulty in obtaining enumerators all the schedules were sent out by post with franked envelopes for their return' (ibid., p. 7).
[5] See ibid. *1931*, pp. 3–4. [6] *Financial Report and Statement 1931*, p. 54.
[7] The persons enumerated were 144,395 (73,947 non-natives and 70,448 natives).

2. *The Problem of Native Censuses*

As regards the question of taking a native census the Superintendent of the 1921 non-native census said:

> It was decided by the local Government that a census of natives in Kenya Colony was impracticable at the present time . . .[1]

Four years later, on 14 August 1925, Lord Delamere, who then was an Elected Member of the Legislative Council, moved 'That this Honourable Council is of opinion that a General Census should be taken on the first of February, 1926'.[2]

The census was to cover the whole population, i.e. (1) Europeans, (2) Asiatics, (3) Natives. Part of the debate was devoted to the question whether the card index currently prepared under the Native Registration Ordinance, which made compulsory the registration of each native male over 16 years, or the annual hut tax rolls did not supply as accurate data as could be obtained through a general census. I shall give here a brief extract of the discussion in so far as it refers to the taking of a census of natives.

> Rt. Hon. Lord Delamere: . . . I think everybody who has lived a great many years in this country will be of the opinion that any statistics of the sort which have been taken in the past cannot be taken as accurate in any degree at all, and my own opinion is that it is the same in all these East African countries. I do not see how it can be otherwise. It simply so happens that in this country we have never taken any census of the native population, and we do not pretend that the statistics of the number of natives are accurate . . . . We have one great advantage in this country, and that is native registration. After all, it does start in the case of most of the tribes from a point where you can accurately know, under the Registration Law, the number of adult males in each Reserve. It may not be correct to the last unit, but if we took trial counts in the different Reserves of the proportions of men, women and children, it ought to give us, even if we are unable to count all the people, something on a basis which can be taken as comparatively accurate, and enable us to compare the figures with a future census.[3]
>
> Hon. Acting Colonial Secretary: Your Excellency, I wish to take an early opportunity in the debate to welcome this motion on behalf of Government . . . . I hope we shall hear from the Honourable Acting Chief Native Commissioner his views with regard to the census of natives. The Right Honourable Member has made an extremely interesting suggestion in regard to the registration law, but I do not know how it will work out, as there is a large number of the population not registered. I am not convinced myself that an actual census will not be possible in certain areas. We have not a high number of educated natives to help take a census. It will be worth while to try it though in the Kikuyu and Kavirondo and other large reserves . . . . It may be necessary perhaps to take a double check of the natives, as the figures based on the 1921 census were arrived at by a multiplication of some mystic number by the huts in the reserves, but that will be only for the purpose of checking, and that should not be the main basis of the census.[4]
>
> Hon. T. J. O'Shea [European Elected Member]: . . . What we want to get down to are the facts. Statistics are being sent out from this country which purport to be statements of facts when they are not facts. They are a complete misrepresentation of facts. May I say it has not been emphasised that the cost of taking the census will be as a flea-bite compared with the advantages to the country of having reliable

[1] *Census Report 1921*, p. 1.
[2] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, p. 520.
[3] Ibid., p. 522.
[4] Ibid., pp. 522–3.

statistics. Time after time we are up against a lack of accurate information. The compiling of statistics will probably be a big item, but it will enable this Council to get on with its work better. . . .

As regards the third aspect—the census of the natives. It is the most important of the lot. . . .[1]

His Excellency [the Governor]: I should like to say, with regard to the motion before the House, that it is one that particularly appeals to Government, and is one that I think we can give every possible support to. . . .[2]

Hon. Acting Chief Native Commissioner: I have listened with great interest to the arguments put forward by Honourable Members, but there is one point which I should like to direct attention to, which has not been touched upon so far as I can see. I think we are all agreed that accurate figures are necessary for all sorts of purposes in our lives, but we have all rather leapt to the conclusion that the only way to get those figures is by a census. I am not quite certain whether that is the only way of getting those figures, or that it is the most accurate way of getting them. We have set to the world in general an example of a new form of legislation by introducing our Registration Ordinance—the registration of natives. That enforces the registration of natives only, but I should very much have liked to have seen the registration of other races in this country as well—even if it would only be once in a man's life he should take out a registration paper. . . . I do think—I am not saying anything against the census; it may give you a good kicking-off point—that probably in the long run it would be cheaper to get down to some system of registration by which you have a continual census, as it were, than to have a rather expensive census every five years, which in twelve months' time is somewhat out of date.

With regard to this census which is contemplated, I should be failing in my duty to the House if I did not say right off that it could not be a complete, exhaustive or accurate census. There are certain areas in this Colony—the Northern Frontier District, for instance—in which it would probably not be possible to carry it out without armed intervention. In a great many of the native reserves there is still that ancient Semitic superstition which abounds in all countries in which the Semites have ever played a ruling part, that if you number the people at all a plague will follow and wipe them out! . . .

On all these points regarding the possibility of a census at all I should like more time to consult the Senior Commissioners. One is not in as close touch in Nairobi as one would like to be with various matters in the country, but in certain areas I think it might be possible to do this; in others I think quite definitely it would not be possible. However, in all the areas we have figures of that kind in connection with the collection of hut tax, which I believe are as accurate as any you will get by a census at this stage, and I think you should really consider taking advice on the point as to whether it is worth your while spending money to get more accurate figures than you have got already.[3]

Hon. Dr. J. W. Arthur [Nominated Unofficial Member to represent the interests of the African Community]: . . . I agree with the Honourable Chief Native Commissioner that it will be impossible to take accurately the native population in certain Reserves by a census of this kind. On the other hand, I think it would be quite possible to take a census among some of the tribes here—and those are the larger tribes in this country. I think it would be an excellent thing to take this census because, after all, I think it would be a check on the statistics which have already been got out, and will also enable a comparison to be made. I am convinced that in any census taken of this kind the Government can rely on any help from the Missionary bodies that it is possible for them to give, and I think the Missions could help very considerably in this respect. We have a very large number of native teachers to-day, who, with careful instruction, would I think be quite capable of taking very complete statistics in certain reserves, and I may say that the Missions would gladly co-operate with the Government in a measure of this kind.

[1] Ibid., pp. 524–5. [2] Ibid., p. 530. [3] Ibid., pp. 531–2.

. . . I think it is very important that if a census is to be taken in the native reserves it should be taken some time when the moon is full, in order that the natives may know about it; but frankly I do not think that one day would be enough for an accurate calculation to be made. I think there would be more satisfaction among the native peoples if a week, say, were given, to make the calculation as accurate as possible.

I do very strongly support this Motion, as I think it is extremely important to have these statistics accurate, for our own information, and also for the information of the world in general. (Hear, hear).[1]

Hon. Shams-Ud-Deen [Nominated Indian Unofficial Member]: . . . As regards a native census we must not forget this is the first time we are going to have a counting of the heads of a primitive people to whom the thing is entirely new, and I think we are treading on dangerous ground in having a census of the natives of Kenya Colony alone at this period which the Honourable Acting Chief Native Commissioner has informed us is looked upon with superstition by certain tribes. I am not wrong in saying that in certain sections of the native population there has been trouble when it was necessary to count the heads of their cattle. It is not only against their superstitions but it is liable to create all sorts of suspicion in their minds. Again I say if the welfare and health of the natives only was in view other methods have been suggested by which a gradual statistical record can be compiled and we need not necessarily inflict what is a modern method of preparing these records on primitive people like natives of this Colony.

. . . As far as the remarks of the Honourable Member who represents the natives about the Missionaries helping in the taking of the census are concerned, I feel that his remarks only refer to a very, very limited sphere of the native population. The native population is large and there are large areas where the Missionaries have not been able to penetrate and it will be an extremely difficult job to have a really reliable statistic taken of the natives, and I think that the costs involved will certainly not be proportionate with the value of such a record that we can reasonably expect to obtain.[2]

Hon. MacLellan Wilson [European Elected Member]: . . . In taking a census of the natives we all realise the great difficulty apart from the Semitic feeling, of which I might say now in my opinion many of these natives are getting away from the horrors of counting their wives and children and cattle owing to their contact with the European. The present idea of counting the natives is to allow so many heads per hut. That presupposes the enumeration of heads[3] as correct, but that is not always the case, not only because the counters are perhaps only half literate but because also there are many huts which may not be seen by those responsible for the counting of huts. I was out at Ngong the other week-end and went through a portion of the Masai Reserve . . . and saw a great piece of land there which had been forest and I understand that that particular place had been tenanted by Kikuyu and they had been there long enough to cut down I do not know how many acres of forest of the Masai Reserve and had planted it up, but it may be fairly estimated that they presumably never paid any taxes. I would not like to say that this goes on in other parts of the country, but the point I wish to make is that the system of counting huts is far from perfect. I do not say that any new methods will be more effective but I want to make this suggestion. It has been mentioned we are getting now quite a number of intelligent educated natives. We are also getting native Councils, in the bigger districts and in the more thickly populated. I quite realise in the Northern Frontier District it may be very difficult to take a census by enumeration, but I do not say there will be the same difficulty, in fact I believe with the co-ordination of efforts of native chiefs of Councils it is quite possible to have proper enumeration of natives in these large districts. There is another point. I quite realise that getting ready for a native census is going to be a more compli-

[1] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, pp. 533–4.
[2] Ibid., pp. 535–6. [3] Should probably read 'huts'.

cated business than getting ready for a census of the European or Asiatic population in this country and it might meet the case if the European census and the Asiatic be taken somewhere about the 1st of February. The native census might be taken at a later date when full preparations have been made for it, but I cannot agree with the Honourable Dr. Arthur that it can be taken in a week. If it is going to be taken it must be taken in one night.[1]

Rt. Hon. Lord Delamere: . . . The Honourable Acting Chief Native Commissioner has asked that before this matter should be agreed to . . . he should be able to consult the Senior Commissioners. . . . This matter has been so long before this country that I should have thought the Senior Commissioners who do occasionally meet would have long ago gone into this matter and would have recommended to the Chief Native Commissioner as to the best way of getting at the number of the natives in this country. If it is not so, I think it is very wrong of them. I must agree it is possible that some modification of the ordinary methods of taking a census among Europeans may possibly have to be taken in certain districts. A census presumably means the counting of the peoples and the best way of counting the peoples is the best way you can do it as accurately as possible.

I am grateful to Government for accepting this Motion and I hope it will show that, apart from all other points, that the prosperity of this Colony as a whole has very much increased.[2]

His Excellency: I have announced from the Chair that the Government is going to accept this Motion . . . .[3]

The motion to take a general census in 1926 was carried by 32 votes to 3.[4] But, as stated before, the 1926 census was confined to an enumeration of non-natives.

It was resolved by the Legislative Council that a census of natives should also be taken this year, but Government has decided that it is impracticable, and that the returns thus obtained would be less reliable than the estimates made by Administrative Officers, which I have used in my report.[5]

The Statistician to the Conference of East African Governors, who edited the 1926 report, stated:

The possibility of carrying out controlled census enumeration is under consideration but the difficulties are great. The vast areas to be covered, the lack of suitably trained officers for enumeration and, above all, the rawness of the material to be enumerated necessitates special and careful organisation.

A simultaneous census based on customary census methods is altogether out of the question.[6]

[1] *Report*, vol. ii, pp. 537–8.

[2] Ibid., p. 540. Ten days later, in seconding the motion for adjournment of the Council, he expressed again his satisfaction that the Government had agreed to take in 1926 a census of both natives and non-natives; see ibid., p. 772.

[3] Ibid., p. 541.

[4] The dissenting members were three Indians who apparently were under the impression that the main motive for taking a new census before 1931 was to obtain, for the sake of restricting immigration, data on the increase in the number of Indians in the Colony.

[5] *Census Report 1926*, p. 3. This decision was apparently not communicated to the Legislative Council.

Shortly thereafter another abortive attempt to improve the population statistics in Kenya was made by the Legislative Council when it passed 'the Statistics (Amendment) Ordinance, 1926' (No. 12 of 1926, reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1926*, p. 168), which extended the scope of the Statistics Ordinance of 1918 (No. 36 of 1918, reprinted in *Laws of Kenya in Force 1924*, vol. i, pp. 328–330) by providing among other things that 'statistics shall be collected annually' in relation to population and to 'vital' matters. These provisions have never been put into operation.

[6] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, p. 20.

In his preface to the 1926 census report he called attention to the 'advisability of preparing for a complete Native and Non-Native Census throughout the East African Territories in 1931',[1] but, as shown above, said in his report on the 1931 non-native census that 'it was considered impracticable to take a complete census of the population, both native and non-native'. In fact, the 1931 census covered only 2 or 3 per cent. of the native population. The Medical Department made the following comment:

> . . . no census has ever been conducted outside the towns of Nairobi and Mombasa, where the count which was made in March, 1931, was in the nature of an innovation. It is unlikely that attempts to carry out a census in the Reserves would meet with success. The superstitions and beliefs of natives are opposed to any such procedure, and there is some evidence that a certain number left Mombasa and Nairobi temporarily on the occasion of the census in order to escape enumeration.[2]

The question of a native census was apparently not raised again until 1945, when a Committee appointed to prepare development plans for the colony stated in its Interim Report:[3]

> We wish to take the opportunity to make certain general observations on the subject of statistics. It is not in fact possible adequately to plan development and welfare policies without reasonably adequate and reasonably accurate statistical data and such data are conspicuously lacking in East Africa. There are, for example, no recent statistics of census. The last census was held in 1931; the figures of native population compiled then were largely in the nature of estimates and no reliable information regarding subsequent rates of birth or mortality exist. Any estimate of the native population in any district or area is accordingly entirely in the nature of a guess.[4]
>
> We consider that a general census should be held as soon after the termination of hostilities as it is possible to make the necessary arrangements.

The Government thereupon told the Legislative Council:

> The Government accepts this recommendation, but, in common with the Governments of Uganda and Tanganyika, considers it desirable that the census should be conducted on an East African basis as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities. Detailed proposals have been submitted to the East African Governments by the Director of Statistics and a conference is to be called later in the year to discuss Group Captain Walter's proposals.[5]

[1] *Census Report 1926*, p. 1.

[2] *Medical Report 1931*, pp. 18–19. But the attempt to enumerate the natives residing on non-native premises and farms proved to be a much greater failure still, as returns were made for only 8,345 such natives, and in this case the failure was not due to superstitions of the natives but rather to defects in the organization of the census or to neglect on the part of the European landholders. (According to *Agricultural Census 1931*, p. 52, the 'native squatters resident on European holdings' numbered 113,176.)

[3] *Interim Report on Development*, 4 Apr. 1945, p. 3.

[4] See also *Legislative Council Debates 1945–6, Fourth Session*, 7 Nov. 1945, col. 35:

'Mrs. Watkins [European Elected Member]: Your Excellency, I want to ask if Government is aware of the grave doubts which we on this side of Council have of the basis of figures of African population which are believed or thought to be true by the Government administration. We do not believe those figures are anything except guess work.

'Mr. Marchant [Chief Native Commissioner]: I should like notice of that question.'

[5] *Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1945* (16 May), p. 1. See also *Legislative Council Debates 1945, Second Session*, 1 May, cols. 9–10.

Finally, when on 11 January 1946 the Government was urged that a general census of the population 'should be carried out immediately'[1] the Acting Deputy Chief Secretary replied:

It is the intention of Government to undertake such a census . . . in 1946 provided that staff is obtainable.[2]

3. *Tax Records*

The Government in 1926 had decided that the returns obtainable through a native census would be less reliable than the annual population estimates made by the Administrative Officers on the basis of the so-called Hut Tax Census. That these estimates had improved very much by 1926 cannot be doubted. According to the information given in 1924 by the Chief Native Commissioner to the East Africa Commission 'the official figures for the native population prior to 1914[3] are admittedly mere guesswork'.[4] The method used prior to 1914 and the change brought about in that year were described by District Commissioner Lambert of Emru to the Kenya Land Commission (1932) in the following terms:

In 1913–14 the only counting was of huts and was done by tribal retainers. The district officer remarks on the lack of accuracy. Population figures were estimated

[1] See ibid. *1945–6, Fourth Session*, cols. 757–8, 787. [2] Ibid., col. 832.

[3] The hut tax was introduced on 15 Nov. 1901 by the Hut Tax Regulations of 23 Oct. 1901 (King's Regulations No. 18 of 1901, reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Orders in Council, &c., in Force 1903*, pp. 117–18), which authorized the Commissioner to impose a tax upon all huts used as dwellings. Hut-tax collection commenced on 1 Jan. 1902 (see *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate* 1905, p. 47). The Regulations of 1901 were repealed by the East Africa Hut Tax Ordinance of 28 Aug. 1903 (Ordinance No. 19 of 1903, reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1903*, pp. 11–12), which authorized the Commissioner not only to impose a tax upon all huts used as dwellings but also to direct that 'in the event of more adults than are comprised in one family [family meaning a husband, wife, and their children only] living in a hut . . . each such additional adult, or adults, shall pay the amount of the hut tax in force for the time being'. The provision referring to the additional tax was applied in 1905 to the Provinces of Seyidie and Tanaland, and in 1909 to the Province of Ukamba and the Districts of Machakos, Kitui, Fort Hall, Nyeri, and Embu (see Proclamations of 13 Oct. 1905, 24 Feb. 1909, 21 May 1909, 22 July 1909, reprinted ibid. *1905*, p. 55, *1909*, pp. 69, 84, 94). The Ordinance of 1903 was repealed by the Native Hut and Poll Tax Ordinance of 11 Mar. 1910 (No. 2 of 1910, reprinted ibid. *1910*, pp. 4–6), according to which (1) every native shall pay a hut tax in respect of every hut used as a dwelling and owned by him, and in respect of every wife in excess of one living in any such hut; (2) every male native who is or appears to be 16 years or over and who shall not be liable to pay the hut tax, shall pay as a poll tax a sum equal to the amount of the hut tax. Rules issued on 25 Jan. 1913 (Government Notice No. 19 of 1913, reprinted ibid. *1913*, Part II, pp. 12–13) stipulated among other things:

'2. The Officers in charge of Districts shall every year cause a complete roll of tax payers in their respective Districts, to be prepared.

'Every tax roll shall contain:

(*a*) The name of every owner of a hut, the number of huts owned by each hut-owner, and the number of wives of each hut-owner, and

(*b*) In the case of any District in which the Poll Tax is leviable, the name and father's name of every Native liable to pay the Poll Tax.

'3. For the purpose of the preparation of the Tax Roll a District Officer may employ persons (hereinafter referred to as Hut-Counters) whose duty it shall be to prepare, under the directions of the District Officer, the roll of tax payers in the area to which they may be respectively appointed.'

Prior to the issue of these Rules the tax registers were evidently kept in a haphazard fashion.

[4] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 185. See also *Report of the Committee on Statistical Services in Kenya* (1925), pp. 3–4: 'Until a decade ago only rough estimates of native population were obtainable from district officers and these showed a fluctuation year by year due probably to staff changes and inaccuracy in estimate.'

by assuming an average of three persons per hut, and entering a round figure which approximated to the result obtained. No attempt at estimation of the population of the sexes or of adults and children was made.

Hut counters were first employed in 1914–15. The District Commissioner was satisfied that the new system was a success but he was more particularly concerned with the assistance it afforded in the collection of tax. The only count was still of huts, and populations were estimated from the count as before.

This system continued in force until 1917–18. In this year the District Commissioner remarked on the dishonesty of the hut counters, one of whom was prosecuted and convicted. Thus, even up to the end of the Great War, the system was the simple one of estimation based on a dishonest count of huts. Such figures are naturally of little use in the investigation of progressive population change.

In the 1918–19 annual report, the District Commissioner remarks: 'In normal years the statistics of the native population are largely a matter of conjecture, and the difficulty of estimating them for this year is greatly increased by the abnormal conditions which have been caused by the famine and the influenza epidemic.'

In spite of the difficulties, however, the basis of the present system, which aims at accuracy in the population count as well as in estimates of taxation, was laid down by a detailed count of the Kichugu Division, then part of Embu District. From this count the District Commissioner deduced the following facts:—

(*a*) Estimation on the number of huts, as had been done in previous years, gave a total population which was 25 per cent too large. . . .[1]

From 1919–20 onwards a complete count on modern lines was made with doubtless a varying degree of accuracy.[2]

In some other areas hut counters seem to have been more conscientious from the outset. District Commissioner Fazan, Secretary of the Commission, says of one early check he made:

In 1915 I was sent out by Mr. Campbell, District Commissioner, when I was his Assistant District Commissioner, to make a very careful check in South Kavirondo, in Karachonyo which is a big location near the lake, the reason being that there was a heavy fall off in collections. In the course of some days' walking round the huts, I found no single case of anybody not being counted . . . At that time wives were not entered by name—the husband's name only was entered, but I checked the wives in each village and found them practically correct.[3]

He summarized his experiences as follows:

I have checked in many districts, certainly on the Coast, at Malindi; on the Tana River; most probably Lamu; and all the Kavirondos; Machakos; Kitui; Nyeri; Kiambu. I have checked over hut counters' tickets, and I am perfectly certain that the big error lies at the foot of the field sheets. The actual field sheets are pretty accurate, but at the foot one finds errors in addition, and in the serial numbers there are errors. Errors in serial numbers would not matter very much, except if they are used to base an estimate. The columns are bad, and I have seen such a thing as this—somebody wrote down 100, and then proceeded with 1,001 instead of 101. It is pretty obvious that that amount of error is detected. In a series of years you spot the location which is wrong.[4]

Hut counters generally are people who have done the job for upwards of ten years. Certainly the senior hut counters are. That is both an advantage and a disadvantage. The disadvantage is that a man is apt to take his books of the year before, and sit in a village, and fill in from information received, and not count. In

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 556. District Officer Fox testified likewise that in Machakos District the figures for the years prior to and including 1918 were unreliable; see ibid., vol. ii, p. 1297.

[2] Ibid., vol. i, p. 557. [3] Ibid., p. 962. [4] Ibid., pp. 962–3.

the course of twenty years' collection I have detected frauds[1] on various occasions, and sometimes rather clever frauds, but all told they have been of small account in any effect they might have on the figures.[2]

But Mr. Fazan, in discussing the counts in the Kikuyu Reserve, emphasized that accuracy varied from district to district. He found the results most satisfactory for the Kiambu District, almost as good for Fort Hall District in 'the last few years', and quite unreliable for South Nyeri District.[3] Leaving out of consideration adding mistakes, he estimated for the Kiambu District the margin of error in the figures of married women at 2 per 1,000,[4] and in the total population at about 1 per cent.[5] In an (unpublished) study made in 1935 he estimated the margin of error, including (undiscovered) adding mistakes for the whole Colony at about 8 per cent.[6]

On the other hand, Major Buxton, District Commissioner of South Kavirondo District, showed that none of the tax register figures provided a reliable basis for estimating the population.

> The counts leave much to be desired, and the original lists for the years before 1927 have for the most part been destroyed. A glance at the existing lists shows that the count of children is quite unreliable, and a check of such earlier lists as still survive shows that polls also were very imperfectly counted. Even the counts of married men do not help us much, since in some cases it appears that only the heads of villages have been counted. The count of women is a little more reliable, but they are counted by villages, and individual names are not given, so that concealment is easy.[7]
>
> As a second line of approach, we may turn to the count of huts. One would expect it to be more reliable than the count of women, since concealment is less easy.
>
> . . . If these figures suggest anything besides the extremely bad counting that has been taking place, they point to an increase.[8]
>
> Neither the count of women nor the count of huts has helped us very materially, and we now must see whether the hut tax collections will shed any light on the matter. . . .
>
> These figures reveal a steady and rapid increase from 1909 to 1921, and then

[1] See also Pim Commission, *Report Kenya*, p. 39: 'The hut counters are certainly not of a type likely to be exempt from the temptation to make a little money.'

[2] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 962.

[3] See ibid., pp. 962, 964. 'As I came to the Nyeri figures I very nearly threw down the pen in disgust because they are so bad.'

[4] See ibid., p. 962. Contrary to the usual custom in Kenya, the married women in Kiambu District are counted by name (see ibid., p. 968).

[5] See ibid., p. 964. Even if the margin of error in the figures for married women should be only 2 per 1,000, and even if it should be very small also as regards other adult persons, it certainly must be much greater than 1 per cent. in the total population as the number of children was merely estimated ('computed on a percentage basis and not by actual count', *Report of Kenya Land Commission*, p. 26), and as the Kikuyu seem to be particularly reluctant to provide a basis for such an estimate. See Dispatch of 14 Aug. 1930 from the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies: 'Another factor of importance that militates against the taking of an accurate census is the reluctance born of superstition on the part of natives of some tribes, notably the Kikuyu, to disclose the correct number of their children' (*Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 16).

[6] See Hailey, *An African Survey*, p. 116.

[7] *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 2348. See also ibid., p. 2349: 'The number of married women for 1919–1920 is given as 87,760, and in the next year as 84,902, and in the year following as 10,939, and suggest that the only conclusion which is warranted is that the figures are worthless as a basis for any calculation.'

[8] Ibid., p. 2349.

a sharp fall due to inability to pay the heavy tax of Sh. 16 in the nine months' year of 1921. The annual report records that many huts were pulled down so as to avoid the tax. The next four years represent a slow and fluctuating return to the normal, and then again there is a steady improvement till 1929, when economic difficulties again caused a depression.[1]

Major Buxton said that in the South Kavirondo District 'the count of children is quite unreliable'. The District Commissioner of the North Kavirondo District stated that 'experience indicates that the hut counters' estimates of children are unreliable'.[2] The District Commissioner of the Kitui District thought that the figure for 'children contains a large percentage of natives between the ages of 15 and 17. There are probably a number of natives in the "children" figure who also appear as adults.'[3] The returns of children were in fact so inadequate that instructions issued on 5 December 1924 stipulated:

In Districts where Officers are not satisfied as to the accuracy of their census of native children, it is recommended that their figures be compiled upon the principle of taking the adult population as 63% and the child population as 37% of the general total. A note should be made shewing whether this principle has been adopted or whether the figures are those obtained from the census.[4]

The figures for children, therefore, are practically useless. The figures for men are much more reliable but suffer from mis-statements due to migrations. In their Report on Native Taxation (1936) the Treasurer and the Chief Native Commissioner say that 'a register of natives resident in a district up to a time three years previously' is 'prepared annually'.[5] This method obviously leads in many cases to duplicate registration, natives being registered both at the place where they are living and at the place where they were living formerly.[6] On the other hand, many natives, by moving about, escape registration altogether.

From the evidence before us we were satisfied that faulty entries in the tax census registers have resulted in a considerable loss of revenue in past years. There is evidence to show that certain natives, particularly in the settled areas, have never been registered for tax. This remark applies chiefly, though by no means entirely, to casual labourers who avoid employment during the census-taking period, and at the same time absent themselves from their reserves.[7]

In considering the accuracy of the figures of adult females, one must distinguish between unmarried girls, wives subject to hut tax, and old

[1] *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, pp. 2349–50. The Chief Registrar of Natives told the Commission: 'With regard to the counts made by District Commissioners, I have discussed the accuracy of their counts with them, and naturally every District Commissioner sticks to his guns and maintains that his figures, and also his methods, are correct' (ibid., p. 3038). Major Buxton was evidently a notable exception.

[2] Ibid., p. 2270. [3] Ibid., vol. ii, p. 1301.

[4] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, p. 21.

[5] *Report on Native Taxation*, p. 38. [6] See ibid., pp. 39–40.

[7] Ibid., p. 44. It cannot, of course, be expected that District Officers in an African Colony who have to perform at the same time so many other more important tasks should succeed in keeping tax registers as complete as revenue officers in Britain. See also in this connexion ibid., p. 45: 'It is natural that officers responsible for collecting tax should regard the actual books of tax receipts as of paramount importance. Any loss or misuse of tickets will affect them, personally, financially. We formed the opinion, however, that they are perhaps not sufficiently alive to the importance of the register as a record of moneys paid as well as moneys due to Government.'

women. The figures for unmarried girls are probably as defective as those of children. 'Elderly women are often excused hut tax. Some hut counters omit them, and some include them.'[1] Wives subject to hut tax are possibly counted more accurately than men as they do not move about to the same extent.[2] But particularly in view of the uncertainty as to the number of adult girls the figures for adult females are probably more defective still than those for adult males.

I shall discuss in Section VII of this chapter various attempts made to derive the changes in population from the changes in the numbers of wives subject to hut tax. At this place I shall merely reproduce some general official comments on the accuracy of the population figures based on hut tax censuses.

The Committee on Statistical Services stated in 1925:

> During the last ten years . . . efforts have been directed towards the compilation of a record of the actual number of taxpayers and of their wives and children, and save as regards children there is no reason to discredit the substantial accuracy of the result. The correct enumeration of children is, however, frustrated by superstitious beliefs, and it is understood that the Native Affairs Department accepts the estimate of children at 37 per cent. of the total population—an estimate reached on the experience of other native administrations.[3]

Lieutenant-Colonel O. F. Watkins, in a Memorandum on Native Research published in 1927, said:

> Hut Tax Census is an administrative measure, without legislative sanction, devised to enable revenue collectors to ascertain evasions of revenue. The method is to send native clerks round the locations to list all huts liable for hut tax and all individuals liable for poll tax. These are entered on a roll, which is revised every year. Figures of women and children are similarly collected, but as native superstition represses this information and its collection is not material to revenue, this figure is scrutinised and when considered defective an estimate is substituted for the purpose of arriving at a total of the population.[4]

The comments in the Annual Colonial Reports may be summarized as follows: A fairly accurate count of adult males is made annually for taxation purposes but the number of children can only be estimated roughly and the return of native population is therefore a rough estimate only.[5]

The author of the 1926 census report who used the estimate of the native population for the end of 1925 took a favourable view of the estimates made by the Administrative Officers, so far as adults are concerned.

> They are generally regarded as accurate, except with regard to children, as the native is very loth to own up to the size of his family, and they are elusive creatures, whom it is difficult to count.[6]

[1] Statement of District Commissioner Fazan, Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 963.

[2] But Wagner, in his recent study of the Logoli and Vugusu tribes in North Kavirondo, states (p. 19) that 'plural wives are often not registered, for purposes of tax evasion'.

[3] *Report of the Committee on Statistical Services in Kenya*, p. 4. The Committee does not report which were these other native administrations.

[4] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, 'Native Research', pp. xvii–xviii.

[5] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1923*, p. 9; *1924*, p. 7; *1925*, p. 7; *1926*, p. 10; *1931*, p. 13; *1932*, p. 13; *1933*, p. 12; *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 10; *1937*, p. 10; *1938*, p. 10.

[6] *Census Report 1926*, p. 3.

But the Statistician to the East African Governors' Conference who edited this report was more critical. After having shown in two tables 'the distribution of the population in districts as derived from the Census Report for 1926' he says:

In considering these Tables it must be remembered that the return of native population is on the whole a very rough estimate. How rough it is can be gathered from Table . . . shewing the figures for each District as estimated by the Administrative Officers for some years past.

It must not be thought that this return, with its evident shortcomings, is inserted in the bulletin attaching any element of blame to the hardworked administrative officers on whom the duty of collecting these statistics devolves. On the other hand it is impossible to emphasize the necessity for a radical alteration in the methods of securing a count of the population unless a measure of the inaccuracy of existing methods is put on record. An examination of the values given from year to year reveals either *irregularities* which could not possibly be due to natural causes or *regularities* which are very improbable. No valid conclusions can be drawn from any figures hitherto published concerning the flow of population from district to district or the increase or decrease of numbers in individual districts.[1]

Persistent efforts have been made by successive District Commissioners to increase the accuracy of population returns but lack of staff and technical assistance have so far rendered their efforts abortive.[2]

In his report on the 1931 census he said, after having shown the percentage increase for each District from 31 December 1925 to 31 December 1931:

A glance at the percentage variations must force any investigator to the conclusion that the differences in many instances cannot be due to natural causes. The discrepancies are, in certain Districts, so considerable as to suggest that the basis of estimation in the two years is entirely different so that the two returns cannot be compared.[3]

Finally, in his statement to the Kenya Land Commission, he expressed the opinion that the population as shown by the hut tax census was underestimated for the Colony as a whole.

We do not generally make errors in a census counting on the plus side. They are generally made on the minus side . . .

[1] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, p. 17. These remarks refer to the estimates for 1917–26. *Medical Report 1929*, p. 13, says with regard to the estimates for 1926–9: 'These figures are estimations based on the hut count which is made for the collection of tax. The yearly increase which the figures show may to some extent be due to closer enumeration . . . .' See also, for example, Native Affairs Department, *Report 1932*, p. 29: 'Northern Frontier Province. Garissa District. The population figures show a slight increase; this is due more to a better count than to an actual increase.'

[2] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, pp. 20–1.

[3] *Census Report 1931*, p. 21. The incomparability of the returns even for recent years may be illustrated by two examples:

The estimated native population of the Machakos District decreased from 254,928 in 1934 to 220,931 in 1935, and the estimated native population of the whole Colony from 3,024,975 to 3,012,421. 'The apparent decline in the population [of the Colony] is due to the fact that, in the Machakos District, in 1934 the number of children was inaccurately assessed at 53 per cent which was too high a figure' (*Report on Native Affairs 1935*, p. 172).

The estimated native population of the Masai District increased from 37,708 in 1935 to 52,333 in 1936 and decreased to 39,507 in 1937. 'Owing to a miscalculation an excessive figure (52,333) was shown in 1936' (*Colonial Reports, Kenya 1937*, p. 10).

The error for the Machakos District in 1934, it seems, was also due to a miscalculation and not to inaccurate assessment. The proportion of females (53 per cent., see p. 152 below) was apparently mistaken for the proportion of children.

Officially, the estimate of population at the moment is about three million for the Colony, and I think that is probably about 150,000 short.

We drew a life curve, but the information was very meagre. There is a very high infant mortality. I am given to understand that the medical authorities consider that half the children die before they reach the age of 2½ or 3. I could not make the population less than about 3,150,000. That is a guess—but a scientific guess.[1]

The Chief Registrar of Natives thought likewise that the population, as returned at the tax censuses, was underestimated.[2]

4. *Kipandi Records*

It will be remembered that the Acting Chief Native Commissioner in the 1925 debate on a native census had suggested that the population figures obtainable through a census would be less trustworthy than those derived from the records of registered natives. Such records have been kept for 25 years. The legal basis is the Native Registration Ordinance[3] which provides that every male native apparently above the age of 16 years should register himself with a registration officer who takes his finger-prints. No employer is allowed to engage a native labourer unless he has a kipandi (registration certificate).

The system was launched in August 1920. Scores of thousands of natives were ordered into the offices of District Commissioners to have their ten finger-prints taken and tribal particulars recorded. Administration officers toured the remote villages and did the work there. Tin containers were stamped out by the hundred thousand.

. . . At the end of 1920 registered natives numbered 194,750. During 1921 the number of registrations rose to 389,632 . . . By May 1922 the number of registered effectives had reached 435,584.[4]

From 1937 on the number of registered natives on record exceeded one million. But the registered natives were not identical with the male natives over 16 years of age living in Kenya, and this for various reasons:

(1) A considerable number of natives evaded registration.

[1] *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3036. See also the statement of the Chief Registrar of Natives (ibid., p. 3040):

'We have one more or less definite figure. We know that approximately 30,000 to 31,000 youths come of age every year and take out *kipandis*. That has given us a starting point. On that starting point the Statistician has produced a life curve going forward and backward to expansion. That is on the basis of the Mauritius-cum-Uganda Census. Dr. Vint had given as his opinion that most natives die here at not later than 55 years of age. The Statistician could not agree that the population died out at 55, so he has softened the curve.

'Assuming a population of practically three million people, if we know that (according to Dr. Vint) approximately 50 per cent die within two years of birth, that should leave a certain number, which is bound to keep on dying off as they grow. If, at the age of 16, we know definitely that there are between 31,000 and 32,000 people in order to have that figure then you must have a definite number at birth and trail them off.'

It is obvious that the margin of error in this 'life curve' is much greater than 5 per cent. and that the total thus obtained is still more uncertain than that based on the hut tax census.

[2] See ibid., p. 3039.

[3] No. 15 of 1915 (18 May), reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1915*, Part I, pp. lxxii–lxxv; amended by No. 35 of 1915 (18 Dec.), reprinted ibid., p. civ. The Ordinance was suspended until after the War and came into force on 1 Nov. 1919; see Government Notice No. 375 of 24 Oct. 1919, reprinted ibid. *1919*, Part II, p. 79.

[4] Ross, *Kenya from within*, pp. 189–90.

(2) A certain number, in order to obscure their identity, had themselves registered unlawfully more than once.

(3) Natives from other territories (Uganda, Tanganyika) were registered after their arrival but often retained their certificates when leaving the country.

(4) The Ordinance was not applied to the whole Colony.

(5) The vast majority of deceased registered natives remained on the records because their deaths were not reported.

The last source of error is the most important. The 'Native Registration Ordinance' provided:

9. (2) Every person shall within such period as may be prescribed forward to the administrative officer in charge of the district the certificate and container of any native who may have died in his employ or on land or premises under his control.

'The Native Registration Rules, 1922'[1] prescribed:

11. (1) The return required to be rendered by employers in respect of their native employees . . . shall include the following information.

(c) The Registration number and name of any Native . . . having . . . died during the month for which the return is submitted, and the date on which such . . . death took place.[2]

13. In accordance with Section 9 (2) of the Ordinance the period after death within which certificates and containers of deceased natives shall be forwarded to the Administrative Officer-in-charge of the district in which the native dies, shall be 7 days.

15. (6) Any deaths in a Prison or Reformatory of any male native shall be notified to the Chief Registrar of Natives. . . .[3]

17. Any death of a registered native or of a native of registering age, occurring in any Hospital or Asylum shall be notified to the Chief Registrar of Natives. . . .

Even if all employers and landholders had made the returns conscientiously the number of deaths reported by them, together with the number of deaths reported from prisons, reformatories, hospitals, and asylums, would have constituted only a minority of all deaths of male adult natives occurring in the territory. But in fact the reporting of deaths has become more and more defective.

The Chief Registrar of Natives, in his report for 1928, stated:

For want of proof to the contrary . . . 737,936 represents the number of registered natives shown in our records as being alive; there is every reason to believe this number is considerably in excess of the actual number of registered natives in existence. The number of deaths reported, *i.e.*, 25,266, is obviously below the actual number of deaths that have occurred among registered natives since the inception of the Ordinance.

The failure to obtain information of all deaths of registered natives may be due to the fact that most natives when ill return to their homes and die there unknown to their employers. Of such deaths nothing is heard officially. Until a system is evolved whereby all deaths occurring in Reserves are compulsorily reported to this Office our

[1] Government Notice No. 128 of 6 Apr. 1922, reprinted in Kenya, *Proclamations, Rules and Regulations 1922*, pp. 33–8.

[2] The 'Native Registration (Amendment) Rules, 1941' (Government Notice No. 94 of 15 Jan. 1941, reprinted ibid. *1941*, pp. 41–2) required that also the 'father's name of any such native' be stated in the return.

[3] See also 'Native Registration (Amendment, No. 2) Rules, 1941' (Gov. Not. No. 562 of 13 June, reprinted ibid., p. 204).

registration records will continue to show a greater registered population than is actually alive, thus precluding any estimate of the population still requiring to be registered.

The Government Statistician has suggested that a death rate of 5 per 1,000 per annum, at 16 years of age, rising to 30 per 1,000 per annum at 45, would be a safe figure to assume, giving an approximate average death rate, among registered natives, of 20 per 1,000 per annum. This estimated death rate seems to me to be a very reasonable one, considering the various epidemics, famines, etc., to which natives have been subjected since 1921.

Assuming that death rate to be approximately correct the number of effective registrations at December 31st, 1928 should be in the neighbourhood of 675,000 (*i.e.*, 673,872), and not 737,936, as shown in our records.[1]

TABLE 1. *Deaths of Registered Natives, Kenya, 1920–37*[1]

	Reported Deaths			*Reported Deaths*			*Reported Deaths*	
Year	*Number*	*Per 1,000*	*Year*	*Number*	*Per 1,000*	*Year*	*Number*	*Per 1,000*
1920[2]	435	2·3	1926	3,632	6·1	1932	2,660	3·4
1921	1,779	4·9	1927	3,523	5·4	1933	1,987	2·5
1922	3,280	7·5	1928	3,034	4·4	1934	2,435	3·0
1923	3,666	7·6	1929	3,061	4·2	1935	2,187	2·6
1924	3,182	6·2	1930	3,153	4·2	1936	2,240	2·7
1925	2,735	4·9	1931	2,774	3·6	1937	1,995	2·2

[1] Computed from *Report on Native Affairs 1933*, p. 159; *1934*, p. 188; *1935*, p. 204; *1936*, p. 199; *1937*, p. 227; *1938*, p. 130. The total numbers of reported deaths have not been published for more recent years. The 'deaths reported of natives in employment' amounted to 993 in 1942 and to 792 in 1943; see *Labour Department Annual Report 1942*, p. 7, *1943*, p. 4.

[2] Oct. 1919 to Dec. 1920.

In his 1930 report the Chief Registrar of Natives said in particular with regard to aliens:

The problem of calculating the correct proportion of Kenya natives registered, and the number of active registrations remaining, is rendered still more difficult by the presence in our midst of thousands of natives from the neighbouring territories, who come to Kenya, yearly, in search of employment, and who take out temporary registration certificates, for the period of their sojourn in Kenya. . . .

Some of these strangers may reside in the Colony for a number of years, very few settle permanently; the majority, I think, return to their country of origin, together with their registration certificates which they frequently lend to their friends and relatives proceeding to Kenya. It is possible that a considerable proportion of the temporary registration certificates issued has been issued to such immigrants.

There are no simple means, except by individual scrutiny of the 'B' certificate (a stupendous task), of ascertaining to what extent these extra-territorial natives figure among the temporarily registered, but in view of the fact that out of the 981,055 registrations effected 300,858 are temporary registration certificates, it may safely be assumed that the number is very considerable.[2]

A few extracts from subsequent reports may serve as an illustration of the varying opinions of the Chief Registrar of Natives on the accuracy of the registration records:

1931. The average number of deaths reported, is approximately 3,150 per annum,

[1] *Report on Native Affairs 1928*, p. 121. See also ibid. *1929*, p. 94; *1930*, p. 108; *1931*, p. 137; *1932*, p. 157; *1933*, p. 142.

[2] Ibid. *1930*, p. 111. By 31 Dec. 1938 out of 1,313,052 registrations effected not fewer than 445,550 were temporary registration certificates (see ibid. *1938*, p. 128).

and the estimated number of deaths occurring among registered natives is now in the neighbourhood of 16,000 per annum; this unchecked accretion to our records means that we probably carry some 100,000 records more than are actually alive and that number added to the large and unascertained number of registrations of alien natives will mean that in a very few years we shall have on record a number of registered natives greater than the whole male native population of Kenya.

It is estimated that about 59 per cent of the male native population are over 16 years of age; thus, if that estimate is reasonably accurate, the total number of Kenya natives that are registerable is in the neighbourhood of 830,993. It is regrettable that alien natives were not registered on distinctive kipandis, as had this been done from the commencement, it would be possible now to state fairly accurately the extent to which the Native Registration Ordinance had been applied. The number of alien natives registered is probably about equal to the number of adult males in the Northern Frontier Provinces and parts of the Coast, who have not yet been brought under the Ordinance; if that assumption is correct, it may be said that Registration has very nearly reached saturation point and that the only registrations to be expected in future, are to be of youths coming of age . . . .[1]

1934. Following the practice in force for some years, the crude native death rate of 20 per *mille* per annum, advised by the late Government Statistician, has been adhered to, from which it would appear that the number of 'live' cards in our records should not exceed 788,867.

The last population count published by the Administration, returns the native population as totalling 3,017,117 men, women and children. Assuming that number to be approximately correct, the male adult population of 16 years of age and upwards should number, theoretically, about 768,744 individuals, of whom about 24,604 reside in the Northern Frontier Province and Lamu-Tanaland areas where registration has not yet penetrated.

Assuming further that out of the 788,867 registered natives considered to be alive, 100,000 are registrations of extra-territorial natives, i.e. from Uganda and Tanganyika Territory, it would appear that there still remain some 55,273 Kenya natives to be registered, in addition to the 24,604 Northern Frontier Province and Tanaland natives.[2]

1935. . . . an officer who went to Mombasa to carry out inspections found himself unable to do so owing to the fact that the majority of natives there had no registration certificates in their possession, either because they had lost them or had never been registered.[3]

1936. . . . a death-rate of 20 per 1,000 is assumed, which brings the probable number of registered natives alive at the end of 1936 down to 828,851. In the

[1] *Report on Native Affairs 1931*, pp. 137–8.

[2] Ibid. *1934*, p. 188. It will be noted that the assumptions made here differ enormously from those made three years earlier.

[3] Ibid. *1935*, p. 204. See also *Report of the Commission appointed to Examine the Labour Conditions in Mombasa* (1939), p. 44: '. . . from evidence we heard and from the number of kipandis we inspected, we have no doubt whatsoever that the provisions of the Native Registration Ordinance are not being adequately observed in Mombasa and we recommend that the Chief Registrar of Natives should take immediate steps to rectify this matter'. (In 1931 a former Chief Native Commissioner had told the Joint Committee on Closer Union in East Africa: 'In the towns, of course, a native who has not got his Kipandi on him gets into trouble at once'; see Joint Committee, vol. ii, *Minutes of Evidence*, p. 835.)

But even if those natives who worked outside their Reserves should have found it difficult in the long run to evade registration, this is certainly not true of those who stayed at home. 'With regard to the natives who do not come out from the reserves, there are quite a number of old men particularly who, since the Native Registration Ordinance came into force, have not required to work, and have not taken out native registration certificates. It is not so common round about Nairobi, but more common in certain areas, such as Meru and North Kavirondo, where the far away people have not registered in full.' (Statement of Chief Registrar of Natives, Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3039.)

opinion of certain authorities, even this figure is too high, and in some quarters it is held that a death-rate of 35 per 1,000 would be nearer the correct figure.[1]

1937. It is obvious that the recorded deaths bear no known relation to actual deaths; in order to obtain a fair approximation of the actual effective registration it has been necessary to assume a death rate among registered natives of 20 per 1,000. That figure is most probably low, but in the absence of accurate vital statistics no better basis can be provided.[2]

1938. For various reasons, principally the fact that all deaths are not reported, it is not possible to state the number of 'effective registrations' in circulation, but . . . it may reasonably be assumed that that number is not less than 850,000.[3]

By the end of 1938 the number of registered natives, after deducting the 50,000 deaths reported, was 1,050,000. Assuming a death-rate of 20 per 1,000, the number was 850,000. Assuming a death-rate of 35 per 1,000, the number was 650,000. What the actual death-rate was it is impossible to tell. It is likewise impossible to tell how much the number of registered natives was affected by the other sources of error mentioned above. 'The total cost of operating the Ordinance from the time of its inception to the end of 1932 was £188,155.'[4] Vast additional sums have been spent since. It lies outside the scope of this survey to appraise the value of the scheme for identification purposes. But in view of the fact that it has often been contended that the registration records have considerable demographic value it may be said that their demographic value is nil.[5] It may also be said that if one-tenth of the amount spent for registration purposes had been used for taking a native census, our knowledge not only of the number of natives of registration age but of the total native population would be incomparably greater than it is to-day.

5. *Sample Count*

In 1932 an interesting attempt was made in the coast belt and most of the Shimba Hills area of the Digo District to ascertain the sex and age composition of the native population. These areas were selected because they were already staffed by sanitary teachers.[6] 'From May on to the end of the year an age group census of the population was made and all huts were enumerated and classified by the sanitary staff.'[7]

For the purpose of age grouping a scheme was worked out whereby the numbers in nine age groups of the two sexes could be simply ascertained.

[1] *Report on Native Affairs 1936*, p. 199.
[2] Ibid. *1937*, p. 227.
[3] Ibid. *1938*, p. 129.
[4] Ibid. *1932*, p. 165.
[5] It may even be said that from a demographic standpoint registration proved to be harmful. As shown above (see p. 129), it has been used as an argument against the need for taking a native census, and it has led to an overestimate of the population. Thus, after having presented the registration returns, the Chief Registrar of Natives told the Kenya Land Commission: 'The conclusion is that the population as shown by hut-counts is under-estimated' (*Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3039).
[6] 'The Coast belt and part of the Shimba hills area have been apportioned into six areas each with a resident Sanitary Teacher. These Sanitary Teachers carry on their duties of inspection of latrines and housing, conducting propaganda barazas for the improvement of sanitation and the raising of the standard of living. They bring in their reports monthly to the medical centre at Msambweni' (*Medical and Sanitary Report, Digo District 1932*, p. 5).
[7] Ibid.

The following table shows the method:

Group	Males	Females	Estimated Age
1	Babies not yet having teeth	As in males	0–7 mths.
2	Babies having teeth but unable to walk	As in males	8–12 „
3	Children able to walk but not yet trusted to herd goats	Able to walk but unable to carry water	1–5 yrs.
4	Able to herd goats but not to be trusted to herd cows	Able to go to well and fetch small tins of water	6–8 „
5	Capable of herding cows on their own	Able to carry a debi of water and pound rice	9–12 „
6	Mvulana, a recognized native age group, young unmarried youths	Msitchana, a recognized native age group ('flappers')	13–15 „
7	Young adults married and of marriageable age	As in males	
8	Middle aged	Middle aged	
9	Old aged	Old aged	

The total census of the area covered amounted to 25,987, mostly Wadigo and nearly half of the native population of the whole of Digo District. The count was about 1,900 in excess of the estimated figure given by the District Commissioner for the same area.[1]

The results of this count will be discussed in Section III of this chapter.

II. Total Population

1. *Native Population*

The first estimate of the native population of the Protectorate was made by Sir Arthur Hardinge in 1897.[2] He arrived at a total of approximately 2,500,000. But this estimate is not comparable with later estimates since the Provinces of Kisumu and Naivasha with a population of perhaps one million[3] were transferred (on 1 April 1902) from the Uganda Protectorate to the East Africa Protectorate. After the transfer the native population of the East Africa Protectorate was estimated at 4,000,000,[4] and this was the estimate given for the total population in the *Colonial Office List* for each year from 1905 to 1914[5] and in the *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire* for each year up to 1909.[6] For the census date 1911 the native population was put at only 3,000,000,[7] and this estimate was accepted by the Medical Department of Kenya in each of its subsequent reports

[1] *Medical and Sanitary Report, Digo District 1932*, pp. 7–8.

[2] See *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, pp. 25–7. Sir Arthur Hardinge was British Consul General at Zanzibar, and when the East African Protectorate was proclaimed, the supreme control of its affairs devolved on him (see Hobley, *Kenya*, p. 73).

[3] It was estimated in *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1902* (p. 823) at 900,000; ibid. *1903* (p. 815) at 1,100,000; ibid. *1904* (p. 459) at 1,040,000. But *Handbook for East Africa* (*1905*, p. 30; *1906*, p. 35; *1907*, p. 37) said that the population of the Province of Kisumu alone 'is believed to approach 1½ millions'.

[4] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1901*, p. 746; *Memorandum on the Four African Protectorates Administered by the Foreign Office in 1903*, p. 6.

[5] It appears for the last time in the *Colonial Office List for 1916*, p. 177, which shows the population at the end of 1914.

[6] It appears for the last time in *Statistical Abstract 1895–1909*, p. 1. For 1905 (see ibid. *1891–1905*, p. 1) the total population is given as 4,038,250, the excess over 4,000,000 being probably allocated to non-natives.

[7] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 34.

up to 1921.[1] But already in the Annual *Blue Book* for 1911–12 the native population was estimated for that year at only 2,648,500,[2] and the report on the non-native census of 1921 put it at 2,483,500.[3]

From 1925 on the estimates of the native population appearing in most public documents are as follows:[4]

1925	2,549,300	1929	2,930,604	1933	3,017,117	1937	3,253,689	1941	3,454,541
1926	2,682,848	1930	2,951,023	1934	3,024,975	1938	3,280,774	1942	3,592,992
1927	2,793,963	1931	2,966,993	1935	3,012,421	1939	3,413,371	1943	3,596,575
1928	2,838,022	1932	3,007,645	1936	3,186,976	1940	3,453,763	1944	3,825,533

In order rightly to appraise the changes in the figures from 1924 to 1925 and from 1925 to 1926 one should realize that on 29 June 1925 the Province of Jubaland, an area of 36,740 square miles, was ceded to Italy,[5]

[1] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 37; *1913*, p. 99; *1914*, p. 55; *1915*, p. 55; *1916*, p. 45; *1917*, p. 55; *1918*, p. 52; *1919*, p. 58; *1920*, p. 68; *1921*, p. 103.

[2] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1911*, p. 402.

[3] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 34. For 1914–24 the estimates in the various official documents vary a good deal.

Statistical Abstracts for the Dominions, etc. (*1899–1913*, p. 6; *1900–14*, p. 6) give, for 31 Mar. and 31 Dec. 1914, 2,834,927 and 2,783,925 respectively while the Chief Native Commissioner, from returns submitted by the District Commissioners, gave to the East Africa Commission (see *Report*, pp. 148, 185), apparently for 31 Dec. 1914, an estimate of 2,797,475.

For 31 Dec. 1915 to 1924 the native population is shown as follows:

	1915	*1916*	*1917*	*1918*	*1919*
Chief Native Commissioner .	2,817,860	2,758,088	2,626,183	2,596,399	2,684,845
Annual Colonial Reports .	..	2,758,088	2,622,163	2,596,379	2,684,847
Colonial Office List . .	2,829,050	2,766,515	2,628,638	2,604,106	2,604,106

	1920	*1921*	*1922*	*1923*	*1924*
Chief Native Commissioner .	2,464,071	2,330,112	2,478,325	2,601,858	2,495,065
Annual Colonial Reports .	2,330,112	2,348,788	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,560,983
Colonial Office List . .	2,483,500	2,483,500	2,483,500	2,585,896	2,560,983

See *Report of East Africa Commission*, p. 185; *Colonial Reports, East Africa Protectorate 1916–17*, p. 25, *1917–18*, p. 27, *1919–20*, p. 27; *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1920–1*, p. 29, *1921*, p. 7, *1922*, p. 6, *1923*, p. 9, *1924*, p. 7; *Colonial Office List for 1917*, p. 178, *1918*, p. 180, *1919*, p. 183, *1920*, p. 187, *1921*, p. 239, *1922*, p. 242, *1923*, p. 245, *1924*, p. 245, *1925*, p. 248, *1926*, p. 248 (the *Lists* show the total, the European, the Asiatic, and for 1924 also the Arab population; the figures given above were obtained by deducting the numbers of Europeans, Asiatics, and for 1924 also Arabs, from the total population).

[4] The estimates refer to 31 Dec. They were taken from *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1925*, p. 7; *1926*, p. 11; *1927*, p. 20; *1928*, p. 20; *1930*, p. 9; *1931*, p. 13; *1932*, p. 13; *1933*, p. 12; *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 10; *1937*, p. 10; *1938*, p. 10; *Blue Book 1939*, Section 15, to *1944*, Section 15. In the report on the non-native census of 1926 the native population is estimated at 2,515,330 (see *Census Report 1926*, p. 42), and this figure, according to *Census Report 1931*, p. 18, refers to 31 Dec. 1925. Native Affairs Department, *Report 1927*, p. 67, *1929*, p. 83, *1933*, p. 114, give for 1926, 1929, and 1933, 2,644,863, 2,899,261, and 3,004,141 respectively. The *Medical Report for 1938 and 1939* (p. 3) gave for 1939 the same figure (3,413,371) as the Blue Book. But subsequent reports showed 3,413,371 for 1940, 3,447,706 for 1941, and 3,455,000 for 1942 (see *Medical Report 1940*, p. 3; *1942*, p. 7) while the *Report for 1943* gave (p. 5) for 1943 again the same figure (3,596,575) as the Blue Book. The *Report for 1944* showed (p. 6) 3,600,000 as against 3,825,533 in the Blue Book.

[5] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1925*, p. 3. See also ibid., p. 7: 'The native population has been decreased to the extent of approximately 135,000 owing to the cession of Jubaland.' According to ibid. *1926*, p. 11, the estimated native population of Jubaland at the end of 1921 was 97,728.

and that in 1926 Northern Turkana, an area of 15,854 square miles, was transferred from Uganda to Kenya.[1] Taking account of these changes in boundaries the population increase between the end of 1921 and the end of 1929 amounted, according to the estimates in the Annual Colonial Reports, to nearly one-third. That it actually was so large is out of the question. For 1930–5 the population estimates indicate only slight changes but again show enormous rises in 1936–44, the increase in those nine years aggregating 27 per cent. However, the basis of all estimates is too uncertain to permit the drawing of any conclusion regarding the extent to which the population has actually risen in the course of the last 25 years.

2. *Non-Native Population*

Sir A. Hardinge, in 1897, gave 391 as the number of Europeans and Eurasians.[2] By the end of 1901 it had increased to 506, and by the end of 1902 (including 75 in the two Provinces transferred from Uganda) to 596.[3] Only a small number of European settlers were then scattered through the country, but the year 1903 marks the beginning of planned white colonization.[4] On 31 March 1904 to 1906 the Europeans and Eurasians numbered 886, 954, and 1,814 respectively.[5] In those years European settlement 'continued as rapidly as the limited staff of the Land and Survey Departments could cope with it[6] until 1906, when it received a set-back from the adoption of a less accommodating policy by the Bank'.[7] For 31 March 1907 and 1908 the numbers of Europeans were estimated at only 1,425 and 1,738 respectively.[8] 'In 1908 the Plateau was opened up for settlement,

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1926*, p. 3. The population of Northern Turkana cannot have been very large, since the native population of the Turkana District was estimated in 1931 at 55,086 as against 30,000 in 1925 when the District consisted only of the southern section (see *Census Report 1931*, p. 18).

[2] See *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, pp. 26–7.

[3] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1901*, p. 746; *1902*, p. 823. *Memorandum on the Four African Protectorates Administered by the Foreign Office in June 1903* (p. 6), however, gives only 450.

[4] Encouragement of European immigration as a matter of policy was initiated by Commissioner Eliot whose viewpoint was: '. . . the interior of the Protectorate is a white man's country. This being so, I think it is mere hypocrisy not to admit that white interests must be paramount, and that the main object of our policy and legislation should be to found a white colony' (Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate*, p. 103). The opposite policy was proclaimed in 1923 in the White Paper *Indians in Kenya*, p. 9: 'Primarily, Kenya is an African territory, and His Majesty's Government think it necessary definitely to record their considered opinion that the interests of the African natives must be paramount, and that if, and when, those interests and the interests of the immigrant races should conflict, the former should prevail.'

[5] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1903*, p. 815; *1904*, p. 459; *1905*, p. 423; Salvadori, p. 73. The number of Eurasians was small.

[6] The Director of Agriculture, in his special report of 6 Feb. 1905, sent under the same date by Commissioner Sir D. Stewart to the Marquess of Lansdowne, evidently overstated the speed of European settlement when he said: 'Two years ago there were not more than six European farmers in East Africa, now there are as many hundreds' (*Reports from the Director of Agriculture on the Government Farms and on the Prospects of Settlers*, p. 41). If the official figures quoted above are correct, there were on 6 Feb. 1905 many fewer than 600 European farmers in the Protectorate, and two years earlier there were certainly more than 6. (Commissioner Eliot, in his report dated 18 Apr. 1903, p. 19, had stated: 'At present there are nearly 100 Europeans settled in or near Nairobi.')

[7] *Census Report 1926*, p. 12.

[8] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1906*, p. 367; *1907*, p. 373; Salvadori, p. 73.

and there was a large influx of settlers from South Africa, mostly of Dutch descent.'[1] For 31 March 1909 to 1914 the number of Europeans was estimated at 2,137, 2,654, 3,256,[2] 3,392, 4,586, and 5,438 respectively.[3] But during the war all alienation of land was in abeyance, and the European population was estimated for 31 December 1918 at 5,570.[4] 'In 1919, settlement revived, and made a considerable spurt with the Soldier Settlers' Scheme.'[5] The estimates for 31 December 1919 and 1920 were 5,914 and 7,660 respectively,[6] but these were evidently underestimates, since according to the census taken in April 1921 the Europeans numbered 9,651.[7] The European population had actually trebled within 10 years in spite of the interruption of immigration through the war. Settlement 'received a severe shock in 1920 from the change of currency, when the rupee was stabilised at Shs. 2',[8] and emigrants seem to have been nearly as numerous as immigrants in 1921–3.[9] But from 1924 on immigration again exceeded emigration.[10] For 31 December 1924 the number of Europeans was estimated at 11,002,[11] and according to the census taken in February 1926, there were 12,529. For 31 December 1929 and 1930 the European population was estimated at 16,663, and 16,842 respectively,[12] and these figures may have come near the truth, since the census taken in March 1931 showed a European population of 16,812. In the 10 years from 1921 to 1931 the number of Europeans had increased by about 75 per cent.

The number of Asiatics[13] is given for the 1911 census date as 20,986.[14]

[1] *Census Report 1926*, p. 12. 'The policy of the reservation of the Highlands for Europeans was definitely laid down by the Earl of Elgin, when Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1908' (*Indians in Kenya*, p. 3).

[2] According to the census of April 1911 there were 3,175 Europeans; see *Census Report 1921*, p. 2.

[3] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies, 1908*, p. 384; *1909*, p. 391; *1910*, p. 388; *1911*, p. 402; *1912*, p. 395; Salvadori, p. 73. The *Medical Reports* (*1912*, p. 37; *1913*, p. 99) show for 31 Dec. 1912 and 1913 a European population of 5,151 and 6,510 respectively, but these figures, though they were computed by adding to the 1911 census population the excess of registered births over registered deaths and of recorded immigrants over recorded emigrants in 1912 and 1912–13 respectively (and neglecting the increase from census date to 31 Dec. 1911) are probably too high.

[4] See *Colonial Reports, East Africa Protectorate 1918–19*, p. 25.

[5] *Census Report 1926*, p. 12.

[6] See *Colonial Reports, East Africa Protectorate 1919–20*, p. 27; *Kenya 1920–1*, p. 29.

[7] The estimates for the period from the outbreak of the war to the end of 1920 again vary considerably in the various sources. The Annual Colonial Reports gave for 31 Dec. 1914 to 1918 5,468, 5,632, 5,824, 5,362, and 5,570 (see *Colonial Reports, East Africa Protectorate 1914–15*, pp. 26-9; *1915–16*, pp. 17–20; *1916–17*, p. 25; *1917–18*, p. 27; *1918–19*, p. 25). The Medical Department gave for 31 Dec. 1914 to 1920 7,032, 7,769, 7,989, 8,201, 9,315, 8,000, and 8,000 respectively (see *Medical Report 1914*, p. 55; *1915*, p. 55; *1916*, p. 45; *1917*, p. 55; *1918*, p. 52; *1919*, p. 58; *1920*, p. 68; *1921*, p. 103), and these estimates have been accepted also by the Statistician to the East African Governors' Conference (see *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, p. 35). But the figures inspire little confidence. It seems out of the question that the European population can have increased so much during the war and it would be difficult to explain the large decrease in the course of 1919.

[8] *Census Report 1926*, p. 12.

[9] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1921*, p. 7; *1922*, p. 7; *1923*, p. 10.

[10] See ibid. *1925*, p. 8; *1926*, p. 12. [11] See ibid. *1924*, p. 7. [12] See ibid. *1930*, p. 9.

[13] The term, as used here, covers all non-natives who are not Europeans.

[14] The number actually ascertained at the census was 11,886, but 'few, if any, Arabs were included in the 1911 census' (*Census Report 1921*, p. 2). The 1931 census report estimated the number of Arabs for the 1911 census date at 9,100, 'assuming an increase of about 1,000 for the

For 31 December 1916–20 it was estimated at 22,118, 24,246, 25,131, 28,903, and 30,685 respectively.[1] But immigration seems to have been underestimated, as in the case of Europeans, since according to the census taken in April 1921 the Asiatics numbered 35,982.[2] This would imply an increase of about 70 per cent. since 1911. But immigration declined considerably in 1921 and was small also in 1922 and 1923,[3] so that although immigration was large again from 1924 on[4] the Asiatic population was estimated for 31 December 1924 at only 34,524.[5] According to the census taken in February 1926 there were 41,140 Asiatics in the Colony. For 31 December 1929 their number was estimated at 55,891,[6] and the census taken in March 1931 showed an Asiatic population of 57,135. In the ten years from 1921 to 1931 it had increased by about 60 per cent.

Prior to 1931 estimates of the total non-native population were published only for some intercensal years and no explanation was given of how they were arrived at. But by 1931 the situation seemed clarified.

Since 1930 the migration returns have been carefully analysed and controlled in the Statistical Department and it is now possible to make a reasonably accurate estimate of population each month. Since the census in March, 1931, up to the end of December, 1931, there has been a steady decrease in the non-native population due to migration.[7]

The results obtained were as follows:

	Population 6 Mar. 1931	*Natural increase*	*Migration*	*Population 31 Dec. 1931*
Europeans . .	16,812	84	61	16,957
Asiatics . . .	57,135	475	−3,858	53,752

But from 1932 on the situation becomes quite puzzling. The *Colonial Report* for that year presents a table showing the estimated European population for 31 December 1931 and 1932 as 16,957 and 17,249 respectively, and the Asiatic population as 53,752 and 51,449, and adds the following 'Note':

No reliable returns of births and deaths are available. The estimates in the above table are based on an assumed natural increase of 6 per cent. per annum for Euro-

decade' 1911–21 (see ibid. *1931*, p. 9). Sir A. Hardinge, in 1897, put the total number of Asiatics at 13,434 (see *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, pp. 26–7). It probably reached 35,000 in 1901, when a very large number of Indian labourers were employed on the construction of the Uganda Railway but dropped thereafter, and the estimate of 25,000 Asiatics given for each year from 1904 to 1914 in *Colonial Office List* (see *List 1906*, p. 95; *1907*, p. 96; *1908*, p. 95; *1909*, p. 187; *1910*, p. 188; *1911*, p, 161; *1912*, p. 162; *1913*, p. 165; *1914*, p. 172; *1915*, p. 177; *1916*, p. 177) was no doubt an overstatement, at least for the earlier years. (The Uganda Railway is entirely in Kenya. 'It is as if the line from Charing Cross to Dover were called the French Railway', Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate*, p. 209.)

[1] See *Colonial Reports, East Africa Protectorate 1916–17*, p. 25; *1917–18*, p. 27; *1919–20*, p. 27; *Kenya 1920–1*, p. 29.

[2] *Colonial Office List* gave for 1915 and 1916, 14,000; for 1917, 17,000; and for 1918, 17,247 (see ibid. *1917*, p. 178; *1918*, p. 180; *1919*, p. 183; *1920*, p. 187). These were evidently understatements.

[3] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1921*, p. 7; *1922*, p. 7; *1923*, p. 10.

[4] See ibid. *1925*, p. 8; *1926*, p. 12.

[5] See ibid. *1924*, p. 7.

[6] See ibid. *1929*, p. 24.

[7] Ibid. *1931*, p. 12.

peans and 10 per cent. per annum for Asiatics, and on the annual excess of migration via Mombasa.[1]

The same Note accompanies all subsequent population estimates in the *Colonial Reports*.[2] However, as shown above, this completely absurd scheme which implied a yearly natural increase of over 1,000 for Europeans and over 5,000 for Asiatics was not used in computing the population on 31 December 1931, nor was it used for any subsequent year. The estimates were apparently made by adding (1) an assumed natural increase of 6 per 1,000 for Europeans and 10 per 1,000 for Asiatics, (2) the annual excess of immigrants over emigrants through the Port of Mombasa, and (3) the annual excess of arrivals in Kenya over departures from Kenya by air, road, and rail. The population figures obtained were as follows:[3]

Year	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Year*	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Year*	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*
1932	17,249	51,449	1937	19,211	61,291	1942	28,997	70,445
1933	17,332	50,303	1938	20,894	64,220	1943	22,000	105,500
1934	17,501	51,803	1939	22,808	66,173	1944	23,323	113,211
1935	17,997	53,933	1940	24,596	61,980			
1936	18,269	56,277	1941	26,692	66,284			

I found nowhere an explanation of the great fluctuations in the numbers of Europeans during the war or for the enormous increase in the number of Asiatics in 1943. Movements of troops cannot have been the cause, since the 'figures are exclusive of military personnel not of local origin'.[4] The number of aliens who came during the war was very small.[5] There were in April 1944 54,684 prisoners of war in the Colony.[6] but they do not, of course, affect the above figures.

3. *Population Density*

The land area of Kenya is given as 219,730 square miles and the population for 31 December 1938 as 3,365,888. There were then on an average 15·3 persons to the square mile. But the density varies enormously in the various sections of the Colony. The semi-desert Northern Frontier District which comprises three-sevenths of the total area had only 0·8 inhabitants to the square mile while in the rest of the Colony the average density was 26. In the Nyanza Province it reached 123.[7] The three Kikuyu and the three Kavirondo districts which comprise only 4 per cent. of the total area comprise about one-half of the total population. 'When every allow-

[1] Ibid. *1932*, p. 12.

[2] See ibid. *1933*, p. 12; *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 9; *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 10.

[3] See ibid. *1933*, p. 12; *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 9; *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 10; Labour Department, *Migration Summary for 1940*, p. 1; *Medical Report 1942*, p. 7; *1943*, p. 5; *1944*, p. 6.

[4] Ibid. *1942*, p. 7; *1943*, p. 5; *1944*, p. 6.

[5] See *Post-War Employment Committee Report* (1943), pp. 15–16; *Legislative Council Debates 1944, Second Session*, col. 168.

[6] See ibid.

[7] See in this connexion *Labour Section Annual Report 1939*, p. 2: 'The Nyanza Province continued to be the chief source of the labour supply. . . . the gross total of natives employed from the Province must be approximately 100,000.'

TABLE 2. *Population Density, Kenya, 31 December 1938*[1]

Districts	*Land area sq. m.*	*Water area sq. m.*	*Natives*	*Non-natives*[2]	*Total*	*Persons per sq. m. land area*
Digo	3,027	25	54,429	652	55,081	18·2
Malindi, Kilifi	4,915	42	113,277	1,917	115,194	23·4
Tana River	9,968	—	12,862	219	13,081	1·3
Lamu	2,430	119	16,299	2,711	19,010	7·8
Mombasa (Island and Mainland)	81	25	39,348	21,986	61,334	757·2
Teita	6,013	6	37,471	420	37,891	6·3
Coast Province Total	26,434	217	273,686	27,905	301,591	11·4
Nairobi	246	—	48,500	24,773	73,273	297·9
Thika, Kiambu	1,071	—	150,886	40	150,926	140·9
Fort Hall	1,208	—	199,210	521	199,731	165·3
South Nyeri	1,476	—	138,307	359	138,666	93·9
North Nyeri	2,019	—	16,116	4,091	20,207	10·0
Embu	1,308	—	151,236	130	151,366	115·7
Meru	3,286	—	215,184	345	215,529	65·6
Machakos	5,032	—	258,335	1,314	259,649	51·6
Kitui	18,270	—	170,375	179	170,554	9·3
Central Province Total	33,916	—	1,348,149	31,752	1,379,901	40·7
Laikipia-Samburu[3]	3,193	2	31,012	309	31,321	..
Nakuru, Naivasha, Ravine, Baringo	7,696	190	91,563	5,121	96,684	12·6
Nandi	735	—	48,391	150	48,541	66·0
Uasin Gishu	1,676	—	21,280	3,299	24,579	14·7
Elgeyo	1,144	—	36,854	12	36,866	32·2
Trans-Nzoia	1,155	—	32,811	1,619	34,430	29·8
Rift Valley Province Total	15,599	192	261,911	10,510	272,421	..
Central Kavirondo	1,762	658	394,300	519	394,819	224·1
North Kavirondo	2,684	—	354,139	686	354,825	132·2
South Kavirondo	2,956	797	339,585	613	340,198	115·1
Kisumu-Londiani	764	2	27,502	3,233	30,735	40·2
Kericho	1,617	—	86,533	777	87,310	54·0
Nyanza Province Total	9,783	1,457	1,202,059	5,828	1,207,887	123·5
Northern Frontier District[3]	93,568	2,064	77,445	136	77,581	0·8
Turkana	8,813	5	59,326	16	59,342	6·7
West Suk	1,821	—	18,575	28	18,603	10·2
Turkana District Total	10,634	5	77,901	44	77,945	7·3
Masai Province Total	15,177	55	39,623	475	40,098	2·6
Extension from Uganda	14,619	1,240	—	—	—	—
Total	219,730	5,230	3,280,774	85,114	3,365,888	15·3

[1] Computed from *Kenya Blue Book 1938*, pp. 214-15; *Report on Native Affairs 1938*, pp. 95–6.

[2] The figures for the various Districts are taken from the 1931 census, but the total is the official estimate for 31 Dec. 1938.

[3] The Samburu area is included in the Northern Frontier District area.

ance has been made for differences in fertility and other factors which affect the matter, the conclusion cannot be avoided that a notable degree of maldistribution exists.'[1]

The population of the capital Nairobi was estimated at the end of 1938 at 65,000 (40,000 Natives, 6,500 Europeans, 18,500 Asiatics).[2]

The population may have increased in the following years, but it was reduced in 1943.

About the same time [February 1943] . . . it was decided by Government that on account of insufficient food being available to feed the natives in the towns a number of them should be repatriated to the native reserves. From the evidence of the Municipal Native Affairs Officer, Nairobi, it appears that about 10,000 natives, including women and children, were repatriated from Nairobi, about 5,000 to 6,000 being women and children.[3]

The population of the municipal area of Mombasa is about as large as that of Nairobi.

		Natives	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Arabs*	*Goans*	*Others*	*Total*
Island	1931[1] .	21,352	1,123	11,847	6,683	1,526		42,531
,,	1937[2] .	28,388	1,316	12,932	7,715	1,421	559	52,331
Mainland	1931[1] .	13,986	92	192	455	68		14,793
Total	1931[1] .	35,338	1,215	12,039	7,138	1,594		57,324

[1] Census figures taken from *Report of Commissioner for Local Government 1938*, p. 38.
[2] See *Report on a Malaria Survey* (1939), p. 7.

The Report on a Malaria Survey of Mombasa (1939) makes the following comment on the 1937 estimate:

A census of the population of Mombasa Island was made in 1931, but there would seem to be no doubt that the population has been gradually increasing since the census year, and while the estimation of the population in an inter-censal year on Mombasa Island with its large floating population is a matter of difficulty,[4] the following approximate figures for 1937 are furnished by the Administration:— . . .

The population of the whole municipal area is even more difficult to estimate, but having cognizance of the above figures is probably about 60,000.[5]

III. Composition of the Native Population

Country of Origin. According to estimates of the Native Affairs Department for 1932 and 1933, 'Kenya Natives' numbered 2,944,218 and 2,984,486 respectively; 'Uganda Tanganyika & Alien Natives resident in Kenya' 22,775 and 23,159 respectively.[6] The Committee on Conscription of African Labour, in its Report dated 26 January 1942, put the number

[1] *Report of Kenya Land Commission* (1933), p. 351.
[2] See *Report of Commissioner for Local Government 1938*, p. 12.
[3] *Food Shortage Commission of Inquiry Report, 1943*, p. 61. However, the Blue Books (Section 15) give as native population of Nairobi (including Kiambu Settled area) in 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944 55,730, 63,246, 76,060, and 88,500 respectively.
[4] See also *Report of Commissioner for Local Government 1938*, p. 34: 'No exact figures of native population were procurable. It is probable that the population of employed natives with their dependents is about 32,000. Those coming to and from the town daily number several thousands.'
[5] *Report on a Malaria Survey*, pp. 6–7.
[6] See Native Affairs Department, *Report 1932*, p. 185; *1933*, p. 173.

of Kenya Natives at 3,412,158 and the number of Non-Kenya Natives at 26,548.[1] The number of aliens has apparently increased since.[2]

Sex and Age. In 1927 the Statistician to the Conference of East African Governors said:

> There is no advantage in shewing the proportion of the sexes in the native population as the methods of obtaining this value have varied so considerably in the past.[3]

From 1928 on the method of obtaining this value was to assume, on the authority of Sir Arthur Newsholme, that the males constitute 47 per cent. of the population.[4] If this estimate were correct, there would be 113 females to 100 males, and something like 120 women to 100 men. However, the data for 1931 submitted to the Kenya Land Commission do not show such a preponderance of adult females.[5]

[1] See *Report of the Committee*, p. 21. The estimated alien natives in 1932 (22,775) constituted 0·768 per cent. of all natives. The figures for 1933 (23,159) and 1942 (26,548) were evidently obtained by estimating the proportion of aliens at exactly 0·77 per cent.

[2] The Committee estimated the *total* number of Non-Kenya Natives in civil employment at 11,000. On 31 Dec. 1942 the *registered* Non-Kenya Natives in civil employment numbered 8,270; see *Labour Department Annual Report 1942*, p. 7. According to the 'Labour Census' which 'was held in respect of all African labour at work or on strength on the 30th November, 1944' the distribution of Kenya Natives and Non-Kenya Natives was apparently as follows:

	Kenya Natives	*Non-Kenya Natives*
Registered (Kipandi) natives who were voluntary workers on monthly contracts or 30-day ticket	235,330	10,066
Absentees (sick, on leave, and absent without leave) employed by private employers	19,430	413
Wa-toto (unregistered juveniles) on monthly contracts or 30-day ticket	42,588	1,327
Daily paid casual labour—men, women and children at work on the census date	17,240	438
Resident labourers—men, women and children at work on the census date	69,200	264
African females on monthly contracts in non-agricultural employment	1,429	216
Total	385,217	12,724

(See *Special Labour Census 1944*, pp. 1, 4, 8, 12–14.)

[3] *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part 1, p. 21.

[4] See Native Affairs Department, *Report 1928*, pp. 138–9; *1929*, p. 117; *1931*, p. 165; *1932*, pp. 184–5; *1933*, p. 173. The figures of the total male and total female population in 1931 given in the *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire* (see, for example, *1928–1937*, p. 3) were evidently likewise obtained by adding to the enumerated male non-native population 47 per cent. of the estimated native population and to the enumerated female non-native population 53 per cent. of the estimated native population. See also in this connexion Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 5: 'The total Native population is estimated at 3,024,975, the males numbering 1,420,738 and the females 1,604,237. The ratio of males to females is approximately 94 to 100, a relation which is of importance in connection with the Hut and Poll Tax . . .' Here again the ratio of males to females was 'estimated' at 47 to 53 (or 94 to 106, not 94 to 100).

The reports of the Native Affairs Department, from 1928 on, say that the authority for this percentage (and for the percentage of males between 15 and 40; see p. 153, below) 'is Sir Arthur Newsholme'; the *Report of the Committee on Conscription of African Labour* (1942) says (p. 21) that the authority 'is Sir Arthur Newsholme—"Vital Statistics".' Actually Newsholme (*The Elements of Vital Statistics*, pp. 62–3) merely showed that according to 'the provisional figures of estimated age-distribution of the population of England and Wales in June 1921' 4,777 out of 10,000 people were males and 5,223 females. (The low proportion of males was, of course, due to the preceding war.)

[5] See Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 973; vol. ii, p. 1300; vol. iii, pp. 2268, 2351.

Tribe or Districts	*Men*	*Women*	*Children*	*Total*
Kikuyu[1] . . .	175,840	180,341	247,516	603,697
Kitui District . .	38,768	41,284	60,535	140,587
Central Kavirondo . .	111,368	116,174	133,636	361,178
North Kavirondo . .	109,977	114,511	128,501	352,989
South Kavirondo[2] . .	81,055	95,561	122,733	299,349
Total . . .	517,008	547,871	692,921	1,757,800

[1] Kikuyu resident in and outside the Reserve.

[2] 'The constant absence of a large number of young men from the District accounts for the great disparity between the sexes.'

These data, which cover about three-fifths of the total population, indicate a ratio of 106 women to 100 men.[1]

Following the general instructions issued in 1924, the number of children in Central Kavirondo was assumed to be 37 per cent. of the total population. 'The low rate of increase does not warrant a higher figure.'[2] In North Kavirondo the returns for 1932 showed a proportion of 37·2 per cent. 'Experience indicates that the hut counters' estimates of children are unreliable, and it would appear probable that a figure of about 39 per cent. would be more consonant with the rate of population increase.'[3] In South Kavirondo children have been assumed to constitute 41 per cent. of the total population. 'It is somewhat doubtful whether an allowance of 40 per cent. or 41 per cent. should be made for children, but the latter figure has been chosen and could be supported by argument.'[4] It is obvious that all these percentages—37, 39, 41—are nothing but wild guesses. The ratio of children to adults bears no relation to the rate of increase in the number of adults. It depends on fertility, mortality, and migrations; it may be very high even if the number of adults decreases, and it may be very low even if the number of adults increases.[5]

The proportion of males between 15 and 40, again 'on the authority' of Sir Arthur Newsholme, has been estimated from 1928 onwards at 20·1 per cent. of the total population.[6] The proportion of males 16 years and over was estimated by the Chief Native Registrar in 1931 at 59 per cent. of the adult male population[7] or 27·73 per cent. of the total population

[1] It should be realized, of course, that the above figures may be wide of the mark. They are based on the numbers of men and married women, as ascertained at the hut tax census. In the Kavirondo Districts the total number of women was obtained by adding 1·5 per cent. to the number of wives and some such procedure was followed apparently also in the other Districts. In 1944 the Labour Department estimated the ratio of females to 100 males for Kavirondo at 104; see *Legislative Council Debates 1944–5, Third Session*, col. 674.

[2] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 2268. [3] Ibid., p. 2270.

[4] Ibid., p. 2351. For the Kikuyu and for the Kitui District the proportion given is also above 40 per cent.

[5] Ireland, where the population has been decreasing for a century, has a much higher proportion of children than England, where the population has been increasing for two centuries.

[6] See Native Affairs Department, *Report 1928*, pp. 138–9; *1929*, p. 117; *1931*, p. 165; *1932*, pp. 184–5; *1933*, p. 173; *Report of the Committee on Conscription of African Labour* (1942), p. 21. Newsholme showed (p. 62) that in England and Wales, in 1911, 201 out of 1,000 persons were males between 15 and 40. All estimates of available labour in Kenya have been made on the assumption that the proportion of males between 15 and 40 is the same as it was in England and Wales in 1911.

[7] See p. 142 above.

(assuming the males constituted 47 per cent. of the total population), but in 1934 at only about 25·5 per cent. of the total population.[1] These various percentages can hardly be reconciled with one another. It is unlikely that the difference between the number of males of 15–40 and the number of those 16 and over was actually so small.[2] Furthermore, if the proportion of children was 37 per cent. of the total population and the proportion of men 25·5 or 27·7 per cent., the proportion of women would have been 35·3 or 37·5 per cent., and the total females would necessarily have constituted more than 53 per cent. of the total population. The official estimates regarding the sex and age composition, which form the basis of all official estimates of the available labour supply and of the effectiveness of the Native Registration Ordinance, are mere guesses. Nothing whatsoever is known about the sex and age composition of the native population as a whole.

From 1928 on the 'Agricultural Censuses' show the number of native squatters resident on European holdings, distinguishing men, women, and children.[3]

	31 July 1928	*31 July 1930*	*28 Feb. 1931*	*28 Feb. 1932*	*28 Feb. 1933*	*28 Feb. 1934*	*29 Feb. 1936*	*28 Feb. 1938*
Men	32,969	31,958	30,650	30,247	30,933	28,939	24,872	28,061
Women	33,329	32,068	33,350	32,294	33,383	31,035	26,908	29,711
Children	45,384	46,130	49,176	48,029	50,124	44,398	41,492	46,382
Total	111,682	110,156	113,176	110,570	114,440	104,372	93,112[1]	104,154

[1] Total does not tally with items.

I found no such data for 1939–42, but the report on the Special Labour Census of 1944 gives the following figures:[4]

Men		*Women*		*Children*		*Total*	
1943	*1944*	*1943*	*1944*	*1943*	*1944*	*1943*	*1944*
38,515	43,332	46,545	52,979	79,734	96,891	164,794	193,202

The percentage of children among the total squatting population increased from 41 in 1928 to 45 in 1938 and to 50 in 1944. The ratio of children to 100 women rose from 136 in 1928 to 156 in 1938, and to 183 in 1944. But it is doubtful whether the returns by the European landholders are trustworthy enough to permit the drawing of any final conclusions.

Probably more reliable results were obtained at the 1932 inquiry in the Digo District (coast belt and most of the Shimba Hills area). At the special count which was made there by sanitary teachers a quite detailed distinction by age was effected.

[1] See p. 142 above.

[2] A recent estimate by the Labour Department puts the proportion of males between 16 and 45 in Kavirondo at only 18·9 per cent. of the total population; see *Legislative Council Debates 1944–5, Third Session*, col. 674.

[3] See *Agricultural Census 1928*, p. 49; *1931*, pp. 1, 52; *1932*, p. 48; *1933*, p. 49; *1936*, pp. 1, 24; *1938*, pp. 1, 25.

[4] See *Special Labour Census 1944*, p. 2.

Sex	0–7 months	8–12 months	1–5 years	6–8 years	9–12 years	13–16 years	Young adults	Middle-aged	Aged	Total
Males .	575	759	1,987	1,450	1,338	935	3,943	1,497	491	12,975
Females .	658	823	1,977	1,517	676	758	4,812	1,422	369	13,012
Total .	1,233	1,582	3,964	2,967	2,014	1,693	8,755	2,919	860	25,987

The results are most startling. The children constitute 52 per cent. of the total population, and there are two children to each adult female. Unless one assumes that many adults have escaped enumeration this investigation proves conclusively that the population concerned contains an enormous proportion of children.[1] Unfortunately the scope of the investigation is too small to permit of any generalization.[2]

Conjugal Condition. Estimates of the conjugal condition of men and women in some areas of the Colony in 1931 were submitted to the Kenya Land Commission by various District Commissioners.[3]

District	Men		Women		Ratios			
	Married	Single	Married	Single	Householder	Bachelors	Wives	Spinsters
Kiambu Reserve . .	21,976	6,626	31,137	903	100	30	142	4
Fort Hall Reserve .	32,793	21,916	48,707	567	100	67	149	2
Nyeri Reserve . .	35,985	24,417	65,374	752	100	68	182	2
Total in Reserve . .	90,754	52,959	145,218	2,222	100	58	160	2
Total outside Reserve .	20,513	11,614	32,415	486	100	57	158	2
Total Kikuyu . .	111,267	64,573	177,633	2,708	100	58	160	2
Central Kavirondo. .	67,558	43,810	114,457	1,717	100	65	169	3
North Kavirondo . .	109,977		112,819	1,692	100	36	139	2
South Kavirondo . .	81,055		94,149	1,412	100	18	137	2

These figures suggest that among tribes comprising more than one-half of the total population of the Colony, 69 per cent. of the males over 16 and 98·5 per cent. of the females over 16 were married. But the unbelievably high percentage of married women is simply due to the fact that the District Commissioners, in making their estimates, started from the assumption that only about 1·5 per cent. were unmarried. However, the estimates of the numbers of husbands and wives are probably not very far from the truth. They show that the ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 152; it

[1] It might be argued that the age figures inspire little confidence, and some are certainly dubious. Thus the first two groups, 'Babies not yet having teeth', and 'Babies having teeth but unable to walk', probably do not cover 7 and 5 months respectively since the second group comprises more children than the first. It is obvious furthermore that far too few girls have been allocated to age 9–12, and that some girls have been counted as young adults who should have been listed as children. But none of these mistakes tends to raise the number of children at the cost of adults.

[2] *Medical Report 1933*, in discussing the results of this investigation, says (p. 25): 'The population of the Digo district is fairly representative of the population of the coast as a whole, that is, of some quarter of a million people.' But quite apart from the fact that the investigation covered only one-half of the population of the Digo District, it is difficult to see how it can be contended that the population of this district is fairly representative of the population of the coast as a whole before similar investigations have been made in the other districts of the coast.

[3] See Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 973; vol. iii, pp. 2268–70, 2348, 2351–2.

varied between 137 and 182. Polygamy apparently was frequent still in some areas.[1]

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population

Race. The non-native population enumerated at the censuses of 1921, 1926, and 1931 was as follows:[2]

Year	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Others*	*Total*
1921	9,651	22,822	2,431	10,102	627	45,633
1926	12,529	26,759	2,565	10,557	1,259	53,669
1931	16,812	39,644	3,979	12,166	1,346	73,947

As regards the Europeans the 1926 census report says that 'the totals of this division may be somewhat unduly inflated by the inclusion of a number of French born in Seychelles and of English born in India, who might more appropriately have come under the heading of Other Races'.[3] The 1931 census report states:

> Mauritians, Seychellois, and others known to be of White European extraction, were included among Europeans. Some errors may have been committed in this classification, but generally the individuals forming the 'Coloured' group were known to the enumerators or other persons to whom the enumerators or coders had access.[4]

The figures for Indians include for 1921 the Baluchis while in 1926 the Baluchis (468) were included among the 'Other Races'.[5] In 1931 the Baluchis were apparently classified as Indians or Arabs.

The figures for Arabs are of doubtful value. After having shown that 3,412 of the 6,641 adults and 954 of the 3,461 children had been returned as born in Arabia, the 1921 census report stated:

> It appears that the returns by Arabs are of doubtful accuracy, both as regards the total numbers claiming to be of Arab race, and as to the large proportion stated to have been born in Arabia. It is probable that a considerable number of the so-

[1] Wagner, in 1939, said with regard to North Kavirondo: 'It is generally agreed among the native elders and Europeans of long residence in the country that polygamous marriage among young men is on the increase' (p. 41).

[2] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 9. The figures include the population on board ships, but the census reports do not show clearly the actual numbers. The 1921 report merely states that the returns include 528 sailors and fishermen, 'all Arabs, principally seamen on dhows in coast ports on the census day, together with a number of fishermen along the coast' (ibid. *1921*, p. 9). The 1926 census report estimates that the number of sailors enumerated in 1921 was 353 (see ibid. *1926*, p. 65; see also ibid. *1921*, p. 32); but it seems unlikely that apart from these 353 Arabs there should have been no people on board ships. In 1926 the ships in port carried no passengers (see ibid. *1926*, p. 5). The 'Visitors' in Kilindini Harbour (see ibid., p. 101) numbered 460 (149 Europeans, 301 Indians, no Arabs, 10 Others), and these were all 'persons aboard a ship' (see *Report of the Local Government Commission 1927*, vol. i, p. 274). But how many of the 495 'Visitors' in Mombasa Island were on board ships it is impossible to tell. The 1926 census report (p. 15) speaks of the Arab crews of dhows which were waiting in Mombasa for the change of the monsoon to return to Arabia. They must have been included among the 231 Arab 'Visitors' in Mombasa Island. The 1931 census report (p. 70) shows for Ships in Harbour, Mombasa Island, 336 persons (53 Europeans, 44 Indians, 5 Goans, 206 Arabs, 28 Others), but these figures possibly did not include all persons on board ships in the Colony.

[3] *Census Report 1926*, p. 14. The total numbers of Europeans returned as born in Seychelles and in India were 72 and 486 respectively.

[4] Ibid. *1931*, p. 10. The numbers of persons born in Mauritius, Seychelles, and India and returned as Europeans were 32, 108, and 561 respectively.

[5] See ibid. *1926*, p. 45.

called Arab women are of African race, and there is little doubt that the number of Arab children alleged to have been born in Arabia is exaggerated. There has been considerable immigration of Arabs during the last few years, but it seems doubtful whether this has been sufficient to account for the numbers, especially of children, alleged to have been born in Arabia.[1]

The 1926 report said:

The Arab figures are inclined to fluctuate. The dividing line between the Arab and the Swahili is a narrow one and some enumerators are more generous in their interpretation of the term 'Arab' than others.[2]

The phenomenal increase of 90 per cent. in Lamu, the increase in Digo, and the decrease in Malindi,[3] are certainly not due to migration of population, but may be accounted for partly by the different interpretation of the term 'Arab' and partly to the effects of the application of the Registration of Natives Ordinance to the Coast, whereby many Arabs of doubtful pedigree have changed their nationality. They had no objection to paying the native tax instead of the non-native tax, but they refused to be registered as natives. They preferred to pay an additional amount of Sh. 18 per annum rather than to suffer the indignity of the 'Kipandi'.[4]

1,347 returns gave 'Arabia' as birthplace. It is safe to assume that practically all of them are either Hadramaut Arabs or Arabs of this country, who filled up the form incorrectly by giving the birthplace of their grandfathers instead of their own.[5]

Thus the number of Arabs returned as born in 'Arabia' had dropped from 4,366 in 1921 to 1,347 in 1926, but it rose again to 4,397 in 1931. Part of the differences is evidently due to changes in the methods of classifying the countries of birth[6] but, taken as a whole, the figures for Arabs inspire little confidence, and it is difficult to understand that the author of the 1931 census report came to the conclusion regarding the Arabs:

On the whole, there is not sufficient evidence to doubt the accuracy of any of the three census figures—1921, 1926 and 1931—but, on the contrary, there is reason to believe that they represent the actual conditions within the usual limits of accuracy of census enumeration.[7]

As regards the 'Other Races' the distribution in 1921 and 1926 was as follows:[8]

	1921	*1926*		*1921*	*1926*
Anglo-Indian	200	123	Abyssinian	3	..[2]
Baluchi	—[1]	468	Afghan	—	22
British West Indian	3	12	Chinese	8	14
Mauritian	18	42	Comoran	8	12
South African (Coloured)	14	21	Japanese	1	4
Seychellois	339	459	Malagasi	—	17
Sinhalese	33	35	Syrian	—	7
Other British subjects	—	3[3]	Other foreign subjects	—	15[4]

[1] Baluchis were classified as Indians.
[2] Abyssinians were not enumerated at the 1926 census.
[3] 2 Burgher (Ceylon), 1 Vidmeney (Borneo).
[4] 1 American (Coloured), 3 Egyptian, 1 Javanese, 3 Persian, 1 Tartar, 1 Tibetan, 5 Turk.

[1] Ibid. *1921*, p. 6.
[2] Ibid. *1926*, p. 14.
[3] The number of Arabs had increased between 1921 and 1926 in Lamu from 1,316 to 2,508 and in Digo from 57 to 432 while it had decreased in Malindi from 1,204 to 727 (see ibid., pp. 20–1).
[4] Ibid., p. 15.
[5] Ibid., p. 44.
[6] In 1926, 920 Arabs were listed as born in Hadramaut, 3 in Asir, 8 in Hedjaz, 145 in Oman, 32 in Yemen, and 1,347 in 'Arabia', the total being 2,455.
[7] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6.
[8] See ibid. *1926*, p. 45.

For 1931 the information is less precise. The 'Other Races' comprised 947 'Coloured', 205 'Half-castes', and 194 'Others'.

The 'Coloured' comprise all those who were definitely returned as such and include Coloured Seychellois,[1] Mauritians and Ceylonese.

The classification of half-castes has in all cases been confined to crossing between non-native and native, whenever the parentage of the offspring was stated. The figures refer in consequence only to the existing generation.

The 'Others' in this grouping comprise Chinese, Japanese and any other non-European races.[2]

Somalis were not counted as non-natives.[3]

'The Arabs were the earliest non-natives to settle in the country',[4] and if the official estimate of their number for 1911 (9,100) comes near the truth they constituted 30 years ago three-eighths of the non-native population. But they increased comparatively little in the following two decades[5] and formed not quite one-sixth of the non-natives in 1931.

'After the Arabs in order of time, the Portuguese from Goa appear to have established themselves in certain parts of Kenya.'[6]

The connection of this Coast with Goa dates back to the days of the Portuguese occupation, and the Goan community has been long established. It includes some prominent merchants, and many clerks in Government and commercial offices. The rest are employed in domestic service.[7]

It would be wrong, however, to conclude therefrom that there are any Goan families of long standing in the Colony. At the 1921 census only 3 adult Goans were returned as born in Kenya,[8] and in 1931 the oldest Goan returned as born in the Colony was 32 years of age.[9] The Goans, for several decades, have constituted about 5 per cent. of the non-native population.

Indian immigration began also before the British occupation, but was not considerable until coolies were imported for the construction of the Uganda Railway. The total number of labourers brought from India between 1896 and 1901 (when importation ceased) was 31,983,[10] and the maximum number of coolies employed at one time was about 20,000.[11] In July 1897

[1] The number of Coloured born in Seychelles increased from 401 in 1926 to 559 in 1931. See *Census Report 1926*, p. 47; *1931*, p. 44. [2] Ibid., p. 10. [3] See ibid.

[4] Ibid. p. 5. Sir A. Hardinge, in 1897, put the number of Arabs at 5,855; see *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, pp. 26–7.

[5] It should be realized, however, that the population of Jubaland, ceded to Italy in 1925, included in 1921 1,298 Arabs (see *Census Report 1921*, p. 21). 'It was thought that at the cession to Italy many British subjects would migrate to this Colony, but they have not done so. Trade is brisk, Kismayu is becoming an up-to-date town and the Italian Government has gone out of its way to treat British subjects generously' (ibid. *1926*, p. 14).

[6] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6. [7] Ibid. *1926*, p. 12. [8] See ibid. *1921*, p. 25.

[9] See ibid. *1931*, p. 97. The enormous difference between the Goan and the Arab community may be inferred from the fact that in 1931 only 68 Goans of 20 years and over were returned as born in Kenya against 3,612 Arabs (although probably quite a few Arabs actually born in Kenya reported themselves as born in Arabia).

[10] See *Final Report of the Uganda Railway Committee*, p. 13. Hobley, 'The Romance of the Foundation of Uganda and Kenya', p. xi, says that 'over 35,000 Indian coolies were imported', but this is apparently an overstatement.

[11] The maximum number of labourers employed at the end of any month was 23,090 in April 1901 (see *Report by the Uganda Railway Committee 1901–2*, p. 4). This figure includes an unknown number of native labourers. On 31 Mar. 1901 the number of Indians was 19,742 and the number of natives 2,506 (see ibid. *1900–1*, pp. 1, 4).

Sir A. Hardinge estimated the number of 'Indians and other non-Arab Asiatics' at 7,579.[1] In 1901 the number of Indians certainly exceeded 25,000 (including wives and children). As the construction of the railway approached completion most coolies left the country, but 'some remained and settled as market-gardeners at Nairobi and on the coast as cultivators, and as artisans and traders. From 1900 onwards considerable immigration of traders and artisans from India to Kenya took place.'[2] In 1911 the Indians numbered 10,651 and there were more than twice as many in 1921. They are numerically the most important group of non-natives. They constituted in 1921 and 1926 one-half and in 1931 54 per cent. of the non-native population. Like the Goans they increased considerably through immigration in 1926–31.

The settlement by Europeans, as stated above, began only in this century. In 1921–31 they constituted between one-fifth and one-quarter of the non-native population. But they supply four-fifths of the agriculturists and of the professional workers.[3]

Finally, I shall give here, for what they are worth, the more recent estimates of the distribution of the non-native population by races:[4]

31 Dec.	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Others*	*Total*
1931	16,957	37,196	3,431	11,751	1,374	70,709
1932	17,249	34,966	3,369	11,752	1,362	68,698
1933	17,332	33,735	3,246	11,932	1,390	67,635
1934	17,501	34,955	3,316	12,131	1,401	69,304
1935	17,997	36,461	3,437	12,599	1,436	71,930
1936	18,269	38,325	3,510	12,855	1,587	74,546
1937	19,211	42,368	3,658	13,660	1,605	80,502
1938	20,894	44,635	3,734	14,077	1,774	85,114
1939	22,808	43,195	3,702	15,481	1,795	86,981
1940	24,596	40,405	3,835	15,857	1,883	86,576
1941	26,692	44,126	4,037	18,121		92,976
1942	28,997	47,016	4,529	18,900		99,442
1943	22,000	73,000	6,000	26,500		127,500
1944	23,323	74,085	6,177	32,949		136,534

Birthplace. Of the 16,812 Europeans enumerated in 1931, 2,908 were born in Kenya, 2,475 in the Union of South Africa, 291 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 39 elsewhere in Africa, 8,507 in British possessions in Europe, 304 in Germany, 214 in Italy, 631 elsewhere in Europe, 642 in British possessions in Asia, 34 elsewhere in Asia, 112 in British possessions in America, 173 in the United States of America, 55 elsewhere in America, 355 in British Oceania.

Of the 39,644 Indians 13,095 were born in Kenya, 434 in Zanzibar, 377 in other British possessions in Africa, 42 elsewhere in Africa, 25,590 in

[1] See *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, pp. 26–7.

[2] Hailey, p. 335. See also *Indians in Kenya*, p. 3.

[3] In 1931, 2,522 of the 3,162 non-native agriculturists and 1,124 of the 1,388 non-native professional workers were Europeans; see *Census Report 1931*, pp. 36, 38.

[4] See *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1932*, p. 12; *1934*, p. 12; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 9; *1937*, p. 9; *1938*, p. 10; Labour Department, *Migration Summary for 1940*, p. 1; *Medical Report 1942*, p. 7; *1943*, p. 5; *1944*, p. 6.

TABLE 3. *European Population by Country of Birth, Kenya, 1921, 1926, and 1931*[1]

Country of birth	1921	1926	1931		
			Males	Females	Total
Kenya	1,140	2,063	1,470	1,438	2,908
Mauritius	..	14	20	12	32
Northern Rhodesia	..	..	8	6	14
Nyasaland	..	3	6	1	7
Seychelles	..	72	47	61	108
Southern Rhodesia	..	39[2]	21	11	32
Tanganyika	9	31	20	25	45
Uganda	23	38	30	17	47
Union of South Africa	1,878	2,083	1,304	1,171	2,475
Zanzibar	10	4	1	3	4
Brit. Dependencies in West Africa	3	4[3]	—	—	—
Other Brit. Dependencies in Africa	31[4]	2[5]	1	1	2
Belgian Congo	..	3	—	1	1
Egypt	15	21	17	4	21
Italian Somaliland	..	—	1	1	2
Madagascar	..	—	—	2	2
Portuguese East Africa	..	6	3	6	9
Elsewhere in Africa	11	7[6]	3	1	4
Africa Total	3,120	4,390	2,952	2,761	5,713
England	5,175	4,831	4,812	3,400	8,212
Wales		92			
Scotland		990			
Channel Islands		5			
Isle of Man		4			
Northern Ireland		413	168	93	261
Irish Free State					
Gibraltar	4	3	20	14	34
Malta	9	6			
Austria	3	7	9	5	14
Belgium	14	18	13	12	25
Bulgaria	..	2	1	1	2
Czechoslovakia	..	14	10	2	12
Denmark	23	33	42	28	70
Estonia	..	—	1	1	2
Finland	..	1	37	—	37
France	89	85	56	57	113
Germany	18	105	182	122	304
Greece	18	15	15	2	17
Holland	22	36	42	27	69
Hungary	..	—	1	—	1
Italy	140	146	114	100	214
Lithuania	..	4	6	—	6
Madeira	..	1	—	—	—
Norway	35	38	31	13	44
Poland	..	29	20	13	33
Portugal	1	4	9	5	14
Rumania	..	2	3	—	3
Russia	64[7]	40	30	26	56
Spain	2	5	4	8	12
Sweden	50	46	46	23	69
Switzerland	12	27	9	14	23
Turkey	2	4	7	2	9
Yugoslavia	..	2	—	—	—
Elsewhere in Europe	18	—	—	—	—
Europe Total	5,699	7,008	5,688	3,968	9,656

Country of birth	1921	1926	1931 Males	1931 Females	1931 Total
Aden	..	3	2	2	4
Ceylon	12	19	20	12	32
India	306	486	279	282	561
Palestine	..	9	19	3	22
Other Brit. Dependencies in Asia	11[8]	23[9]	17	6	23
Arabia	..	1	—	2	2
China	7	18	17	8	25
Goa	..	—	—	1	1
Japan	3	1	3	1	4
Persia	..	--	1	1	2
Elsewhere in Asia	3	2[10]	—	—	—
Asia Total	342	562	358	318	676
Canada	31	55	34	32	66
Newfoundland	..	5	1	3	4
West Indies	31	33	22	11	33
Other Brit. Dependencies in America	15	13[11]	7	2	9
Argentina	..	..	12	6	18
Brazil	..	..	5	1	6
Chili	..	..	6	5	11
Mexico	1	—	—	1	1
United States of America	161	152	80	93	173
Elsewhere in America	21	37	12	7	19
America Total	260	295	179	161	340
Australia	157	188	118	112	230
New Zealand	53	69	71	42	113
Other Brit. Dependencies in Oceania	7	2[12]	8	4	12
Oceania Total	217	259	197	158	355
At Sea	5	6	4	4	8
Not stated	8	9	26	38	64
Grand Total	9,651	12,529	9,404	7,408	16,812

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 25; *1926*, pp. 109–10; *1931*, pp. 108–9.
[2] Including Northern Rhodesia.
[3] 3 Ascension, 1 St. Helena.
[4] East and Central African Colonies.
[5] 1 South-West Africa, 1 Sudan.
[6] 1 Portuguese West Africa, 5 Reunion, 1 Tunis.
[7] Including Poland.
[8] Including 4 Cyprus.
[9] 1 Andaman Islands, 10 Cyprus, 7 Federated Malay States, 2 Hong Kong, 3 Straits Settlements.
[10] 1 Dutch East Indies, 1 Siam.
[11] 9 British Guiana, 3 British Honduras, 1 Falkland Islands.
[12] 1 Fiji Islands, 1 Samoa.

India, 34 in other British possessions in Asia, 40 elsewhere in Asia. The proportion of Indians not born in British territory is negligible.

Of the 3,979 Goans 892 were born in Kenya, 38 in other British possessions in Africa, 7 elsewhere in Africa, 2,857 in Goa, 170 in other British possessions in Asia.

Of the 12,166 Arabs 7,225 were returned as born in Kenya, 109 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 75 elsewhere in Africa, 4,397 in Arabia,[1] 273 in Aden, 50 in other British possessions in Asia, 23 elsewhere in Asia.

[1] This, as said above, is apparently an overstatement.

TABLE 4. *Asiatic Population by Country of Birth, Kenya, 1931*[1]

Country of birth	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Others*
Kenya	13,095	892	7,225	468
Mauritius	6	—	1	54
Northern Rhodesia	—	—	—	2
Nyasaland	—	—	—	1
Seychelles	5	4	3	559
Tanganyika	168	3	20	4
Uganda	169	9	12	12
Union of South Africa	29	—	1	14
Zanzibar	434	22	61	2
Other Brit. Dep. in Africa	—	—	11	—
Abyssinia	1	—	—	—
Belgian Congo	—	4	—	—
Egypt	—	—	5	—
Italian Somaliland	13	—	64	2
Madagascar	22	—	5	—
Portuguese East Africa	2	1	—	—
Elsewhere in Africa	4	2	1	7
Africa Total	13,948	937	7,409	1,125
Europe Total	—	—	—	15[2]
Aden	20	—	273	—
Ceylon	14	4	9	28
India	25,590	166	28	57
Palestine	—	—	—	1
Other Brit. Dep. in Asia	—	—	13	1
Afghanistan	3	—	—	12
Arabia	13	—	4,397	4
China	—	—	—	26
Goa	22	2,857	17	2
Irak	2	—	3	2
Japan	—	—	—	19
Java	—	—	1	—
Persia	—	—	—	31
Syria	—	—	2	9
Asia Total	25,664	3,027	4,743	192
America Total	—	—	—	4[3]
At Sea	—	—	1	1
Not stated	32	15	13	9
Grand Total	39,644	3,979	12,166	1,346

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 110–12.
[2] 1 British Mediterranean Possessions, 4 France, 5 Italy, 5 Turkey.
[3] 2 British West Indies, 1 Other British Dependencies in America, 1 elsewhere in America.

TABLE 5. *Europeans born within and outside Kenya, by Age and Sex, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Born in Kenya		Born outside Kenya		Total	Age (Years)	Born in Kenya		Born outside Kenya		Total
	M.	F.	M.	F.			M.	F.	M.	F.	
0	135	138	17	15	305	14	33	30	26	36	125
1	133	120	32	31	316	15	28	31	27	35	121
2	137	111	51	34	333	16	26	31	37	39	133
3	112	110	44	33	299	17	30	43	52	25	150
4	97	90	49	43	279	18	27	29	70	45	171
5	88	85	43	60	276	19	20	27	75	51	173
6	92	103	50	53	298	20–24	58	65	797	437	1,357
7	79	84	57	59	279	25–29	17	19	1,175	835	2,046
8	81	68	50	53	252	30–34	9	3	1,078	987	2,077
9	70	57	65	43	235	35–39	1	2	1,052	878	1,933
10	58	65	55	66	244	40 and over	—	—	2,701	1,841	4,542
11	49	34	43	47	173	Not stated	23[2]	16[2]	216[3]	147[3]	402
12	40	43	31	43	157	Total	1,471	1,437	7,933	5,971	16,812
13	28	33	40	35	136						

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 95–7.
[2] 0–9 years 11 M., 5 F.; 10–19 years 4 M., 6 F.; 20–49 years 8 M., 5 F.
[3] 0–9 years 3 M., 1 F.; 10–19 years 3 M., 6 F.; 20–49 years 210 M., 140 F.

Years of Residence. 'A record of the years of residence in Kenya has been secured for the whole non-native population, for the first time, in the 1931 Census.'[1] The author of the report has taken great pains in showing the results of this inquiry by classifying the non-native population according to years of residence, race, decennial age groups, and sex.[2] Unfortunately the figures are not conclusive because 24 per cent. of the non-natives did not state the period of their residence in the Colony, and because the results were not shown separately for those born outside Kenya. To give one example. Of the 73,947 non-natives, 28,054 stated that they had resided less than 5 years in Kenya. Since 17,908 did not state the period of their residence in the Colony, the number of non-natives who had actually resided less than 5 years in Kenya was anywhere between 28,054 and 45,962. But not all of these were immigrants; over 8,000 were children under 5 born in Kenya.[3] Thus the total number of immigrants (and visitors) who had resided less than 5 years in Kenya was between 20,000 and 38,000. Since the total number of immigrants (and visitors) was 49,372, it is impossible to tell whether the proportion of recent immigrants was large or small.

Nationality. Of the 16,812 Europeans, 14,556 were returned as British born, 813 as 'South African Dutch', 153 as British Naturalized, 314 as Germans, 202 as Italians, 87 as French, and 687 as of another nationality. The census report makes the following comment:

> The problems connected with nationalities are so difficult and varied, and in reality so little understood by the people themselves, that any classification based on the information given, other than birthplace, is subject to criticism.

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 48. [2] See ibid., pp. 114–18. [3] See ibid., pp. 96–7.

In the tables of birthplaces, the population is shown under the main race classifications adopted in the census, under sex and some of the main nationalities in which the Kenya Administration is interested, i.e., South African Dutch, French, Italian, German, British Born and British Naturalized. All others are classified as 'Foreigners born in the British Empire' and 'Foreigners born outside the British Empire'. The places of birth, which are tabulated in great detail, must be taken to indicate the nationalities to which these two last divisions belong.[1]

The last sentence is evidently based in part on a mistake. The birthplace of the foreigners (other than French, German, and Italians) who are born in the British Empire does not provide the slightest indication of their nationality. But even as to the foreigners born outside the British Empire the birthplace is no reliable guide to their nationality. It may suffice to mention that of the 72 non-British born in France only 56 were French.

Of the 39,644 Indians all but 16 were British born. On the other hand, only 211 of the 3,979 Goans were British born, but 912 of the foreigners were born in the British Empire (735 in Kenya). Of the 12,166 Arabs 5,492 were British born, 92 British naturalized, and 6,582 foreigners,[2] of whom 2,750 were born in the British Empire (2,625 in Kenya). Of the 1,346 'Others' 1,169 were British born, 5 British naturalized, and 172 foreigners, of whom 44 were born in the British Empire.[3]

TABLE 6. *Europeans by Country of Birth and Nationality, Kenya, 1931*[1]

Country of birth	British				Foreigners				
	British born	*British Naturalized*	*South African Dutch*	*Total*	*French*	*German*	*Italian*	*Others*	*Total*
BORN IN BRITISH EMPIRE									
Kenya	2,499	10	303	2,812	5	12	7	72	96
Union of S. Africa	1,957	26	485	2,468	—	4	—	3	7
Elsewhere in Africa	239	4	24	267	17	—	3	4	24
Europe	8,488	7	—	8,495	--	1	—	11	12
Asia	615	5	—	620	2	12	—	8	22
America, Oceania	467	—	—	467	—	—	—	—	—
Not stated	63	—	—	63	—	—	1	—	1
Total	14,328	52	812	15,192	24	29	11	98	162
BORN OUTSIDE BRITISH EMPIRE									
France	33	8	—	41	56	5	2	9	72
Germany	9	7	—	16	—	272	—	16	288
Italy	7	2	—	9	1	1	179	24	205
Elsewhere in Europe	53	72	—	125	1	4	1	387	393
Elsewhere	119	11	1	131	5	3	9	153	170
At Sea	7	1	—	8	—	—	—	—	—
Total	228	101	1	330	63	285	191	589	1,128
Grand Total	14,556	153	813	15,522	87	314	202	687	1,290

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 108–9.

Sex. Among the Europeans there were in 1921 66 females to 100 males, in 1926 74, and in 1931 79. Among the Indians the ratios were 46, 51, and

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 43.

[2] How differently nationality has been treated at the various censuses may be inferred from the fact that in 1926 only 386 Arabs were listed as foreign subjects and 10,171 as British subjects (see ibid. *1926*, p. 46).

[3] See ibid. *1931*, pp. 110–12.

TABLE 7. *Non-Native Population by Race, Sex, and Age, Kenya, 1921, 1926, and 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Europeans						Indians		Goans		Arabs		Others		Total		Total
	Males 1921	Females 1921	Males 1926	Females 1926	Males 1931	Females 1931	Males 1931	Females 1931	Males 1931	Females 1931	Males 1931	Females 1931	Males 1931	Females 1931	Males 1931	Females 1931	Total 1931
0–4	462	426	696	662	807	725	2,998	3,030	306	302	628	594	124	114	4,863	4,765	9,628
5–9	357	359	441	454	675	665	2,275	2,107	171	197	815	658	105	81	4,041	3,708	7,749
10–14	203	235	347	330	403	432	2,042	1,266	38	48	816	374	62	53	3,361	2,173	5,534
15–19	213	199	328	298	392	356	2,323	1,437	61	82	667	460	52	54	3,495	2,389	5,884
20–24	475	306	586	364	855	502	3,461	1,791	380	155	636	441	53	58	5,385	2,947	8,332
25–29	869	510	849	640	1,192	854	3,198	1,299	434	156	628	446	70	67	5,522	2,822	8,344
30–34	925	550	967	718	1,087	990	2,840	913	378	122	697	442	70	47	5,072	2,514	7,586
35–39	776	443	904	631	1,053	880	2,129	544	353	51	525	262	76	48	4,136	1,785	5,921
40–44	619	323	721	400	920	632	1,521	406	291	26	562	339	37	24	3,331	1,427	4,758
45–49	409	184	577	326	665	423	953	250	151	7	311	145	28	22	2,108	847	2,955
50–54	232	139	345	205	490	313	593	183	80	3	368	223	22	13	1,553	735	2,288
55–59	134	78	193	126	293	197	193	80	41	1	139	58	16	11	682	347	1,029
60–64	74	48	118	88	171	134	247	119	23	1	213	140	7	3	661	397	1,058
65–69	31	34	73	47	83	69	146	55	8	1	87	22	3	3	327	150	477
70–74	20	17	32	19	45	39	103	36	2	—	110	51	1	1	261	127	388
75–79			12	17	21	21	44	20	—	—	51	18	—	1	116	60	176
80 and over	1	—	4	4	7	9	48	36	—	—	91	65	1	1	147	111	258
Not stated	—	—	6	1	245[2]	167[2]	694[3]	264[3]	86[4]	24[4]	55[5]	29[5]	10[6]	8[6]	1,090	492	1,582
Total	5,800	3,851	7,199	5,330	9,404	7,408	25,808	13,836	2,803	1,176	7,399	4,767	737	609	46,151	27,796	73,947

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 23; *1931*, pp. 29–30, 83–94.

[2] 0–9 years 14 M., 6 F.; 10–19 years 7 M., 12 F.; 20–49 years 218 M., 145 F.; 50–59 years 5 M., 4 F.; 60 years and over 1 M.

[3] 0–9 years 43 M., 59 F.; 10–19 years 76 M., 40 F.; 20–49 years 572 M., 163 F.; 50–59 years 3 M., 2 F.

[4] 0–9 years 2 M.; 10–19 years 4 M., 6 F.; 20–49 years 80 M., 18 F.

[5] 0–9 years 1 M., 9 F.; 10–19 years 8 M., 2 F.; 20–49 years 44 M., 18 F.; 50–59 years 2 M.

[6] 0–9 years 1 F.; 20–49 years 10 M., 7 F.

TABLE 8. *Non-Native Population by Race, Sex, Age, and Conjugal Condition, Kenya, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Males						Females					
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
EUROPEANS												
0–19	2,298	—	—	—	—	2,298	2,178	18	—	—	—	2,196
20–24	796	56	2	1	—	855	249	244	7	1	1	502
25–29	707	478	3	2	2	1,192	256	582	9	5	2	854
30–34	432	634	13	6	2	1,087	213	760	11	5	1	990
35–39	263	775	9	5	1	1,053	182	664	27	7	—	880
40–44	175	710	23	11	1	920	107	495	25	4	1	632
45–49	127	514	18	6	—	665	63	309	46	3	2	423
50–54	81	383	22	1	3	490	49	217	43	3	1	313
55–59	52	220	18	2	1	293	32	119	46	—	—	197
60–64	29	124	16	2	—	171	11	77	46	—	—	134
65–69	11	63	9	—	—	83	6	28	35	—	—	69
70 and over	14	42	17	—	—	73	6	10	52	1	—	69
Not stated	90	116	7	5	6	224[2]	30	103	13	1	2	149[2]
Total	5,075	4,115	157	41	16	9,404	3,382	3,626	360	30	10	7,408
INDIANS												
0–19	8,837	869	6	1	44	9,757	6,704	1,204	14	5	12	7,939
20–24	1,184	2,182	39	1	55	3,461	70	1,699	16	2	4	1,791
25–29	585	2,512	58	3	40	3,198	23	1,244	29	3	—	1,299
30–34	334	2,386	63	9	48	2,840	11	855	45	—	2	913
35–39	180	1,828	67	4	50	2,129	6	501	33	1	3	544
40–44	212	1,218	63	1	27	1,521	8	321	75	—	2	406
45–49	67	788	80	3	15	953	2	176	69	2	1	250
50–54	39	488	51	5	10	593	3	96	80	—	4	183
55–59	10	157	26	—	—	193	2	41	35	1	1	80
60–64	19	182	39	1	6	247	4	35	80	—	—	119
65–69	11	94	40	—	1	146	1	17	37	—	—	55
70 and over	19	128	46	—	2	195	—	9	81	1	1	92
Not stated	135	416	13	—	11	575[4]	7	147	9	—	2	165[4]
Total	11,632	13,248	591	28	309	25,808	6,841	6,345	603	15	32	13,836

ARABS

0–19	2,777	102	3	—	53	2,935	1,736	324	13	13	11	2,097
20–24	386	206	4	5	35	636	43	359	10	21	8	441
25–29	278	299	7	7	37	628	38	370	13	18	7	446
30–34	218	416	15	5	43	697	17	367	28	19	11	442
35–39	146	342	5	5	27	525	14	195	28	23	2	262
40–44	99	408	22	5	28	562	16	227	67	25	4	339
45–49	55	234	5	4	13	311	6	89	38	9	3	145
50–54	45	291	16	4	12	368	8	117	80	17	1	223
55–59	15	113	8	2	1	139	8	27	23	—	—	58
60–64	26	154	18	8	7	213	7	61	60	10	2	140
65–69	6	67	8	4	2	87	3	10	7	2	—	22
70 and over	26	188	24	9	5	252	7	23	95	6	3	134
Not stated	23	17	2	—	4	46[6]	4	9	3	1	1	18[7]
Total	4,100	2,837	137	58	267	7,399	1,907	2,178	465	164	53	4,767

GOANS AND OTHERS

0–19	922	1	—	—	2	925	875	61	—	—	2	938
20–24	405	24	—	—	4	433	30	182	—	—	1	213
25–29	377	123	2	2	—	504	28	190	3	—	2	223
30–34	167	275	3	—	3	448	10	153	3	—	3	169
35–39	62	356	7	—	4	429	6	86	6	1	—	99
40–44	27	292	4	—	5	328	3	37	7	2	1	50
45–49	18	152	8	—	1	179	1	20	8	—	—	29
50–54	7	90	4	—	1	102	2	3	11	—	—	16
55–59	4	48	3	—	2	57	—	6	6	—	—	12
60–64	2	24	3	1	—	30	—	3	1	—	—	4
65–69	—	10	1	—	—	11	—	1	3	—	—	4
70 and over	1	3	—	—	—	4	—	—	3	—	—	3
Not stated	40	40	2	—	8	90[8]	1	22	2	—	—	25[9]
Total	2,032	1,438	37	3	30	3,540	956	764	53	3	9	1785

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 83–94.
[2] 20–49 years 89 single, 113 married, 5 widowed, 5 divorced, 6 not stated; 50–59 years 1 single, 2 married, 2 widowed; 60 years and over 1 married.
[3] 20–49 years 30 single, 102 married, 11 widowed, 2 not stated; 50–59 years 1 married, 2 widowed, 1 divorced.
[4] 20–49 years 135 single, 414 married, 12 widowed, 11 not stated; 50–59 years 2 married, 1 widowed.
[5] 20–49 years 7 single, 147 married, 8 widowed, 1 not stated; 50–59 years 1 widowed, 1 not stated.
[6] 20–49 years 23 single, 16 married, 1 widowed, 4 not stated; 50–59 years 1 married, 1 widowed.
[7] 20–49 years 4 single, 9 married, 3 widowed, 1 divorced, 1 not stated.
[8] 20–49 years 40 single, 40 married, 2 widowed, 8 not stated.
[9] 20–49 years 1 single, 22 married, 2 widowed.

54 respectively, among the Arabs 61, 75, and 64. The large increase in the proportion of female Europeans was mainly due to the fact that the great disproportion between male and female immigrants has vanished. The enormous drop in the ratio of females to males among Arabs between 1926 and 1931 was apparently due to a large male immigration in that period.[1]

Age. In 1931 the proportion of children (under 15) among the European population was only 22·2 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age (15–49) 28·5 per cent., and the proportion of old people (60 and over) only 3·6 per cent. Of the Europeans born in Kenya 83 per cent. were children, of those born outside Kenya only 9 per cent.

The proportion of children among the Asiatics was 33·9 per cent. (35·0 per cent. among the Indians, 32·1 per cent. among the Arabs). The proportion of women at child-bearing age was 18·1 per cent. (17·2 per cent. among the Indians, 20·9 per cent. among the Arabs). The proportion of old people was 3·1 per cent. (2·2 per cent. among the Indians, 7·0 per cent. among the Arabs).

Conjugal Condition. Of the male Europeans over 15 years in 1931, 42·4 per cent. were bachelors, 55·0 per cent. husbands, 2·6 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans over 15 years 27·8 per cent. were spinsters, 65·2 per cent. wives, 7·0 per cent. widows or divorced.

As regards the conjugal condition of Asiatics the 1931 census report states:

> In the census tables of civil condition and ages, no account has been taken of marriages below the age of 11 years. The Indian child marriages have not, in consequence, been shown. In some cases, infants of one year were returned as married persons.
>
> While a record of this Indian custom may have special economic value in India, it does not appear to be of great interest in Kenya. In some cases, there was considerable uncertainty as to whether the indication 'married' followed by repeat commas on the line referring to the child was really intended to designate marriage of the children or not, and while this uncertainty exists, it was considered preferable to omit all reference to Indian child marriages.[2]

It is to be regretted that the returns on conjugal condition were not entered in the census tables as they appeared on the census forms. The reported numbers of married and widowed children which, as shown in the preceding statement, are incomplete were as follows:

Age (Years)	*Indians*			*Arabs*			*Others*
	Males married	*Females*		*Males married*	*Females*		*Females married*
		married	*widowed*		*married*	*widowed*	
11	9	3	—	2	2	—	—
12	29	20	—	4	9	1	—
13	24	26	1	—	7	—	—
14	48	51	—	4	27	2	1

Of the male Indians over 15 years 24·2 per cent. were bachelors, 72·4 per cent. husbands, and 3·4 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female

[1] The number of male and female Arabs born outside Kenya increased by 1,577 and 513 respectively. See *Census Report 1926*, p. 59; *1931*, p. 96.

[2] Ibid., p. 32.

TABLE 9. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Kenya, 1930–41*[1]

Date	15–19 years		20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
1 Jan.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
1930	30	23	140	41	257	36	244	48	269	41	251	34	144	17	71	7	47	3	37	9	1,490	259
1931	25	16	125	43	298	25	224	51	293	33	254	31	158	15	78	6	48	5	73	17	1,576	242
1932	16	14	109	34	252	42	230	46	234	49	250	35	162	22	72	8	57	4	73	21	1,455	275
1933	10	12	82	32	223	45	219	41	218	51	239	38	140	24	88	11	40	4	63	18	1,322	276
1934	9	14	63	28	197	34	218	37	207	52	228	27	146	29	86	5	26	3	59	15	1,239	244
1935	9	13	57	32	178	32	236	38	190	40	224	37	174	29	86	10	34	1	65	22	1,253	254
1936	19	19	58	30	168	32	234	34	180	48	224	33	160	26	102	16	41	1	66	18	1,252	257
1937	17	14	74	28	150	26	219	46	178	37	189	38	188	29	93	20	50	2	71	17	1,229	257
1938	24	22	64	31	158	28	230	51	198	32	192	41	200	31	97	17	76	4	68	18	1,307	275
1939	31	21	72	42	155	35	227	51	224	33	204	42	187	33	115	22	81	4	85	19	1,381	302
1940	18	10	55	20	150	22	171	21	188	30	153	24	137	28	78	11	18	2	125	30	1,093	198
1941	12	7	52	21	148	19	159	20	190	27	152	25	142	32	82	11	28	2	129	32	1,094	196

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.

Indians over 15 years only 6·4 per cent. were spinsters,[1] 85·2 per cent. wives, and 8·4 per cent. widows or divorced.

Of the male Arabs 15 years and over 38·2 per cent. were bachelors, 57·8 per cent. husbands, and 4·0 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Arabs 15 years and over 10·4 per cent. were spinsters, 69·3 per cent. wives, 15·0 per cent. widows, and 5·3 per cent. divorced.

The ratio of the number of wives to 100 husbands was 88 among Europeans, 48 among Indians, 47 among Goans, 77 among Arabs, and 83 among Others. The proportion of European husbands whose wives resided outside the Colony had become quite small.

European Officials. The number of European officials by sex and age is shown in Table 9 (p. 169).

V. Birth and Death Registration

Registration of births and deaths was provided in the East Africa Protectorate by 'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904'.[2] This Ordinance made compulsory the registration of the birth of a child 'if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent'. For all other births and for all deaths registration was to be optional, but the Commissioner was authorized to extend by Order published in the *Gazette* the provisions relating to compulsory registration to the births and deaths of all persons in the Protectorate of any particular race, class, tribe, or other group, or of all or some of the inhabitants of any particular town, district, or other area. In accordance with this provision an Order of 23 January 1906[3] made compulsory the registration of deaths of 'all persons of European, American or Indian origin or extraction within the Colony' and of 'all natives resident or being within any township area'.[4] But this Order has apparently never been enforced either for Indians or for Natives. The Medical Reports often stated explicitly that registration was compulsory only for Europeans,[5] and from 1922 on they urged quite emphatically the introduction of compulsory registration of native deaths and also births.

[1] Of 5,897 female Indians 20 years and over only 137 were returned as spinsters.

[2] No. 7 of 1904 (20 Apr.), reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1904*, pp. 6–9, and in *Laws of Kenya in Force 1924*, pp. 322–6 (Cap. 29). The Ordinance came into force on 1 Oct. 1904; see Notice of 30 Sept. 1904, reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1904*, p. 76.

[3] Reprinted in *Laws of Kenya, containing Orders, &c., in Force 1927*, vol. i, p. 251.

[4] While this was the first enactment which imposed upon the nearest relatives of a deceased the duty to register his death, notification through persons responsible for the distribution of the property of a deceased had already been prescribed by the following Notice issued on 18 Dec. 1896:

'Whereas it is expedient that a register should be kept of persons dying within the Protectorate.

'Now it is hereby ordered that every Executor, Wazee or other person responsible for the distribution of the property of any persons dying after this date or any person who inherits property through the death of any person shall give notice of the death at the Office of the Sub-Commissioner of the district wherein the death occurs and wherein any property of the deceased may be situate.'

(No. 12 of 1896, reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations up to 1899*, p. 39.)

[5] See, for example, *Medical Report 1913*, p. 32; *1920*, p. 16. See also *Colonial Reports, Kenya*

1922. Registration of births and deaths is not enforced among the non-European population and the absence of this makes the preparation of vital statistics an impossibility. It is evident that a system of births and deaths registration is a necessity, at any rate, in the larger towns, though even if such were instituted immediately reliable figures would not be obtained until the population had become used to the innovation.[1]

1924. It is earnestly to be hoped that measures for the registration of births, deaths and marriages among all sections of the population in, at any rate, the larger townships of Mombasa, Nairobi and Kisumu will be instituted before long by Government.[2]

1925. The necessity for the institution of compulsory and effective registration of births, deaths and marriages in at least the larger townships has been referred to in these Reports on many previous occasions. It may be hoped that as the result of the recent appointment of a statistical officer for the Colony the matter will shortly receive that degree of attention which it merits and which is now long overdue.

Other important matters with regard to which information is required are the vital statistics with regard to employees and squatters on farms and estates and the vital statistics with regard to the population of the native reserves.[3]

1926. No general registration of births and deaths is yet compulsory in Kenya and it is no exaggeration to state that such records as are made are all but valueless for statistical purposes.[4]

Nairobi. . . . registration of births and deaths is a procedure which is required of a relatively small portion of the inhabitants only. . . . The introduction of a system by which the collection of accurate vital statistics can be ensured becomes more urgently necessary from year to year.[5]

Mombasa. There is still no compulsory registration of births other than amongst Europeans. The importance of making registration for all races compulsory in a town such as Mombasa cannot be too strongly emphasized.

To attempt to carry out a scheme for assisting and advising mothers in the proper care of their children without compulsory registration of births is almost impossible, and the work done to-day by the Health Sisters only touches the fringe of the distressing conditions existing amongst the larger sections of the population.[6]

1927. Extended measures for the compulsory registration of births and deaths have been under consideration by Government, but were not introduced during the year. The necessity for the institution of effective registration in the larger townships in particular has been referred to on many previous occasions and until the necessary measures are adopted the compilation of vital statistics of any real value is quite impossible. Under these circumstances it is extremely difficult to gauge the success or otherwise of measures directed towards the improvement of the health of the community.[7]

1922, p. 6. These statements were certainly incorrect. The legal position was as described in the *Report of the Committee on Statistical Services* (1925), p. 2:

'Under the Registration of Births and Deaths Ordinance, 1904, there is compulsory registration of:—

(1) All births of Europeans and Americans;

(2) All deaths of Europeans, Americans and Indians;

(3) All deaths of natives and non-natives in townships.'

[1] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 16. See also ibid. *1923*, p. 5.

[2] Ibid. *1924*, p. 4.

[3] Ibid. *1925*, p. 8. The Report shows furthermore (pp. 9, 66–8) that the lack of birth registration has handicapped efforts of the newly established Welfare Centres to a large extent and has impeded the proper functioning of the Child Welfare Clinic.

[4] Ibid. *1926*, p. 46.

[5] Ibid., p. 10. The report on Kisumu speaks likewise of 'the imperative necessity for the institution of accurate registration of births and deaths' (p. 18).

[6] Ibid., p. 14.

[7] Ibid. *1927*, p. 18. See also ibid., p. 29, and *1928*, p. 23.

Extended measures for the compulsory registration of births and deaths had in fact been under consideration by Government for several years. A Committee on Statistical Services, composed of four members (the Director of Agriculture as chairman, and representatives of the Secretariat, the Native Affairs Department, and the Audit Department), reported in August 1925:

Vital Statistics. There are two aspects of this subject, viz., the number of births, marriages and deaths; and the causes of death. As regards townships there appears to be no reason why registration of these particulars by all races should not be observed, and the Committee notes that Government has in view the action necessary, viz., an order published under Ordinance No. 7 of 1904, to enforce the registration of all births in townships which will complete the statutory provision for the registration of all vital statistics under that head. . . .

In Native Reserves the paucity of medical staff renders it impossible to obtain statistics of causes of death but the Committee recommend that efforts be made to obtain figures as regards numbers of births, marriages and deaths. We realise the difficulties attending registration of births and that progress towards complete registration will be slow and in the present circumstances it should not be attended by compulsion. The registration of marriages is already becoming increasingly popular and there should be no difficulty in securing the registration of deaths. The Committee recommend that action be taken to permit the application of the various Ordinances to native districts, and that the Native Councils be interested in the need for registration and that provision be made for the appointment of sub-registrars who would be the clerks of the Native Councils.[1]

Thereupon, the Acting Governor (Colonial Secretary), in his Address to the Legislative Council, on 11 August 1925, stated:

It is urgent that steps should be taken for the registration of native births and deaths. At present our information with regard to the birth and death rate, both amongst adults and children in the Reserves, is of little value.[2]

Three days later, during the debate on the motion for taking a census of the native and non-native population in 1926,[3] the Acting Colonial Secretary said:

The census will give us also a good strong point for the registration of births, deaths and marriages of natives, which we hope will be a matter very shortly of accomplishment here. They are statistics of the very greatest value to us.[4]

The Director of Agriculture reported:

In respect of vital statistics again we considered that a start should be made on the registration of births, deaths and marriages, which, except in the case of Europeans in this Colony, is not satisfactory. We think a start should be made by requiring that the terms of the Ordinances in respect of the native population should be compulsory in townships, and we hope that at no far distant date circumstances will allow the same action to be taken with the squatter population in the alienated areas.[5]

Actually the Government decided to abandon its more ambitious plan for the time being and to confine compulsory registration of native births and deaths to the towns. A special committee was appointed to report on

[1] *Report of the Committee on Statistical Services*, p. 4.
[2] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, p. 383. See also p. 186 below.
[3] See pp. 128–31 above.
[4] Ibid., p. 523.
[5] Ibid., p. 527.

the restricted scheme, its recommendations were scrutinized by the Government,[1] a Bill was prepared and finally, on 31 October 1927, in presenting the Estimates for 1928 to the Legislative Council, the Colonial Secretary announced:

> An important measure which will be introduced at this Session provides for the Registration of Births and Deaths of Natives in towns.[2]

But the Bill which three weeks earlier had been published in the *Official Gazette*[3] actually did not in any respect enlarge the scope of registration, as fixed in 1904–6, and in particular did not provide for registration of native births in towns. The 'Objects and Reasons' of the Bill, as stated in the *Official Gazette*, were:

> The Bill repeals and re-enacts the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance (Chapter 29 of the Revised Edition) with a number of alterations and additions.
>
> Provision is made for the appointment of Registrars to administer the Ordinance in cases where it is applicable or in areas to which it may be extended by order of the Governor, and for the periodical preparation of various returns and statements.
>
> The periods for compulsory registration are altered, in the case of births, from 3 months to 20 days and, in the case of deaths, from 3 months to 24 hours, and it is provided that notification shall be given of births and deaths within the same periods. It is contemplated that both processes will, in the ordinary case, be concurrent.
>
> The issue of burial permits is introduced to meet the case of areas where provision does not already exist.
>
> The sections of the repealed Ordinance dealing with optional registration are preserved.

It is obvious that if the Bill had provided for an extension of the scope of registration this would have been mentioned among its objects. But, strange to say, the Colonial Secretary remained unaware of the content of the Bill. In moving its second reading, on 28 November 1927, he said:

> The Bill embodies the Bill that has already been in force, but the point of the Bill is that it applies to natives and it is intended to introduce through the medium of this Bill the registration of births and deaths of natives in the towns. The time has not yet come to introduce a measure for the registration of births throughout the whole country amongst the natives of this Colony. It would be very difficult and the state of progress in the different districts is not such as to justify any such step being taken, but for some time Government has had its attention called to the need for obtaining accurate statistics with regard to the birth and death rates in this country amongst the natives. We are, I am afraid, in many respects lamentably behind other countries in regard to our statistics and we are taking steps now to consider and bring those statistics, through the efforts of the Statistician and the Statistical Department up to a standard where they will be really useful in appreciating the growth and progress of the different races in this country. To really ascertain what is happening amongst the native races, whether they are progressing or whether they are decreasing, it is necessary to find out whether the birth rate is being maintained or whether there is a heavy mortality amongst natives. . . . We

[1] See Address of the Acting Governor (Colonial Secretary) to the Legislative Council, 8 Mar. 1927: 'The registration of native births and deaths in the towns has been reported upon by a special committee, whose recommendations are now receiving the attention of Government' (ibid. *1927*, vol. i, p. 15).

[2] Ibid., vol. ii, p. 478.

[3] See *Official Gazette of Kenya*, 11 Oct. 1927, pp. 1183–7.

consider the first step should be taken in respect of the towns and that an Ordinance should be introduced which can, and will, ensure that all births and deaths of natives in towns will be registered. It was thought that it would be advisable to make no special provision for natives but to bring them under the same Rules and Regulations as other races in regard to the registration of births and deaths. . . .

There are various points in connection with this Ordinance which possibly will require further consideration. A point has been raised by the Hon. the Chief Native Commissioner with regard to provision which might be made for carrying out some form of registration, even if not compulsory in some portions of the native reserves. The point has been raised by the Legal Advisors to Government as to whether it would be possible to put provision in this Bill or provision to enable portions of its requirements to be carried out in the native reserves, because in some respects it might be difficult to introduce portions only of the Bill in the native reserves. If this Bill passes its second reading it is proposed to move that it should be referred to a select committee.[1]

The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, which submitted its report on 17 May 1928.[2] At the meeting in Committee on 19 May 1928 the Colonial Secretary moved various amendments to the Bill. In pursuance of the demand of the Indian Elected Member[3] he moved that registration be made compulsory for Asiatic births. He moved furthermore that the words fixing the time within which births and deaths are to be notified (20 days and 24 hours respectively) be deleted, and that births and deaths should be notified 'within such time as may be from time to time prescribed by the Rules', leaving it to the discretion of the Governor in Council to make such Rules if he wished to do so. These amendments were all accepted.[4]

'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1928',[5] which repealed the Ordinance of 1904 and implicitly also the Order of 1906, was enacted on 9 June 1928, but was only put into force after having been amended a year later by an Ordinance[6] which provided that the Governor should appoint a Principal Registrar of Births and Deaths. The motive for this amendment was to facilitate the enforcement of the registration of native deaths. Prior to the enactment of this amendment registration of native births and deaths had been under the administration of the Registrar General of Births and Deaths, an official whose other duties brought him hardly in contact with natives.[7] In his report for the year 1927 he had said:

I would . . . like to point out the futility of registering native births, deaths and

[1] *Legislative Council Debates 1927*, vol. ii, pp. 635–7.
[2] See ibid. *1928*, vol. i, p. 203.
[3] See ibid. *1927*, vol. ii, pp. 637–9.
[4] See ibid. *1928*, vol. i, pp. 281–3.
[5] No. 2 of 1928, 'An Ordinance to Provide for the Notification and Registration of Births and Deaths and other Matters incidental thereto', reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1928*, pp. 7–13.
[6] No. 6 of 1929 (8 July), 'Births and Deaths Registration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1929', reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1929*, pp. 17–18. The Ordinance of 1928 was amended again (in a minor point) by 'the Births and Deaths Registration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1931' (No. 25, 8 Sept.), reprinted ibid. *1931*, p. 161; see also *Legislative Council Debates 1931*, vol. ii, p. 374.
[7] The Notice of 30 Sept. 1904 (see p. 170 above) announced the appointment of 'the First Secretary to the Administration to be the Registrar General of Births and Deaths for the East Africa Protectorate'; by General Notice No. 51 of 1913 (reprinted in *Ordinances and Regulations 1913*, Part II, p. 45) 'the Officer for the time being holding the Office of Assistant Chief Secretary' was appointed 'Registrar General of Births and Deaths, in the place of the First Secretary to the administration'. But Notice No. 380 of 1924 (reprinted in *Laws of Kenya, containing Orders,*

marriages in this Department, which in my opinion, should be confined to Europeans, and possibly, Asiatics.[1]

After the passage of the 1928 Ordinance it became evident that a change in the organization was necessary. In moving the second reading of the amendment Bill, the Solicitor-General, on 13 June 1929, gave the following explanation:

The Ordinance, Sir, was largely concerned with the registration of births and deaths of the natives of the Colony with a view to statistics being available as to the ebb and flow of the native population.

The whole of the material which concerns the vital statistics of the native population, which of course, Your Excellency, form the vast majority of the population of the Colony, are in the office of the Chief Registrar of Natives. It is considered desirable, therefore, Sir, in the circumstances, that the Chief Registrar of Natives should have the administrative working of the Ordinance under the instructions of the Registrar General of Births and Deaths, and with this object in view it is proposed to create the office of Principal Registrar, the holder of which office, Sir, will be the Chief Registrar of Natives who will, in addition to performing the duties of Registrar of Births and Deaths under the Ordinance, administer the Ordinance under the instructions of the Registrar General of Births and Deaths.[2]

The administration of the registration of both native and non-native births, marriages, and deaths was thereupon transferred to the Registration Section of the Native Affairs Department, but responsibility for the registration of non-native births, marriages, and deaths was re-transferred in 1938 to the Registrar-General's Department.

The records of births, marriages and deaths for the Colony were transferred to this section from the Registrar-General on the 30th March, 1930, and thereafter, until the 31st August, 1938, all duties arising out of the registration of births, marriages and deaths, normally carried out by the Registrar-General, became one of the several functions of this section. On the 1st September of this year all non-native records of births, marriages and deaths were re-transferred from this section to the Registrar-General's department. Records relating to native births, marriages and deaths were retained by this section, which continues to be responsible for the registration of births, marriages and deaths of natives . . . .'[3]

&c., *in Force 1927*, vol. i, p. 251) provided: 'The Registrar General, Public Trustee and Official Receiver is appointed Registrar General for the purpose of the [Births and Deaths Registration] Ordinance with effect from the 1st day of December, 1924.' See also in this connexion, Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 228:

'The Registrar General, Public Trustee, and Official Receiver, has a great variety of duties, but his principal branches of work are:—

'(1) The administration of the estates of deceased persons and of trust estates under the Public Trustees Ordinance, 1925.

'(2) As Official Receiver under the Bankruptcy Ordinance and rules thereunder, including the realization and winding up of bankrupt estates.

'(3) As Official Receiver in companies liquidation under the Companies Ordinance.

'(4) Registration of deeds of arrangement.

'(5) Registration of companies, business names, co-operative societies, bills of sale (including chattel mortgages and transfers), etc.

'(6) Assessments of duty under the Estate Duty Ordinance.

He also has nominal duties in connection with the Marriage Ordinance and the registration of births and deaths.'

[1] *Registrar General's Report 1927*, p. 3.

[2] *Legislative Council Debates 1929*, vol. i, pp. 101–2.

[3] *Report on Native Affairs 1938*, p. 142; see also *Registrar General's Report 1938*, p. 6.

In accordance with the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904, Rules were issued on 30 September 1904.[1] They have been amended once.[2] The main rules as they stand to-day read as follows:

1. Births and deaths may be registered at the District Commissioner's office in any District during office hours.

2. Births and deaths occurring on board ships while within the territorial waters of the Colony shall be registered at Mombasa, Lamu or Shimoni.

3. Births and deaths occurring on board ships in that portion of Lake Victoria Nyanza within the Colony shall be registered at Kisumu.

4. (i) Any person whose duty it is to register a birth or death residing at a greater distance than fifteen miles from the District Commissioner's office or sending to the District Commissioner a satisfactory certificate of inability to attend through ill-health may register such birth or death without personal attendance: Provided that in any case the District Commissioner may refuse to register without personal attendance.

(ii) A person registering a birth or death without personal attendance shall fill in and sign a form to be obtained from the District Commissioner giving the prescribed particulars.

(iv) Such forms shall be numbered consecutively by the District Commissioner and forwarded quarterly to the Registrar.

6. The registers, returns and indexes in the custody of the Registrar may be inspected at the office of the Registrar during office hours.

Finally, on 29 April 1943, the Governor in Council made Rules[3] fixing the time within which births and deaths are to be notified.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by section 27 of the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1928, His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to make the following Rules:—

1. These Rules may be cited as the Notification of Births and Deaths Rules, 1943.

2. The time within which the notice of the birth of any child is to be given under section 10 of the said Ordinance to the registrar of the registration area in which the birth occurs shall be three months.

3. The time within which the notice of the death of any person is to be given under section 16 of the said Ordinance to the registrar of the registration area in which the death took place shall be one month.

The main provisions of the Ordinance (and Rules) ensuring registration of births and deaths, as they now stand, are as follows:

Registrar General, Principal Registrar, Registration Areas

3. The Governor shall appoint a Registrar General of Births and Deaths for the Colony.

3A. The Governor shall appoint a Principal Registrar of Births and Deaths for the Colony, who in addition to performing the duties of a Registrar, and carrying out such instructions as may be issued by the Registrar General, shall have such duties and powers as may be prescribed.

4. The Governor may from time to time, by notice in the Gazette, appoint any area in the Colony to be a 'registration area' for the purposes of this Ordinance, and may appoint fit and proper persons to be the Registrars for each registration area.

[1] 'Rules Issued by His Majesty's Commissioner under the provisions of the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance 1904', reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1904*, p. 72, and in *Laws of Kenya, Orders*, &c., *in Force 1927*, vol. i, pp. 246–50.

[2] Government Notice No. 692 of 1938 (2 Sept.), 'Births and Deaths Registration (Amendment) Rules, 1938', reprinted in *Proclamations*, &c., *1938*, p. 322.

[3] Government Notice No. 453, reprinted ibid. *1943*, p. 162.

Births and Deaths Registration

8. (1) The registration of the birth of a child shall be compulsory if either one or both parents are of European or American or Asiatic origin or descent, or, in the case of an illegitimate child, not recognised by its father, if the mother is of European or American or Asiatic origin or descent.

14. (1) The registration of the death of every person of whatsoever race, origin or descent dying within a township shall be compulsory, and the registration of the death of every person of European, American, or Asiatic descent dying elsewhere within the Colony shall be compulsory.

In case of a birth the registration of which is compulsory, (1) the father and mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred and every person present at the birth and the person having charge of the child shall within three months give notice of the birth to the Registrar or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £25 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

In case of a death the registration of which is compulsory, (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling or being in the same registration area as the deceased, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) each inmate of such house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried shall within one month give notice of the death to the Registrar or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £25 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months or to both such fine and imprisonment.

Burials

No person shall bury the body of any deceased person the registration of whose death is compulsory without a permit issued by the Registrar.

Headings of Register

Birth (Form A): No.; Where born; Name; Sex; Name and Surname of Father; Father's occupation and rank; Father's Nationality; Name and Maiden Name of Mother; Mother's occupation; Mother's Nationality; Signature, description and residence of informant; Date of birth; Signature of Registering Officer; Date of Registration; Baptismal name if added or altered after registration of birth.

Death (Form B): No.; Name and Surname of deceased; Age; Sex; Residence; Occupation; Nationality; Date of death; Place of death; Cause of death; Signature, description and residence of informant; Signature of Registering Officer; Date of Registration.

The Registrar-General, the Principal Registrar, and the Registrars receive no compensation for their services in this capacity. A fee has to be paid for the registration of a birth or a death after six months from the event (Shs.10); for the registration of the name or alteration in the name of any child whose birth has been previously registered (Shs.10); for the inspection of any register, return, or index (Shs.4); and for a certified copy

of any entry in any register or return (Shs.10). The revenues from these fees in 1934–8 were as follows:[1]

Year	Birth certificates		Death certificates		Late birth registrations		Late death registrations		Additions and alterations of names in registers	
	No.	Fees	No.	Fees	No.	Penalties	No.	Penalties	No.	Fees
		£ s.		£ s.		£ s.		£ s.		£ s.
1934	434	217 0	75	37 10	41	20 10	6	3 0	13	6 10
1935	557	278 10	123	61 10	123	61 10	8	4 0	4	2 0
1936	594	297 0	138	69 0	94	47 0	5	2 10	13	6 10
1937	645	322 10	146	73 0	113	56 10	2	1 0	5	2 10
1938	695	347 10	138	69 0	151	75 10	4	2 0	..	4 16[1]

[1] Correction and Search Fees.

The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance was supplemented in 1930 by 'An Ordinance relating to Children born out of Wedlock',[2] which provided for the re-registration of the births of legitimated persons. The Schedule attached to the Ordinance was almost identical with that attached to the 'Legitimacy Act, 1926' for England and Wales.

The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance of 1928 did not essentially enlarge the scope of compulsory registration provided by the Ordinance of 1904 and the Order of 1906. It merely extended it to the births of children of Asiatic origin or descent,[3] all birth registration of Natives and death registration of Natives outside towns remaining optional. Moreover, the new Ordinance contained a provision which authorized the Governor to reduce the scope of compulsory registration still further. Contrary to the birth and death registration Acts of all other British Dependencies, the Kenya Ordinance listed among the matters with regard to which the Governor may make Rules:

(7) The exemption from all or any of the provisions of this Ordinance of persons of any particular class or race within an area in which the registration of births or deaths has been declared to be compulsory;

(8) The exemption from all or any of the provisions of this Ordinance of any district or township within an area in which the registration of births and deaths has been declared to be compulsory.

Such Rules, it is true, have apparently never been made. But that there was from the outset the intention to limit the area of compulsory registration may be inferred from the following statement in the Registrar-General's Report for 1928:

Under this Ordinance notification in the case of natives as distinct from actual registration is only required[4] and it is intended to apply the Ordinance only to the Town-

[1] See *Registrar General's Report 1934*, p. 7; *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 6; *1938*, pp. 6–7.

[2] No. 23 of 1930 (10 June), 'the Legitimacy Ordinance, 1930', reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1930*, pp. 390–6. The Ordinance was amended by Ordinance No. 26 of 1931 (8 Sept.), 'the Legitimacy (Amendment) Ordinance, 1931', reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1931*, pp. 162–3.

[3] That from now on all Asiatic deaths and not only all Indian deaths were compulsorily registrable is hardly worth mentioning.

[4] Actually the Ordinance made compulsory 'the registration of the death of every person of whatsoever race, origin or descent dying within a township'.

ships of Nairobi and Mombasa at first as an experiment, with a view to its further extension if successful. The provisions of the Ordinance, however, will apply to Asiatics as well as Europeans . . . .[1]

It seems, moreover, that even in townships the Ordinance was not applied to Asiatics.

Nairobi. It is to be noted that only births among Europeans are compulsorily registrable.[2]

Mombasa. Registration of births is compulsory only in the case of Europeans.[3]

The transfer of birth and death registration to the Native Affairs Department does not seem to have improved registration among Natives, and it led apparently even to a deterioration of registration among Europeans. While no report prior to the enactment of the 1928 Ordinance complained about incomplete registration of European births or deaths, the annual Blue Books from 1932 on accompanied the figures of European births, marriages, and deaths with the following Note:

Whilst the Marriages records are accurate any data relating to Births and Deaths must be accepted with reserve as the figures shown only represent those Births and Deaths that are recorded and not those actually occurring.[4]

The complete failure of the 1928 Ordinance may finally be illustrated by the following quotations:

1929. An Ordinance amending the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance was passed during the year and draft Regulations for promulgation thereunder were prepared and submitted to Government. At the end of the year these Regulations still await approval and the registration of births and deaths remains, therefore, highly unsatisfactory.[5]

1930. Little progress can be recorded during the year in connexion with the registration of births and deaths, and the position remains unsatisfactory to a degree. Until the legislation regarding this matter has been brought into operation, accurate vital statistics cannot be produced.[6]

1931. The position in connexion with registration of births and deaths remains unsatisfactory. The existing legislation on the matter has not been put into effect, as the necessary machinery has not yet been set up.[7]

. . . compulsory registration of deaths is not in force in Mombasa . . .[8]

1934. In commenting on the registration of births and deaths occurring among the non-native communities, the Principal Registrar of Births and Deaths notes in his Annual Report for 1934 as follows:—

'In the circumstances, no attempt has been made to calculate even a crude birth rate for any of the non-native racial groups as obviously this could only be entirely misleading, if not actually dangerous. And in these circumstances, no consideration

[1] *Registrar General's Report 1928*, pp. 2–3. It should be noted also that sub-clause (8) was not contained in the original Bill but was inserted as an amendment moved by the Colonial Secretary on 19 May 1928 (see *Legislative Council Debates 1928*, vol. i, p. 283), evidently with the intention of further limiting the area of compulsory registration.

[2] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 9. See also ibid. *1930*, p. 11; *1931*, p. 15.

[3] Ibid. *1929*, p. 10. See also ibid. *1931*, p. 16.

[4] Kenya, *Blue Book 1932*, p. 217; *1933*, p. 226; *1934*, p. 228; *1935*, p. 235; *1936*, p. 234; *1937*, p. 210; *1938*, p. 215; *1939*, Section 15, to *1941*, Section 15. See also in this connexion the 'Note' in the Annual Colonial Reports 1932–8 (quoted pp. 148–9 above) which says that as no reliable returns of births and deaths are available the official estimates of the European population are based on an assumed yearly natural increase of 6 per cent.

[5] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 9.

[6] Ibid. *1930*, p. 11.

[7] Ibid. *1931*, p. 14. Literally the same, ibid. *1932*, p. 31; *1933*, p. 37; see also ibid. *1934*, p. 14.

[8] Ibid. *1931*, p. 16.

has been, or could be given to the preparation of any death statistics or even crude death rates'.[1]

1936. . . . year by year it has been noted that in the absence of any effective system for the regular collection of certain prescribed facts it is impossible to measure with accuracy the progress of the public health, or to determine whether any changes of importance may be taking place with regard to the growth or constitution of the population. The point has also been made that changes—'possibly such startling changes as may revolutionize existing schemes of work'—may be in operation, and that it is of the greatest importance that knowledge of such changes, if they are occurring, should be at the disposal of Government. With regard to this issue, it is satisfactory to be able to record that the question of the institution of a satisfactory system of registration of births and deaths has been under review by Government during the year . . . .

Till, however, much greater accuracy in the recording of data has been achieved, it would be unwise to reproduce in these reports any analyses of any figures which are now available, since to do so, even with the most careful reservations, would almost inevitably be misleading. Of this fact one illustration may perhaps be given. In the annual report of the health of the population of one of the larger towns of Kenya it is recorded that the infantile mortality rate among Asians in 1936 was 518 per 1,000, as against 187 for British India. An infantile mortality figure of such startling proportions led naturally to inquiry, when it was found that the total number of Asian births which had been notified was less than a number which could be accounted for as having occurred in one very well-conducted maternity hospital plus those which had been attended by two trained midwives in good practice.

As it is also known, however, that in the town in question there were not only qualified but unqualified midwives . . . it becomes clear that the data from which the infantile mortality rate was calculated were inaccurate. How inaccurate these figures may be is not, however, known, and until further information is available the local health authority concerned is in a very unsatisfactory position, since it is impossible to say with certainty that the position is not serious and equally impossible to justify proposals for large expenditure. What can, however, very clearly be justified is expenditure on determining what the position may really be![2]

1937. It is to be regretted that once again it becomes necessary to record that it has not yet been found possible to introduce a satisfactory system of registration of births and deaths and little, if any, machinery as yet exists for the collection, registration and analysis of information which is of considerable importance in connexion with the initiation and promotion of public health schemes.

The taking of a census occurs only at infrequent intervals and in the absence of any effective system for the constant and regular collection of certain prescribed facts, it is quite impossible to gauge with any degree of accuracy the progress of the public health. It is of the utmost importance that such information should be at the disposal of Government if public health administration is to proceed on organised and economic lines.[3]

1938. The position with regard to the registration of births and deaths remains unchanged.[4]

. . . under the Ordinance, the registration of all persons dying within a township is compulsory, but that theoretical compulsion notwithstanding, registration . . . is not generally carried out.[5]

1939–40. Owing to the absence of any general system of notification of births and deaths, no figures are available with regard to the total births and birth rates, total deaths and death rates, the infantile mortality rate, or the main causes of deaths under the different heads.[6]

[1] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 15.
[2] Ibid. *1936*, pp. 16–17.
[3] Ibid. *1937*, p. 18. See also ibid., p. 12.
[4] *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1938*, p. 12.
[5] Kenya, *Report on Native Affairs 1938*, p. 142.
[6] *Medical Report 1938 and 1939*, p. 3; literally the same, ibid. *1940*, p. 4.

As shown above,[1] late birth registrations were very numerous in 1935–8. That conditions have not improved since appears from an official statement made on 17 January 1945 in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Paroo: Will Government please state the total number of births of Indian and European children during 1943 as distinct from the total number of such births registered during the same period?

Mr. Surridge: The number of Indian births registered in 1943, . . . was 10,622, and the number of European births 608. The hon. member is aware that a large number of births, especially in the Indian community, that were registered in 1943, actually occurred some years previously. It is therefore impossible to furnish the hon. member with accurate figures since the Registrar General is still receiving applications for authority to register births which occurred in 1943. The Registrar General, however, estimates that roughly 5,000 Indian and 580 European births actually occurred during 1943.[2]

While registration records have failed to provide a basis for vital statistics of Asiatics or natives such statistics have been supplied, on a very small scale to be sure, by other devices.

(1) Compulsory notification of deaths in townships was introduced even before registration of deaths became compulsory. Under the provisions of 'The East Africa Townships Ordinance 1903'[3] the Commissioner of the East Africa Protectorate, on 19 May 1904, issued Rules[4] which provided among other things:

(160) Any death occurring in the township shall be reported to the Collector.

(162) No interment or cremation or other method of disposing of a corpse shall take place until the Collector has issued a permit.

(199) These rules may be cited as 'The Township Rules 1904' and shall apply to all townships, proclaimed under the East Africa Townships Ordinance 1903[5] save where other provision is made.

Such other provisions were made in several townships. The Nairobi Township Rules of 11 January 1905[6] provided:

(2) Any death occurring in the Township shall be reported immediately to the Police Office.

(3) The police receiving any report shall communicate the same at once to the Medical Officer of Health.

(4) The person to make any report of . . . death is the owner or occupier (or their representative) of the house, shop, hotel, boarding house, store etc., in which the case occurs, and in case of the owner or occupier being ill the duty shall devolve upon a relative, agent or servant of the owner or occupier. In case of any such . . . death occurring in a camp the report shall be made by the headman or other person in charge of the camp for the time being.

(5) No . . . corpse [shall] be disposed of until a certificate to that effect shall have been issued by the Medical Officer of Health, or person appointed to do so.

(6) Any person found guilty of a breach of any of the above rules will be liable to a penalty of two hundred rupees fine, or imprisonment not exceeding two months or to both. . . .

[1] See p. 178.

[2] *Legislative Council Debates 1944–5, Third Session*, col. 673.

[3] No. 20 of 1903 (15 Sept.), reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1903*, pp. 12–13.

[4] Reprinted ibid. *1904*, pp. 43–58.

[5] The number of these townships was then 13 (see Proclamations of 7 Sept. 1903 and 28 Jan. 1904, reprinted ibid. *1903*, p. 42; *1904*, p. 24). It increased considerably thereafter.

[6] Reprinted ibid. *1905*, pp. 24–5.

Additional Rules for Nairobi Township were issued on 9 October 1905:[1]

(36) Every death occurring within the Municipal Area shall be reported to the Police Officer in charge of the nearest Police Station within 6 hours after the death has occurred by the nearest relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased or (in case of the death, illness, absence, inability or default of such relative) any other person present at the death; or, (in default of such relative or other person) the occupier of the premises on which the death occurred; or, (if such occupier be the deceased) any other person living in the premises in which the death occurred: provided that:—

(*a*) If any one of the aforesaid persons make such report, no other person shall be bound to make it;

(*b*) If such death occurs in a hospital none of the aforesaid persons shall be bound to make the report, but the Medical Officer in charge of such hospital shall within 6 hours after such death send written notice thereof to the Medical Officer of Health.

(37) No corpse shall be interred, cremated or otherwise disposed of until a certificate of the cause of death has been signed and granted by a Government Medical Officer, and a written permit for such interment, cremation or disposal has been issued by the Police.[2]

The 'Kisumu Township Rules' of 3 April 1907[3] were practically identical with the Nairobi Rules of 11 January 1905, and these Kisumu Rules were made applicable to the Townships of Machakos and Kitui on 27 May 1911,[4] to the Township of Kyambu on 29 July 1911,[5] and to the Townships of Kismayu and Gobwen on 1 July 1913.[6]

'The Mombasa Township (Report of Deaths) Rules' of 26 May 1916,[7] provided:

2. Every death occurring within the Township of Mombasa shall be reported immediately to the Police Officer in charge of the nearest Police Station by:

(*a*) the nearest relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased; or

(*b*) in case of the death, illness, absence, inability or default of such relative by any other person present at the death; or

(*c*) in default of such relative or other person by any other person living on the premises in which the death occurred; or

(*d*) if such occupier be deceased by the owner or occupier of the premises upon which the death occurred; or

(*e*) if a duly qualified Medical Practitioner has treated the deceased during the last illness of the same by such Medical Practitioner; or

(*f*) if the death has occurred in a street or public place by any public servant to whose knowledge the death may have come.

3. The Police Officer in charge shall upon receipt of such aforesaid report forthwith communicate the same to the Medical Officer of Health.

4. No corpse or part of a corpse shall be interred, cremated or otherwise disposed of until a certificate of the cause of death has been signed and granted by a Government Medical Officer, and a written permit for such interment, cremation or disposal has been issued by the Police.

[1] See Nairobi Township Rules No. 3 of 1905, reprinted in East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations* 1905, pp. 48–54.

[2] These Rules were amended and reissued on 7 Sept. 1917; see ibid. *1917*, Part II, pp. 123–98.

[3] Reprinted ibid. *1907*, p. 56. See also ibid. *1919*, Part II, p. 29.

[4] See ibid. *1911*, pp. 61–2. See also ibid. *1912*, Part II, p. 61.

[5] See ibid. *1911*, p. 89.

[6] See ibid. *1913*, Part II, p. 91.

[7] Reprinted ibid. *1916*, Part II, pp. 49–50.

5. Rules 160–162 of the Township Rules dated the 19th day of May, 1904, shall cease to apply to the Township of Mombasa.

While thus much more elaborate provisions were made for some townships, it seems that even the simple Rules contained in 'The Township Rules 1904' were not applied to all other townships. This becomes evident from the fact that many Rules were issued providing that Rule No. 160 (but not No. 162) should apply to such and such townships.[1]

The Medical Reports discuss quite fully the numbers of deaths notified to the Police, particularly in Mombasa, Nairobi, and Kisumu, but they warn the reader to accept them with due reserve.

1924. Mombasa. Until the notification and registration of deaths is made universal, and records sent in are more complete, no recorded death rate can be struck.[2]

Nairobi. It should . . . be noted that the death returns are still compiled from reports issued by the Police, a system incompatible with accuracy.[3]

[1] See for Machakos, Proclamation of 2 May 1906, reprinted ibid. *1906*, p. 81 (repealed by Rules of 27 May 1911, see above); for Kisii, Kapsabet, Kaptumo, and Mumias, Rules of 30 Oct. 1909, ibid. *1909*, pp. 107–8; for Kericho, Proclamation of 12 Mar. 1910, ibid. *1910*, p. 152; for Fort Hall, Rules of 21 Mar. 1910, ibid., pp. 162–3; for Kapiet Location, Rules of 11 July 1910, ibid., pp. 198–9; for Yala River, Rules of 7 May 1912, ibid. *1912*, Part II, p. 33; for Nyeri, Rules of 12 May 1912, ibid., p. 51; for Muhoroni, Rules of 6 July 1912, ibid., p. 83; for Homa Port, Rules of 26 Sept. 1912, ibid., p. 133; for Embu and Meru, Rules of 14 Feb. 1913, ibid. *1913*, Part II, pp. 64–5; for Londiani, Rules of 1 Mar. 1920, ibid. *1920*, Part II, pp. 16–17; for Kalamega, Rules of 27 Sept. 1920, ibid., pp. 104–5; for Nanyuki, Rules of 26 Nov. 1920, ibid., p. 140. But the Rules for Kipini of 11 Aug. 1912, reprinted ibid. *1912*, Part II, p. 96, for Eldoret of 14 Nov. 1912, ibid., p. 142, for Rabai and Mazeras of 9 Aug. 1913, ibid. *1913*, Part II, pp. 105–6, for Rumuruti of 24 Mar. 1921, Kenya, *Ordinances and Regulations 1921*, Part II, pp. 12–13, for Kitale of 18 Aug. and 24 Oct. 1921, ibid., pp. 66, 101–2, for Gilgil of 31 Dec. 1921, Kenya, *Proclamations*, &c., *1922*, p. 1, for Eldama Ravine of 13 Apr. 1922, ibid., p. 46, for Kacheliba of 11 May 1923, ibid. *1923*, p. 89, for Fort Ternan of 13 Nov. 1926, ibid. *1926*, pp. 389–90, for Kibigori of 2 June 1927, ibid. *1927*, pp. 617–19, and for Moyale, Marsabit, and Wajir of 22 Sept. 1928, ibid. *1928*, pp. 356–9, have made applicable both Rules Nos. 160 and 162. The Eastleigh Township Rules of 6 Apr. 1921, reprinted Kenya, *Ordinances and Regulations 1921*, Part II, pp. 15–42, and the Muthaiga Township Rules of 25 Mar. 1922, Kenya, *Proclamations*, &c., *1922*, pp. 23–30, contain provisions very similar to those of the Nairobi Township Rules of 7 Sept. 1917.

[2] *Medical Report 1924*, p. 5.

[3] Ibid., p. 8. The reader should not be deluded by the apparent impression of completeness conveyed by the sometimes very large number of deaths reported. Thus for Nairobi the total numbers of deaths reported in 1922–4 were 504, 575, and 536, and the numbers of African deaths reported 339, 410, and 349 respectively (see ibid. *1922*, pp. 17–18; *1923*, p. 7; *1924*, p. 8). The official death-rates for Africans were 27·9, 33·5, and 28·9, and may inspire confidence. But the Medical Report for 1925 relates (p. 9) that in 1925 the total number of deaths reported dropped to 390, and the number of African deaths reported to 221, giving a death-rate of 16·6 for the whole population and 18·3 for Africans. 'Although there has been a distinct decrease in the number of deaths recorded it must be pointed out that the decrease is more apparent than real, being largely due to more careful registration. In past years many deaths were reported to the Health Office as having occurred in Nairobi which really occurred outside the township, but for which burial permits were issued by the Police. In the year under review only deaths actually occurring in the township have been recorded.' Thus the higher figures for earlier years have no value whatsoever. But the lower figures for 1925 are hardly more useful as they were evidently quite incomplete. 'Of the 390 persons who died it was found that 248 were normal residents of the town; 74 could definitely be described as strangers and in regard to the 68 remaining no reliable information could be obtained. If the 74 deaths of strangers are excluded and half the deaths in regard to which no information as to residence could be obtained are added to the deaths of residents and if in addition 17 deaths of residents which occurred outside the township are included the recorded death-rate would be 12·8 per thousand living.' A death-rate of 12·8 for the residents of a town such as Nairobi makes it seem doubtful whether the majority of deaths were actually reported.

1926. Apart from the European population, the only vital statistics available are those which have been obtained from the towns of Nairobi, Mombasa and Kisumu . . . .

The figures for the three large towns offer some indication of the health and mortality of the mixed populations of those towns: but they cannot be taken as accurate or complete . . . .[1]

1927. Nairobi. The low percentage of infant deaths among Africans tends to corroborate a suspicion that very few Africans report infant deaths, the bodies being buried without the formality of a Police permit.[2]

1928. Mombasa. Again it is open to grave doubt whether all the deaths occurring are ever reported to the Police and hence to the Health Office. Certainly, unauthorised burials take place in unauthorised cemeteries, and in the case of young infants it is possible that the bodies may be disposed of in various ways. Much of this is undoubtedly due to ignorance of the law, but as time goes on the situation should improve.[3]

1932. The statistical material . . . is in all cases so unreliable or so limited that with the possible exception of Nairobi it is unsuitable for comparative purposes.[4]

But while in other towns the Registrars apparently use the burial permits as a basis of some kind of death registration, this is not done in Nairobi.

Copies of these permits are sent by the police to the registrars, who make a record of the deaths so reported. In Nairobi the registrar does not enter the particulars of native deaths received from the police in a register, but merely files the copies of burial permits he receives from the police.[5]

Yet the Commissioner for Local Government evidently thought that the vital statistics for Nairobi were satisfactory.

1938. During the year 1,436 births were notified, of which 1,067 were of residents and 369 of non-residents, compared with a total of 1,245 notified last year among 963 residents and 282 non-residents.

The true birth rate for all races increased to 15·74, the rates for the communities being 13·5 for Europeans, Asian 24·91, and native 12·0. . . .

The percentage of stillbirths to total births among residents showed a slight increase over the previous year, being 3·5% compared with 2·8%, whilst the figure for non-residents decreased from 6·7% to 5·6%. The difference in the figures for residents and non-residents is still marked.

Although the sickness rate for non-fatal illnesses is reported to have been high throughout the year, the death rates for all communities have shown a remarkable decrease compared with the previous year.

The death rate for the European community declined from 6·9 to 5·8, the Asian from 16·4 to 13·9, and the native from 18·7 to 15·3, whilst the death rate for all races fell from 16·9 to 13·9.

It will be noted that the total number of deaths in Nairobi during 1938 decreased from 1,411 to 1,305, the resident deaths being 911 compared with 1,040 during the previous year, the decrease being shared by all communities.

It is very pleasing to be able to record a decided continued improvement in the infant mortality rate. The infant mortality rate for all races during 1938 amounted to 249·7 per 1,000 live births, compared with a figure of 309·8 for 1937 and 412·2 for 1936. The infant mortality rate for the communities was European 90·9, Asian 262·4 and Native 266·6, compared with 109·3, 310·1, and 338·6 respectively for the previous year.[6]

[1] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 9. [2] Ibid. *1927*, p. 20. [3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 27.
[4] Ibid. *1932*, p. 31. See also ibid. *1933*, p. 37; *1934*, p. 14.
[5] *Report on Native Affairs 1938*, p. 143.
[6] *Report of the Commissioner for Local Government 1938*, pp. 25–6.

(2) According to the Medical Reports many special investigations have been made to supply vital statistics for limited areas or groups of people.

1922. 2,591 married women in Central Kavirondo were asked questions regarding their pregnancies and the mortality of their children.

An interesting investigation has been carried out in the Central Kavirondo district with the object of obtaining figures bearing on the vital statistics of the native population in the reserve, chiefly in the direction of the infant mortality and the fecundity rates. . . .

The method followed in conducting the investigation was to examine all the inhabitants and interrogate all the women of those villages to which opportunity enabled a visit to be paid, and though the numbers are not very large and allowance has to be made for errors in the estimation of ages and in the facts as given by the women themselves, yet, on the whole, it is probable that the results are fairly accurate and give a not incorrect picture of conditions as they exist. It is, of course, possible that were every small village over a large area to be investigated, the results obtained might vary from those hitherto arrived at, and it does not by any means follow that figures relating to Kavirondo would hold good for another tribe, *e.g.*, the Kikuyu.[1]

1923. No such extensive investigation, as was recorded in the 1922 Report, with regard to the Vital statistics of the population in the Native Reserves, has been carried out during 1923. A certain amount of information has been collected by the Medical Officer at Chuka, but the figures are too small for any definite conclusion to be drawn.[2]

Medical Survey conducted in a portion of the Nyanza Province.—In the early portion of the year the Principal Medical Officer placed before the Board certain tables of statistics which had been compiled as the outcome of a Medical Survey carried out by Government in an area of the native reserve in the Nyanza Province, and commenting upon the value of the information supplied by these statistics he remarked that, to the best of his knowledge, only on one previous occasion had any investigation of this character been carried out.[3]

1925. An attempt was made to arrive at the infantile mortality rates for the year among the various sections of the population of Kisumu by means of a house to house enquiry . . . .[4]

1930. Figures [for 1920–1930] were obtained concerning the infant mortality among the adherents of a mission in the Teita Hills which keeps accurate records.[5]

1931. In the Masai Province 907 married women were questioned with regard to the number of births, surviving children, and miscarriages.[6]

1932. Digo District.[7] In the first half of 1932 arrangements were put in train for the systematic collection of records with regard to births and deaths and in the second half of the year such records were collected, chiefly among the Wadigo.

Each sanitary teacher did his own area, counting the population and registering births and deaths on his routine tour of his area each month. At the end of each month the figures were checked at Msambweni, deaths and births entered up in the registers and birth certificates filled in for distribution on the next month's round.[8]

[1] *Medical Report 1922*, pp. 19–20. [2] Ibid. *1923*, p. 8. [3] Ibid., p. 91.

[4] Ibid. *1925*, p. 14. The attempt was repeated in 1926 and 1927; see ibid. *1926*, p. 18; *1927*, p. 24.

[5] Ibid. *1930*, p. 15. Similar figures were obtained for 1931 and 1932; see ibid. *1931*, p. 19; *1932*, p. 25.

[6] See *Medical Survey Masai Province 1930–1*, pp. 6, 26A; Kenya, *Medical Report 1933*, pp. 14, 16.

[7] These data were obtained in connexion with the investigation described pp. 143–4 above.

[8] Ibid. *1932*, p. 13. The recording of births and deaths was continued in 1933; see ibid. *1933*, pp. 17–21.

(3) In his Address to the Legislative Council on 11 August 1925, the Acting Governor had urged that records of births and deaths be kept in the native Reserves.

There should be no difficulty in obtaining these statistics through the Headmen, and it should be a condition of their advancement that they are able to give such information. It may be necessary to appoint Registrars of Births and Deaths, and supply native clerks for the Councils and bigger Chiefs. Openings will thus be afforded for the better educated native in his own district.[1]

Three days later, during the debate on the motion for taking a census of the native and non-native population in 1926, the Acting Chief Native Commissioner said:

The question of registration of births and deaths has been touched upon. I should just like to say that the Administration is slowly feeling its way towards this, but we also feel that it is a thing which has rather to come from inside the reserves than be superimposed on the people. You cannot really get at figures of that kind except from the people themselves, and it would probably have to be done in a very simple way at first. Probably the best way to do it would be to appoint a clerk under a headman, who could collect the figures from his own knowledge of the people, and possibly a small fee could also be charged for the registration, which could go to the headman or clerk. This may stimulate the getting of more accurate figures.[2]

As suggested by the Governor, the Native Councils might have been used for promoting registration of births and deaths in the Reserves. They had been established by 'The Native Authority (Amendment) Ordinance, 1924',[3] which provided:

2. The Governor-in-Council may establish a Council in any area, which may be a district or part of a district, in the Colony, to be known as a Local Native Council, which shall be composed of the District Commissioner and the Assistant District Commissioners (if any) of such district together with such Headmen and other natives as the Governor may appoint thereto.

6. (1) A Local Native Council may make and pass resolutions for the welfare and good Government of the native inhabitants of such area in respect of any matters affecting purely local native administration and particularly the following: . . .

The Ordinance did not particularly mention the registration of births and deaths among the matters concerning which 'a Local Native Council may make and pass resolutions', but this gap could have been easily filled. However, as the Acting Chief Native Commissioner said, the Administration was only *slowly* feeling its way towards birth and death registration, and nothing was done in the following decade. Finally, some of the Local Native Councils themselves asked for the power to make resolutions concerning registration[4] and this demand was supported by the Provincial Commissioners:

The Provincial Commissioners had unanimously recommended at a meeting held in the previous year [1936] that provision should be made for the purpose of enabling

[1] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, p. 383. [2] Ibid., p. 532.

[3] No. 14 of 1924 (26 Sept.), reprinted in *Ordinances Enacted 1924*, pp. 91–3.

[4] See the statement of the Chief Native Commissioner in the Legislative Council, 8 Mar. 1937: 'The Kiambu and North Kavirondo local native councils have now, and others probably will, asked for these powers to make resolutions to register births, deaths and marriages in their reserves. I think it has the support of every single person I have spoken to about it.' (*Legislative Council Debates 1937*, vol. i, cols. 156–7.)

Local Native Councils to pass resolutions making compulsory the registration of births, deaths and marriages in districts where native opinion was prepared to accept the principle.[1]

The recommendation was accepted, and the 'Native Authority Bill' of 1937 which consolidated the existing Ordinance and its various amendments listed among the matters on which the Local Native Councils may pass resolutions 'the registration of births, deaths and marriages'. In supporting the Bill, Dr. C. J. Wilson, Nominated Unofficial Member Representing the Interests of the African Community, said in the Legislative Council on 8 March 1937:

> The institution of the registration of births and deaths will be a very notable advance in the interests of public health; the registration of births and deaths is the foundation or, at least one may say, one of the foundation stones in an organized system of public health. In attempting any measures for the maintenance and improvement of public health of any community, it is of primary importance to know how many people are born and die, even though it is not possible at first to register the cause of the deaths which are recorded. That is a development we hope will follow later.[2]

The 'Native Authority Ordinance, 1937'[3] marks the first step towards compulsory registration of native births and deaths in the Reserves. Resolutions for the registration of marriages, births, and deaths were passed in 1937 in the Central Province by the Kiambu, South Nyeri, and Fort Hall Local Native Councils.[4] But I found no evidence that these resolutions have been carried out.

VI. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. The current birth registration data throw no light on fertility.[5] The opinions on fertility are based either on impressions or on small samples, and have varied in the course of time.

Dr. Norman Leys, who at that time was Medical Officer of Health in the Colony, relates that 'both before and during the War medical officers made rough counts of births and deaths in restricted areas. They always found the birth-rates very low and the death-rates very high.'[6] He thinks that one of the reasons why the birth-rate remained low was the migration of labourers. 'The separating of so many husbands from their wives obviously tends to diminish the birth-rate and to encourage sexual irregularities.'[7]

The Medical Report for 1922 says with regard to Mombasa that 'the Medical Officer of Health from personal observation suggests that the

[1] *Report on Native Affairs 1937*, p. 179. [2] *Legislative Council Debates 1937*, vol. i, col. 172.

[3] No. 2 of 1937 (24 Mar.), 'An Ordinance to Make Provision in Regard to the Powers and Duties of Native Official Headmen and Local Native Councils and to provide for matters incidental thereto', reprinted in Kenya, *Ordinances Enacted 1937*, pp. 15–26.

[4] See *Report on Native Affairs 1937*, p. 52.

[5] The numbers of African births registered in the Colony seem to have been published only for 1912 (39) and for 1932–8 (2, 6, 8, 4, 12, 3, and 5 respectively); see *Medical Report 1912*, p. 37, *Report on Native Affairs 1937*, p. 242, *1938*, p. 142. The indices compiled of the native births on record cover 1,012 births; see ibid. *1938*, pp. 143–4. Since the yearly number of native births probably exceeds 100,000, birth registration is practically non-existent.

[6] Leys, *Kenya* (1924), p. 281. 'The results of these investigations were not published.'

[7] Ibid., p. 290.

birth-rate among African natives of the town is low, certainly considerably lower than that of the Indian community,'[1] but that the fertility rate of the women in the Reserves is high.[2] The Report shows furthermore the results of the special investigation in the Central Kavirondo District.[3] It appears that the 2,591 married women examined had had 522 abortions, 52 stillbirths, and 7,843 live-births. The mean age of the women examined is given as 25·76 years, and, therefore, comprises probably few women past child-bearing age. Thus, the average of 3 children born to a woman cannot be considered low. The report gives 6·8 as the 'Estimated number of children during child-bearing period (15–40)', but does not tell how this high estimate was arrived at. It appears furthermore that the 'Number of barren women (married five years and without children)' was only 17. Unfortunately, the report does not give the total number of women married five years (or more), but even so the figure of 17 must be considered very low.

It might be argued from the small proportion of barren women that venereal disease, especially gonorrhœa, is not common, but little information is available as to the correctness or otherwise of this deduction.[4]

The East Africa Commission, on the other hand, reported that 'in the Meru district of Kenya tribal customs and practices are responsible for the progressive sterility of the female population'.[5]

On 14 August 1925 the Nominated Unofficial Member to represent the interests of the African Community said in the Legislative Council:

Now we find that amongst the educated natives to-day there are families that have four, five, six, seven or eight children; whereas before there were only two children.[6]

The Medical Report for 1925 even went so far as to state that 'in some of the tribes the fertility is such that there is an average of between seven and eight live births per married couple'.[7]

[1] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 16. See also ibid. *1924*, p. 7, where the low birth-rate of the African population in Mombasa is attributed to the fact that 'housing conditions amongst Africans are generally unsatisfactory and privacy difficult amongst the poorer classes'.

[2] See ibid. *1922*, p. 63. [3] See ibid., p. 21. [4] Ibid., p. 20.

[5] *Report*, p. 54. See also Church, *East Africa*, p. 123: 'Various mechanical methods are used as well as a variety of abortifacient drugs. The practice has an appalling effect in some districts. The Provincial Administrator at Nyeri attributed the progressive sterility of the tribes in the Meru district of Kenya to the practice. In that district sexual intercourse is common before marriage, but it is considered a disgrace for a woman to give birth to a child out of wedlock.' See furthermore the Dispatch of the Acting Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 15 Sept. 1925 (*Tours in Native Reserves*, p. 18): 'It is now proposed to station a Medical Officer in the Meru district, and advantage will be taken of the willingness of the people to co-operate with Government to establish Government medical services throughout the district. These should have a very considerable effect on the birth-rate and infantile mortality from which this tribe has always suffered owing largely to the late date at which circumcision takes place. It has been the custom to defer circumcision of the youths and girls until the advent of a good season which would enable celebrations to be prolonged for a considerable time. As steps are taken to prevent young women from having children before they are married—a ceremony only performed after they have been circumcised—the birth-rate in this district is very low.'

[6] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, p. 533. See also in this connexion the statement of Dr. Leakey quoted p. 216 below.

[7] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 16. See also ibid. *1929*, p. 14: 'We do not know what the general birth, death and infant mortality rates may be, but we do know that in certain areas both the fertility rate of the women and the infant mortality rates are very high, the former being in the

The examination of 907 married women interrogated in the Masai Province between 5 November 1930 and 28 April 1931[1] revealed that they had had 288 miscarriages and had borne 2,817 children.[2] Since 'recently married women' were excluded from the investigation the average number of 3·1 births seems rather low, but it is possible, of course, that few of the women questioned were past child-bearing age. It appears that 102 women had never been pregnant, and that 211 were 'possibly sterile from miscarriage'.[3] 'Gonorrhœa and all its sequelæ and complications is practically universal.'[4] It 'is the most common sterilizing disease of women and the Masai themselves knew that large numbers of their women-folk were sterile but did not know the cause'.[5]

While thus the Masai, a primitive semi-nomadic tribe, 'inhabiting highland country, possessing great flocks, and comparatively untroubled by malaria or hookworm', are reported to have a very large proportion of sterile women, the sample taken in the Digo District among an agricultural tribe 'inhabiting a hot moist lowland country where malaria and hookworm are rife'[6] revealed a very high birth-rate. With a population of about 26,000 the number of recorded live-births was 633 in the six

neighbourhood of seven live births per woman, and the latter in the neighbourhood of four hundred infant deaths per thousand children born.' Since in the report on the 1922 investigation in Central Kavirondo the infant mortality rate was shown to be about 400 and the 'number of children during child bearing period' was 'estimated' at 6·8 I suspect that this estimate or guess is the basis of what 'we do know' about the fertility rate of the women in certain areas.

[1] See *Medical Survey Masai Province 1930–1*, p. 26A; *Medical Report 1933*, p. 16.

[2] Presumably including stillborn.

[3] 'The usual history obtained was no children after miscarriage.'

[4] *Medical Survey Masai Province 1930–1*, p. 25. 'It is . . . now believed by the Masai with whom the question was discussed that gonorrhoea is much more prevalent than of yore and that the increase in prevalence is partly due to the Moran [warriors] through their giving up their old custom [of living with unmarried girls], becoming infected by prostitutes and married women' (ibid., p. 30). Merker had, in fact, reported in 1904 that gonorrhœa was quite rare among the Masai (of German East Africa) and that fertility was very high. 87 old women questioned by him had had 548 children or 6·3 on an average (see Merker, pp. 177, 191–2, 333). But most of these children were born before the Moran changed their habits, and Johnston, as far back as 1902, reported: 'It is said . . . that . . . the Masai females are becoming increasingly sterile' (*The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 829).

[5] *Medical Survey Masai Province*, p. 26. See also ibid., p. 28; Native Affairs Department, *Report 1931*, p. 16; *Medical Report 1933*, pp. 25–7; and Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. ii, p. 1299. See finally *Medical Report 1935*, p. 9:

'In 1931 a somewhat detailed medical survey was carried out with regard to the health of one of our pastoral tribes, namely, the Masai. From this survey it appeared that from many points of view the most important disease from which this tribe was at that time suffering was gonorrhoea, and that as a result of a high incidence of this disease a large portion of the women were sterile, and the tribe perhaps in danger of ultimate extinction. What may have happened in the interval between 1931 and 1935, or in the year now under review, we do not know since owing to the financial depression which has prevailed it has been impossible either to take any preventive action or to repeat the survey.

'One of several things may have happened during the past five years, the incidence of sterility may have increased, or it may have decreased, or it may have begun to decrease during the year now under review, but we do not know, and so as regards the fashion in which the health of some 40,000 of our population of 3,000,000 may have altered in the past year we have no information of any kind whatsoever. The grazing has we know been better than usual, and the incidence of malaria has been greater, but whether the balance has been tipped to one side or the other by an increase or a decrease in the incidence of sterility or of any other of the many serious complications of gonorrhoea we have no knowledge whatsoever.'

[6] Ibid. *1933*, p. 25.

months from June to November 1932, and 1,625 in the twelve months from October 1932 to September 1933. The annual birth-rate was computed at 49 for the former and 62 for the latter period.[1] The incidence of venereal disease was rather low.[2]

Both these samples were far too small to permit the drawing of any general conclusions, and since no investigations of any kind seem to have been made since 1933, our knowledge of fertility among the natives of Kenya is practically nil.[3]

General Mortality. The current death registration data, though more complete than the birth registration data, have been far too defective to throw any light on mortality.[4] As regards death notifications to the police, comprehensive statistics were published in the earlier Medical Reports for a few towns, particularly for Nairobi, Mombasa, and Kisumu, but were discontinued owing to their untrustworthiness. Even if they had been more accurate it would not be worth while to reproduce them here, as the population of those towns was not known. The only sample investigation at which the total number of deaths was ascertained was the one in the Digo District. The recorded deaths were 259 from June to November 1932, and 550 from October 1932 to September 1933, the computed death rates being 20 and 21 respectively. Taken as a whole, the data on general mortality are even less instructive than the data on fertility, and our main sources of information are opinions expressed by observers who were in more or less close touch with the natives.

In his *Report on the Condition and Progress of the East Africa Protectorate* Sir Arthur Hardinge, in 1897, took the view that mortality before the establishment of the British Protectorate had been very high and he attributed this to the intertribal wars and slave-hunts and to famines. Six years later Sir Charles Eliot wrote:

> It is only a few years ago since East Africa was nothing but a human hunting-ground where the hunters did not even take ordinary precautions for preserving the game. On the coast the Arab Chiefs required two children out of every three from the neighbouring tribes as slaves; Arab caravans ravaged the interior and carried off the population of whole villages, of whom a terribly small proportion reached the coast alive as slaves for exportation. The native tribes warred with one another in order to get slaves to sell to the Arabs, and this picture of slavery and bloodshed was chiefly diversified by interludes of terrible famine.[5]

[1] See *Medical Report Digo District 1932*, p. 8; Kenya, *Medical Report 1932*, p. 15; *1933*, p. 18.

[2] See *Medical Report Digo District 1932*, p. 25.

[3] Very little is known also about the incidence of venereal disease for the country as a whole. The Medical Report for 1943 stated (p. 4): 'The position as regards venereal disease gave cause for some anxiety as, although there is no reliable evidence to suggest that there has been a very notable increase amongst the civil population, an insidious spread appears to be taking place.'

[4] The numbers of native deaths registered in the Colony seem to have been published only for 1912 (1,446) and for 1932–8 (759, 852, 1,172, 1,404, 1,377, 1,543, and 1,444 respectively); see *Medical Report 1912*, p. 37, *Report on Native Affairs 1937*, p. 242; *1938*, p. 142. The indices compiled of the native deaths on record cover 42,469 cases (see ibid., pp. 143–4), but this figure, which anyway is exceedingly small, comprises not only registrations proper but also some records made by the Registrars from notifications of deaths to the police.

[5] *Report on the East Africa Protectorate*, dated 18 Apr. 1903, p. 29.

It is interesting, first of all, that neither Sir A. Hardinge nor Sir C. Eliot mentions diseases. But this omission is not conclusive. They may have taken the prevalence of diseases (before and after the arrival of the British) for granted while the Government had already checked slave-raids and tribal warfare and hoped to rid the country of famines before long.

As regards slave-raids, Eliot amplified his statements of 1903 in his book published in 1905. He said that only ten or fifteen years ago 'on the Coast the Arabs took two children out of three from every family as slaves',[1] that 'the caravans of slave-traders traversed the whole country seeking for their victims',[2] and that one of the causes which 'tended to depopulate' the fertile highlands of East Africa (in which he wanted Europeans to settle) was that 'they were specially accessible to the slave-raiders'.[3] In a paper read at the Royal Colonial Institute on 16 January 1906 he went even so far as to say with regard to 'the natives of East Africa' in general that 'it is only ten or fifteen years ago that slave traders raided the whole country and took about two-thirds of the children as slaves'.[4] There is, however, not the least doubt that Eliot, even in his more conservative statements, grossly exaggerated the importance of slave-raids.

(1) Lugard, who in his famous book published in 1893 dealt very fully with slavery in East Africa, Nyasaland, Uganda, and Zanzibar,[5] says that 'in East Africa there is . . . comparatively little internal slavery among the purely savage tribes',[6] that it 'is not dominated . . . by bands of slave-raiders as are other territories in Africa,'[7] and that 'whereas in Nyasaland and other parts of Africa, large numbers of Arab and Swahili slave-traders have permanently settled down in the country, and prose-

[1] Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate*, p. 239. See also ibid., p. 57: 'The Arabs took two out of every three children as slaves in the whole of this district, a tribute which was naturally terribly destructive to the native population, and after the Mazrui rebellion [1895] a great number of them emigrated, so that the country was deprived of both its aristocracy and proletariat.' See finally ibid., p. 191: 'In some districts, particularly on the coast, the slave trade was a terrible drain on the population, as more than half the children were taken away.'

[2] Ibid., p. 239.

[3] Ibid., p. 152. Though he repeatedly emphasized (for example, ibid., p. 233) that 'our interest and activity in this part of the world largely originated in our desire to put down the slave trade' and that 'the establishment of our rule, by effectively terminating that trade, had been one of the greatest philanthropic achievements of the later nineteenth century', he suggested (ibid., p. 191) that the abolition of the slave-trade justified the imposition of a hut tax, a subject with which he had dealt already in his report, dated 10 June 1901 (p. 12), in the following terms: 'There can, I think, be no abstract objection to taxing the African natives, for few populations have more obviously and directly gained by our rule than they have. A few decades ago they were exposed to continual raids by the Arab slave-dealers and to all the suffering and loss of life incidental to the progress of a slave caravan from the interior to the coast, and to subsequent voyages in slave dhows. Under British protection all this has come to an end, and a moderate contribution to the expenses of Government is not an unreasonable equivalent.'

[4] Eliot, The Progress and Problems of the East Africa Protectorate, p. 91.

[5] Captain Lugard commanded in 1888 an expedition against slave-traders on Lake Nyasa and was from 1889 to 1892 Administrator of Uganda in the services of the Imperial British East Africa Company. One of the principal objects of this Company was the suppression of the slave-trade in its territories.

[6] Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, pp. 173–4. See also, for example, Routledge and Routledge, *With a Prehistoric People, The Akikúyu of British East Africa*, p. 16: 'Slavery as an institution did not exist amongst them, nor did they make raids for the capture of slaves.'

[7] Lugard, vol. i, p. 390.

cuted this traffic, and taught the native tribes to participate in it, British East Africa is entirely free of any such *resident* slave-traders'.[1]

(2) Eliot said that ten or fifteen years ago, i.e. in the first half of the 1890s, slave-traders raided the whole country. Yet Sub-Commissioner Ainsworth, who certainly was not inclined to understate the amount of slavery, and who emphasized the difficulties encountered by the Administration all through the 1890s in suppressing the slave-raids of native tribes in Ukamba Province, reported with regard to the Arab and Swahili slave-traders merely:

> In 1892 a large slave caravan proceeding from Kavirondo to the coast . . . was located at Nwazi . . . . On another occasion, in 1894, a large caravan of slaves was surprised in Kitui. . . . On several occasions small trading parties of Arabs and Swahilis were arrested at various places for slaving. This sort of trade continued in the Ulu country up till 1894, and in Kitui for some years longer.[2]

(3) In so far as slave-traders procured slaves for export the native population was reduced both by deaths during the march to the coast and by the forced emigration of the survivors, but it is doubtful whether this kind of slave-trade from Kenya has ever been numerically important.[3] In so far as the slaves remained in the country, their capture, no doubt, caused internal migrations, but it is doubtful whether the expectation of life of those enslaved was reduced essentially.

Intertribal wars caused probably many more deaths in Kenya than raids by slave-traders. Lugard (1893) tells us that the 'Wakamba are at constant war with the Masai',[4] that the Kikuyu 'are at constant war with the Masai',[5] and that 'in East Africa the population is restricted to certain areas, mainly through tribal wars and Masai raids'.[6] Eliot says that in East Africa 'every tribe was at war with its neighbours',[7] and relates of the Masai proper that 'formerly every man's youth—that is, till he was about twenty-seven or thirty—was spent in fighting or cattle-raiding'.[8] Sub-Commissioner Ainsworth says of the Ukamba Province which comprised Kamba, Kikuyu, and Masai, that 'the country . . . was inhabited by tribes whose everyday occupation had been for generations one of raiding and killing one another and enslaving and selling women and youths'.[9]

[1] Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, p. 194.

[2] *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 27.

[3] Leys (*Kenya*, p. 288) says that such slave-raids were only just beginning when the British stopped them. See also Margery Perham (Huxley and Perham, *Race and Politics in Kenya*, p. 214): 'Certainly, where the Arab slave-trade (a fairly new scourge as far as its inland penetration is concerned), was doing its worst, European intervention saved whole tribes from decimation or even extermination. But this trade had not affected Kenya very much.'

[4] Lugard, vol. i, p. 283.

[5] Ibid., p. 327.

[6] Ibid., pp. 487–8.

[7] Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate*, p. 239.

[8] Ibid., pp. 134–5; see also ibid., p. 239. Later on, the Masai were used by the British in their wars against other tribes; see ibid., p. 200: 'We have often used the Masai against other tribes, and were it necessary to operate against the Masai, which I do not anticipate, it would be equally easy to use other tribes against them.' See also Hinde and Hinde, p. xi, and footnote 8, p. 195 below.

[9] *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 1. He says furthermore that 'up to a date subsequent to the great cattle plague of 1884, Masai warriors dominated the whole of what is now known as British East Africa' (ibid., p. 28), and that 'the Wakamba have always been inimical to all surrounding tribes, and in the past they were constantly engaged in internal raids and troubles' (ibid., p. 35).

All these and many other descriptions of intertribal warfare in East Africa give the impression that before the proclamation of the British Protectorate *whole* tribes were *constantly* at war. But Dr. Leakey told the Kenya Land Commission:

Enormous numbers of Kikuyu and Masai intermarried during times of peace and treaties. There are hundreds of Kikuyu with Masai names, and vice versa, and at certain times—very often periods of five, ten or twenty years—they were at peace and intermarriage took place, and the Kikuyu would allow relations in law to come through and graze as freely as they liked. They were allowed to go to Kiambu to the salt-licks, to the swamps, and to build *bomas* there.[1] At other times, there would be war, and even though the Masai might be relations in law, unless they had made blood brotherhood out they had to go or they were killed.

I can only speak from what I know. There are old men to-day who are half Masai, and who must have been the result of intermarriages very much before the Europeans came here, and they certainly speak of a time when there was peace and the Kikuyu and the Masai were absolutely friendly and intermarried, just as to-day there are Kikuyu living in the Masai Reserve on perfectly friendly terms and Masai living in the Kikuyu Reserve.[2]

Major Macdonald suggests that even in times of war not all raids were genuine.

The Wakikuyu warriors would have one believe that they raid the Masai, but I fear these raiding-parties rarely leave their favourite forest belt. It is true that a band of young braves, got up in their war-paint, often assemble and make it known to all and sundry that they mean to extirpate the Masai. Their bravery is loudly applauded, and is, moreover, fortified with copious draughts of pombe. Then, breathing goro and destruction, the heroes depart, and plunge into the forest *en route* for the nearest Masai kraal. As a rule, this is the extent of the raid, for the open plains appear to exercise a depressing influence on their spirits, and, though they may spear some unfortunate old man who may have approached the forest for firewood, they rarely arrive at conclusions with the Elmoran [Masai warriors].[3]

It goes without saying that, on the other hand, many raids were very bloody affairs and caused a great deal of misery and despair. Captain Lugard relates:

Here is a description (one of many) of the last returned traveller from Africa (Commander Dundas, R.N.), relative to the doings of the Masai:—

'On our return through the Mbé country, a most harrowing sight presented itself: what only a few days before were prosperous villages, standing amid fields of grain, were now smoking ruins; bodies of old men, women, and children, half-burnt, lay

[1] See also Kenyatta, who after having described a severe fight between the Kikuyu of the Mathera District and the Masai of Laikipia and their reconciliation on the battlefield, relates (*My People of Kikuyu*, p. 55):

'From that time on the two sections remained friends, and the friendship was later strengthened when a cattle disease devastated both Masai and Kikuyu cattle. The Masai, who depend entirely on the milk, meat and blood from their cattle, experienced great hardship and thousands of them died of starvation. But the section which had established friendship with the Kikuyu were saved, for during this time trading relations were established and marketing centres were set up.

'In the markets, or sometimes in the homesteads, the Kikuyu women brought grain, yam, flour, sweet potatoes and bananas, which the Masai women bought with sheep, skins or hides.'

[2] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 661. That inter-marriage took place was also admitted by Ainsworth who wrote: 'Marriage with Masai. By some means or other the southern Kikuyu have become possessed, from time to time, of Masai women . . . .' *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 33.)

[3] Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa 1891–1894*, pp. 110–11.

in all directions; here and there might be seen a few solitary individuals, sitting with their heads buried in their hands, hardly noticing the passing caravan, and apparently in the lowest depths of misery and despair. On questioning several of these unhappy beings, I was informed that the Masai had unexpectedly arrived one morning at dawn, spearing and burning all before them, and carrying off some 250 women, and large herds of cattle. Only a few of the unfortunate people had escaped by flying to the mountains."[1]

Now let us assume that one such raid in which some 250 women were carried off and perhaps 200 people were killed occurred every week, year in, year out, in the present territory of Kenya which 50 years ago had probably at least 3 million inhabitants. What would this mean from the demographic point of view? It would mean that every year a little over 1 per cent. of the women had to change their husbands, and that about 3 per thousand of the population were killed in raids. But I do not think that such unexpected raids with so disastrous consequences were a weekly occurrence.

It is easy to exaggerate the extent and severity of tribal warfare. These affrays were nothing much more than a series of border quarrels, conducted for the purpose of, or in retaliation for, thefts of produce or stock.[2] Within the tribal borders the bulk of the native population lived at peace. No majestic *impis* moved across the country. Heavy fighting on a tribal scale rarely took place. The Masai did make forays in some strength, but, except when sections of this tribe were fighting each other, their operations were nothing more than cattle raids, skilfully planned to take unsuspecting stock-holders of other tribes by surprise.[3]

There cannot in fact be any doubt that times of peace alternated with times of war, and that as a rule only a minority of those capable of bearing arms took part in fighting. War casualties sometimes were certainly heavy but there is no reason to assume that they were more numerous in proportion to the total population than in other parts of the world.[4]

The Administration, to be sure, does not deserve less credit for having abolished slave-raids and intertribal wars if the number of deaths caused by such events was smaller than it was supposed to be, yet from a demographic standpoint famines were more disastrous. Even the local famines which probably occurred nearly every year claimed in the long run numerous victims, but the great famines affecting vast areas constituted the direst scourge. Sir Arthur Hardinge stated in 1897:

. . . I have heard it said, though I know not with what truth, that the great famine of 13 years ago, reduced the inhabitants of the present province of Seyyidieh to about half their previous numbers. Whether this be so or not, it is certain that the memory

[1] Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, p. 87.

[2] See also Kenyatta, *Facing Mount Kenya*, pp. 208–9.

[3] Ross, *Kenya from within*, p. 59. See also Leys, *Kenya*, p. 288: 'Traditional accounts of intertribal warfare are as reliable as contemporary accounts of mediaeval battles or of the old Jewish wars.'

[4] Sir A. Hardinge said in 1898 that Ukamba Province comprised '9,000 square miles and a population of over 1,000,000' (see *Report on the British East Africa Protectorate 1897–8*, p. 16), and there is a great deal of other evidence indicating that population density then was not less than it is to-day. It seems inconceivable, therefore, that, as Ainsworth says, the Province was inhabited by tribes whose everyday occupation had been for generations one of raiding and killing one another and enslaving and selling women and youths.

of this famine is more deeply graven than any other occurrence in their recent history in the minds of the native population.[1]

If this famine had actually reduced the population of the Province of Seyidie by one-half, it would have caused the death of more than 100,000 people.[2]

Another great famine, which this time affected the pastoral tribes of East Africa as of other parts of the continent, occurred in 1890–1. It was due to rinderpest. Lugard relates:

> The plague seems to have started on the East Coast, opposite Aden, and to have spread inland. It began at the end of 1889, and when I went into the interior in the December of that year, it had not reached Masailand and Ukamba, nor yet in the spring of 1890. When I returned up-country in the autumn of 1890 it had spread through these countries, and the cattle and buffalo were dead. . . .[3]
>
> Not for thirty years has a plague like this been known in the country, and even then it was not to be compared in virulence to the present one. Never before in the memory of man, or by the voice of tradition, have the cattle died in such vast numbers . . . .[4]
>
> In the case of the Bantu (or negroid) tribes, the loss, though a terrible one, did not, as a rule, involve starvation and death to the people, since, being agricultural, they possess large crops as a resource. But to the pastoral races the loss of their cattle meant death.[5]

Merker says that 'hundreds of thousands of Masai, particularly men and boys', died from that famine.[6] This is possibly an exaggeration, but the losses of the Masai no doubt were extremely heavy. A cattle plague and a famine which ravaged their country in 1884—apparently in the same year as the famine in Seyidie—had already seriously undermined their fighting power,[7] and the plague and famine of 1890–1 brought to an end their career as a great warring nation.[8] Although they have lived in this century under comparatively favourable conditions, their number is now probably only a fraction of what it was until 1884.[9]

The next great famine, probably the worst of all, occurred in 1898–9, and as this famine was witnessed by many Europeans our knowledge of it is much more comprehensive.

The Collector of Customs stated that in the spring of 1898 'nearly all the districts of the coast are in a state of famine'.[10] Hardinge himself, in

[1] *Report on the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 25.

[2] The province, according to Sir A. Hardinge, had 175,000 inhabitants in 1897.

[3] Lugard, vol. i, p. 526. [4] Ibid., p. 527. [5] Ibid., pp. 525–6. [6] See Merker, p. 336.

[7] See, for example, *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate* (1905), p. 28.

[8] See, for example, Lugard, vol. i, p. 527: 'In some respects it has favoured our enterprise. Powerful and warlike as the pastoral tribes are, their pride has been humbled and our progress facilitated by this awful visitation. The advent of the white man had else not been so peaceful. The Masai would undoubtedly have opposed us . . . .'

[9] The total number of Masai now living in Kenya and Tanganyika seems to be approximately 80,000. Sub-Commissioner Ainsworth reported in 1905: 'Amongst the Masai I am inclined to think that there is a very slight annual increase in the population' (*Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 5). In *Medical Survey Masai Province, 1930–1*, it is stated (p. 31): 'Sterility before marriage and after miscarriage has resulted in a greatly decreased birth rate. . . . A child mortality approaching 500 per 1,000 does not leave a margin for increase but on the contrary is bringing about a steady decrease.'

[10] *Report by Sir A. Hardinge on the British East Africa Protectorate 1897–8*, p. 6.

the introduction to his report dated 20 July 1898, referred to 'the failure of the rains for two summers running, and the consequent prevalence of famine throughout a large part of the territory, and the ravages caused in the Province of Ukamba since last autumn by pleuro-pneumonia among the cattle, and afterwards, since March last, by the more serious scourge of rinderpest'.[1]

> Drought and Famine—This has been more severely felt in the Province of Ukamba (excepting in Kikuyu and parts of Ulu, where rain has fallen, though in smaller quantities than usual), than in other portions of the territory. Kitui has suffered more than any other district . . . .[2]

But the following twelve or eighteen months proved to be much more disastrous still, though the scanty official documents may not give this impression.[3] Commissioner Eliot, in 1901, merely reported: 'In 1899–1900, the failure of the usual periodical rains brought about a widespread famine, which was most acute in Ukamba. Every effort was made, both by the Administration and the missionaries, to relieve the starving population, but the mortality was considerable, and, unfortunately, small-pox followed on famine.'[4]

Apparently the first estimate of the losses of one tribe was published in 1904 by H. R. Tate:

> . . . both Kitui and Ulu suffered terribly from the famine of 1898 and 1899, when fifty per cent. of the Akamba are estimated to have died. . . . During this time many Akamba migrated to the Kikuyu country, where they stayed until 1900, selling cattle, and leaving their children in payment of food, to be afterwards redeemed when better days came round.[5]

It is most puzzling that Tate, although he deals as fully with the Kikuyu[6] as with the Kamba, not only does not mention any famine among the Kikuyu but even says that the Kamba went into the Kikuyu country for relief.[7] One year later, Sub-Commissioner Ainsworth reported that famine had been severe also in Kikuyu but not as terrible as in Kitui and Ulu.

> A very severe famine visited Ukamba some time about 1888,[8] then came years of

[1] *Report by Sir A. Hardinge on the British East Africa Protectorate 1897–8*, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 9. See also ibid., p. 28, the special 'Report on Kitui'.

[3] If any general report on the Protectorate has been made between Sir A. Hardinge's report of 20 July 1898 and Sir C. Eliot's report of 10 June 1901 it has not been published. The Reports on Trade for 1897–8 and 1898–9 are likewise lacking.

[4] *Report on the East Africa Protectorate*, dated 10 June 1901, p. 9. The *Trade Report 1899–1900*, apparently the only other public report of that period dealing with the famine, revealed still less its catastrophic effects: 'The country, as a whole, is slowly recovering from the severe distress into which it was plunged by the drought two years ago, which brought in its train famine and small-pox. The rains have fallen abundantly during the past monsoon, and crops, where the natives have possessed seed, are plentiful, the only drawbacks being a plague of rats in the Giriama country and the diminished number of labourers consequent on mortality from famine and small-pox' (*Report on the Trade and Customs Revenue of the East Africa Protectorate 1899–1900*, p. 3).

[5] Tate, 'Notes on the Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes', p. 135; see also ibid., p. 137.

[6] See ibid., pp. 130–5, and 'Further Notes on the Kikuyu Tribe', pp. 255–65.

[7] Canon Leakey who reached the Kikuyu country in January 1902 told the Kenya Land Commission: 'I have always heard that a great many Kikuyu went into the Kamba country at that time because they were dying from famine. Some came back soon after' (*Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 847).

[8] I found nowhere else any reference to a famine in Ukamba about 1888.

plenty, then, a little more than ten years later, *i.e.* at the beginning of 1898, the whole of the province was subjected to a similar visitation. The coast districts were affected similarly at the same time.

So far as this province is concerned, the famine was not caused by absolute failure of the rains, but by the irregular manner in which the rain came. A further partial cause was the improvident habits of the natives.

Ample rains in season began to fall during the latter part of 1899, when the famine period came to an end. Just before this, however, small-pox broke out at several places in the afflicted areas. It is, apparently, a regular thing for small-pox to follow famine in Africa. From the joint causes of famine and small-pox large numbers of the population died. I estimate that in Ulu and Kitui districts approximately 25 per cent. of the people died, while in Kikuyu the average must have been 15 per cent. . . .[1]

While these reports probably do not convey a true picture of the intensity of the disaster among the Kikuyu, they fulfil one very useful purpose. They prove that the famine affected practically the whole of the Ukamba Province, and, both in 1898 and 1899, spread beyond this Province. Since, according to Sir A. Hardinge, the population of Ukamba Province comprised 1,044,000 of the 1,336,000 natives living in the four Provinces of the Protectorate, the famines of 1898–9 seem to have affected nearly the entire country under administration. What happened to the people in the unorganized territories of the Protectorate, who according to Sir A. Hardinge numbered 1,150,000, is unknown.

According to the estimates published in 1904–5, 25 or 50 per cent. of the people had died in the Ulu and Kitui Districts and 15 per cent. in the Kikuyu District. Some other Europeans who were at that time in the country or came shortly afterwards think that the proportion of Kikuyu who died was one-half or three-quarters. Thus Mr. McGregor, who went to Kenya in April 1900 as Assistant Engineer on the construction of the Uganda Railway, wrote in 1927: 'As the Railway engineers had good reason to know, the majority of the native population had perished during the years 1898 and 1899 by a famine, unparalleled within native memory, due to the failure of three rainy seasons in succession—a drought of nearly eighteen months' duration. It was contended by survivors that three out of every four of the Kikúyu residents in an extensive stretch of country had died, either from famine or from pestilence, chiefly small-pox, following upon it.'[2] A similar view was held by some other witnesses. When Mr. John Patterson of the East Africa Scottish Mission, who came in 1893, was asked by the Chairman of the Kenya Land Commission 'You remember all about the famine?' he replied: 'Yes. It was in 1898–99. About half the population died about that time, the famine was at its worst. People were dying of smallpox and drought. . . . I could say two-thirds of the Kikuyu population died. . . . About 1898 the Masai too were starving as they had had an attack of rinderpest.'[3] Dr. H. A. Boedeker, who came

[1] *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, pp. 25–6.

[2] Ross, *Kenya from within*, p. 62; see also Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3369.

[3] Ibid., vol. i, p. 746. The statement that the Masai too were starving 'about 1898' was possibly incorrect. Ainsworth says: 'The famine of 1898 did not affect the Masai' (*Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 26).

in 1896, said: 'In 1898 a big famine started and on top of it there were several outbreaks of smallpox, with the result that many thousands of natives died throughout the Kikuyu country—about 70 per cent of the population round Kiambu.'[1] When asked by the Chairman 'Was the mortality from smallpox about the same throughout the Kikuyu country?' he answered: 'I have no reason to think that it was different, but I could not state definitely about other parts. There was no doubt that the outbreak spread throughout the whole district as far as Mount Kenya.'[2] But Mr. W. P. Knapp of the Gospel Missionary Society, who came in April 1899, made a more conservative estimate: 'We arrived at the beginning of the famine in Kikuyu, and it advanced ahead of the railway line. I was present at the famine in Kikuyu when at least one-third of the people died through famine, small-pox and acute indigestion when they finally got their crops.'[3] The representative of the Kikuyu testifying before the Land Commission was likewise more cautious: 'I do not agree with this number 75 per cent, but between 30 per cent and 40 per cent died.'[4] Finally, Dr. A. R. Paterson, Acting Director of Medical and Sanitary Services, when asked whether the statement that 60 per cent. of the Kikuyu had died from famine appeared to him to be reasonable, said: 'That 60 per cent died appears to me to be incredible, even in a limited area like Kiambu. Ten per cent is far nearer what I should think it was likely to be. In most of these cases, the actual number of deaths which occur is far less important than the damage done to the people who live—rendering them liable to other diseases, either at the time or in the future.'[5] He did not make an estimate of those who had died from smallpox.[6]

That 60 per cent. of the Kikuyu should have died from famine alone or even from famine and smallpox seems to me to be out of the question, because this would imply that the Kikuyu before the famine numbered at least 1,000,000,[7] a figure which I consider inacceptable in view of the small area which they occupied (about 1,700 square miles) and of the estimate of the population of the whole Province of Ukamba made shortly before the famine by Sir A. Hardinge. But I see no reason to reject an estimate putting the deaths in Ukamba from both famine and smallpox at something like 30 per cent., and it may well be that the four Provinces together lost something like one-quarter of their population.

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 696.
[2] Ibid., p. 697. [3] Ibid., p. 769. [4] Ibid., p. 216. [5] Ibid., vol. iii, p. 3214.
[6] Another well-known medical officer, Dr. Christopher J. Wilson, who came to British East Africa (Kenya) in 1911, wrote recently: 'At the time of the settlers' arrival, the Kikuyu had reached the neighbourhood of Nairobi. About the same time, two other events occurred: a severe drought, followed by a great number of deaths from famine, and an epidemic of smallpox. The resulting mortality has been estimated at 70 per cent. of the population. These disasters led to the withdrawal from the stricken districts of the surviving Kikuyu; and when a survey was made of the district around Nairobi, to find land suitable for settlement, so few natives were found that the land was classified as unoccupied . . . .' (*One African Colony*, 1945, p. 23.)
[7] The Kenya Land Commission, on the basis of the figures submitted by District Commissioner Fazan, estimated the number of Kikuyu for 1902 at 451,562, and for 1931 at 600,000 (see *Report*, p. 26). But even assuming that the Kikuyu immediately after the famine numbered only 400,000, there would have been 1,000,000 before the famine if 60 per cent. had died from starvation and smallpox.

The famine of 1898–9 was certainly more devastating than any prior famine the natives could remember, and we need not assume that such a widespread famine had ever occurred before. It rather seems that the exceptional extent of the catastrophe was due to factors which were connected with the arrival of the Europeans. Mr. Knapp of the Gospel Missionary Society, in discussing the causes of the famine among the Kikuyu, pointed out that 'the Government had commandeered the last crop prior to the drought for the trip to Uganda'.[1] Canon Leakey said that the famine was greatly intensified by the fact that 'an enormous *safari* with Nubian troops marched right through the Kikuyu country. The agents of the food contractor (Alidina Visram, I believe) bought up quantities of grain of all sorts for what seemed to the unfortunate sellers magnificent returns of brass wire, Amerikani [cloth sheetings] and beads. But it spelt disaster for them . . . .'[2] Mr. Patterson of the East Africa Scottish Mission thought 'the railway had something to do with the famine because a large number of Indians then working on the line bought their surplus food'.[3] As regards the rinderpest which next to the drought was the most important cause of the famine in Ukamba Province, Sir A. Hardinge said: 'it was believed by our authorities there to have been brought up with some infected cattle alleged to have been imported for the Uganda Railway'.[4] It is true that, on the other hand, the natives received some assistance from the Europeans. The Government imported food in order to alleviate the situation and opened a few relief camps.[5] But it did not distribute the food free of charge,[6] and this help therefore was not very effective.

For quite a time famines continued to harass the country intermittently, and there were other factors which kept mortality on a high level. In the early years of this century sleeping-sickness claimed many victims,[7] plague became endemic,[8] and the medical and sanitary services for natives were inadequate.

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 771.

[2] Ibid., p. 865. [3] Ibid., p. 746. [4] *Report 1897–8*, p. 8.

[5] See *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate* (1905), p. 26: 'During the time of this famine relief camps were opened at Ndii, Kibwezi, Machakos, Nairobi, and Kikuyu. . . . Information was sent all over the country to the people to the effect that they would receive food if they came to the relief camps, but thousands died before they either got our messages or could reach the camps.' See also Elspeth Huxley, *White Man's Country*, vol. i, p. 67: 'The Government imported a good deal of food but the country was so thinly administered that the distribution of the grain could only be very patchy.' (According to Sir A. Hardinge, *Report 1897–8*, p. 16, there were in Ukamba Province 'nine English officials'.) The total expense per head in the afflicted areas was 1*d*. (Of the total expenditure of the Protectorate from 1 July 1895 to 31 Mar. 1904 aggregating £1,954,111, £3,892 were spent for 'famine relief and small-pox', and £971 for 'cattle diseases'; see *Reports* 1905, p. 46. The expenditure for 'military purposes' was £607,665. 'The point in our own relations with natives which is most open to criticism is our fondness for little wars, generally called punitive expeditions. Some of these, no doubt, are inevitable, but it is certain that the majority of military officers go out to Africa in the hope of seeing active service, and that the younger and more energetic civilians are not averse to such experiences.' Eliot, 'The Progress and Problems of the East Africa Protectorate', p. 89.)

[6] See *Report 1897–8*, p. 9, and *Report*, dated 10 June 1901, p. 12.

[7] See, for example, *Report on the East Africa Protectorate 1903–4*, p. 1: 'That terrible scourge the sleeping sickness continues its ravages . . . and is increasing its range . . . .'

[8] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 24; see also ibid. *1917*, p. 36.

In the early days of the East Africa Protectorate, now the Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, the energies of the Medical Officers attached to the administration were chiefly directed towards the maintenance in health of the European and native employees of Government. The practice either of curative or preventive medicine among the general native population was, on account of the paucity of the medical staff, the difficulties and dangers of transport and the backwardness of the native population, largely impossible, while the preventive work which these officers were called on to perform was limited to such as was necessary for the maintenance in a sanitary condition of small administrative stations, the population of which would not, as a rule, exceed half a dozen Europeans and fifty or a hundred native troops or police.[1]

While according to the findings of Medical Officers mortality seems to have been high wherever they went,[2] it was excessive among Natives from the highlands working on the coast and Natives from hot regions working in the highlands.[3] A few quotations from the evidence furnished to the Native Labour Commission 1912–13 may serve as an illustration:

M. C. R. W. Lano, Provincial Commissioner, Nyeri: . . . Work at the Coast, Kibwezi, [and] the Magadi Railway . . . was becoming more and more unpopular . . . in spite of high wages and as a rule good treatment, on account of high death and sickness rates . . . During the year 1912 of 45 gangs from districts in this Province, totalling 1,889 men, 145 had died either at work, on the road, or shortly after reaching their villages. This was a death rate of 80 per 1,000.[4]

Dr. H. R. A. Philp, Scottish Mission, Tumu-Tumu. . . . In his opinion, the Nairobi—Fort Hall road alone was annually responsible for more deaths than would supply the present demand for labour in this country. The sickness on that road was chiefly malaria and dysentery.

He was chiefly interested as to what state of health the native was in after he had been ten days back inside his Reserve. In many hundreds of instances all that remained of the native was a corpse in the bush awaiting the hyena's visit.

He had reported this mortality from malaria from time to time to Government and was glad to say that Dr. Leys the Medical Officer took the matter up very strenuously, but he was suddenly transferred and so the matter was dropped.[5]

Dr. Norman Leys: During 1911 the death rate among Kikuyu in Mombasa was 14%, a rate six times higher than among the rest of the population. The excess was largely due to sick discharged from plantations. In addition many Kikuyu die after returning home. . . .

The chief cause of this mortality is the absence of Sanitary Measures on plantations and in Townships, such as are enforced by law in other tropical Colonies. Contributory causes are bad dietaries and poor housing, both of which are inferior to what was provided for slave labour a generation ago. The conditions which determine sickness and death rates vary greatly in different plantations. There is no provision for reaching exact statistics with regard to the different plantations.

Physique deteriorates so rapidly among up-country labourers that few can serve for as long as three months and many cannot earn their pay after the first few weeks. Malaria and dysentery cause most of the acute disease. Anchylostomiasis is responsible for much of the chronic labour inefficiency on the Coast.[6]

A system of domestic slavery would have many advantages over existing conditions and should be seriously considered if an immediate and abundant labour supply is a political necessity. If labourers were property it would pay to feed and house them better than they are fed and housed now. . . .[7]

[1] *Medical Report 1921*, pp. 16–17. See also Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 190.
[2] See p. 187 above.
[3] See *A Handbook of Kenya*, pp. 324–5.
[4] *Native Labour Commission 1912–13*, p. 195.
[5] Ibid., pp. 204–5.
[6] Ibid., p. 270.
[7] Ibid., p. 271.

During the war a great number of native unarmed porters died of disease,[1] and a probably still greater number of natives succumbed to influenza.[2] Then followed a devastating famine. Hobley, who had been Chief Political Officer to the Expeditionary Force in East Africa, summarized the events as follows:

> . . . large numbers of men came back from the war emaciated and worn out. It was an illustration of the biblical reference to 'war, pestilence and famine.' They came back full of malaria and dysentery, and a year after the war there was the influenza epidemic and then the cerebro-spinal meningitis epidemic, and finally famine ensued. Few actually starved but many were under-fed, and disease was rife and killed thousands. The mortality in 1919 was very heavy. This set-back to the population was bad in other ways. All the best of the men, the potential fathers, had gone away to the war.[3] I am of opinion that over 60,000 natives from Kenya died in the war, apart from a very considerable number in addition who died after its cessation or whose death was caused by the war.[4]

Conditions remained bad in the early 1920s. Mortality in the Reserves was reported to be very high.

> It is doubtful whether many even of those Europeans who come most closely in contact with the native in his own Reserves, fully realise how low the sanitary standard in these Reserves actually is. The European travelling in a Native District, by means of porters and servants carries with him in the form of tent and bed, food and filters, a bath and a change of clothing, a fairly sanitary environment. A bright sun, a warm climate, the dark skin of the native, the fact that for the most part it is only the more healthy of the male population who are usually in evidence and that the interior of a boma and still less the interior of a hut are seldom seen, tends to obscure the fact that large numbers of the population are not physically fit, that most are unwashed and that nearly all live under conditions which cannot be described otherwise than as grossly insanitary.[5]

Dr. Leys wrote in 1924:

> . . . two diseases [smallpox and yaws] are under control. None of the other preventible diseases are, except to some extent in the towns. Of these, malaria and

[1] According to Leys (*Kenya*, p. 287) the officially recorded native deaths were:

	Killed	*Died of disease*	*Total*
Armed Forces . . .	1,377	2,923	4,300
Unarmed Porters . .	366	41,952	42,318
Total	1,743	44,875	46,618

'The number of deaths given in the official figures does not include many thousands who died after their return home, from diseases contracted on service. Many of the deaths were due to starvation rather than to disease' (ibid., pp. 287–8).

[2] See *Medical Report 1918*, p. 37: 'Careful statistics have been compiled by Administrative Officers, Missionaries and others showing 501,772 cases with 39,927 deaths, but . . . the figures can only be regarded as approximate.' See also Ross, p. 152, who states that influenza killed 155,000 natives (and quotes as his source for this statement an article by the Chief Native Commissioner in *The Leader of East Africa*, 21 Jan. 1920).

[3] See also in this connexion Orr and Gilks, p. 17: 'Of the 16,754 men of one district of the [Kikuyu] Reserve who were called up during 1917 for enrolment in the Carrier Corps, 10,912 were immediately rejected on medical grounds. Following the march of one hundred miles to the depôt at Nairobi, a further 17 per cent. were rejected as physically unfit.'

[4] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 444. See also Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa*, vol. i, p. 287: '. . . probably fifty thousand natives died during the World War, while one hundred and fifty thousand died from famine and influenza in 1918–19.'

[5] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 63.

dysentery nearly everywhere, and anchylostomiasis on the coast, are as prevalent as ever. They are indeed probably greater scourges than they were forty years ago.[1]

Of diseases recently introduced the chief are tuberculosis and venereal diseases. The first shows an ominous tendency to spread.[2]

The Medical Report for 1925 summarized the situation as follows:

. . . the period 1914 to 1924 was one during which a number of severe strains were being experienced by the native population. A sleeping sickness epidemic had during the previous decade swept through parts of the Nyanza Province, and its effects were probably still in evidence: in 1913 a severe epidemic of cerebro-spinal meningitis had taken a large toll of lives in the Kikuyu Province: between 1914 and 1918 many thousands of natives died on active service, while many others were more or less incapacitated; in 1918 influenza was responsible for a great increase in the death rate; while in 1919–20 there was a serious famine in many parts of the country. Plague also was spreading during this period, and the long epidemic of yaws was probably at its maximum.

Other factors which were probably not without effect were tolls exacted by the necessity for Railway Construction, at a time when neither the experience nor the machinery essential for the proper care of large bodies of inexperienced labourers was available,[3] and by the employment of bachelor labour in the development of farms and estates. Nor can the heavy toll which is always exacted as the result of the first urbanization of rural folk be left out of account.[4]

Between 1904 and 1924 internal peace was given to the tribes of Kenya; but at the same time economic changes were taking place and development along new lines was in progress. Both peace and development were in relation to the conditions which had previously existed, more of the nature of shocks than of stimulants: the advent of external war in 1914 postponed for at least a decade the devising or application of methods whereby the results of these shocks could be controlled.[5]

The same report described the medical and sanitary services in the Reserves until 1925 as follows:

In the Native Reserves the position was that to any one district one medical officer was usually posted and he would have under his care a very large stretch of country with a population in some cases of as many as 300,000. He was expected to manage a hospital sometimes of one hundred beds and to supervise or to carry out the treatment of the patients in that hospital, to be responsible for the inauguration and control of measures against outbreaks of epidemic diseases such as plague and

[1] Leys, *Kenya*, p. 283.

[2] Ibid., pp. 283–4.

[3] According to *Medical Report 1923*, pp. 33–4, the average number of native labourers employed on the construction of the Uasin Gishu Railway was 11,220 in 1922 and 14,400 in 1923. The number of deaths was 560 and 511, and the death-rate amounted to 50 and 35 respectively. It is doubtful whether deaths by accident are included in these figures. One reason for the reduction in mortality was 'the largely increased supply of temporarily engaged natives. Instead of large gangs of labour, recruited from remote districts for a period of six months, the labour during the later stages of the construction consisted in great part of men who were individually engaged, on monthly or even shorter contract. This labour was of course entirely voluntary, and as a rule only comparatively strong and healthy natives volunteered. Moreover any native proving unfit for the task, or becoming sick, was immediately released, as being unprofitable to his employer, whereas the Native recruited at considerable expense for a period of six months would have been retained until his repatriation was ordered by a Medical Officer' (ibid., pp. 36–7). It may well be, therefore, that the proportion of natives who later died in their homes from sickness contracted while they were employed was larger in 1923 than in 1922.

[4] See also in this connexion Leys, p. 289: 'The codes which, in civilised countries, have gradually been built up to protect the worker do not and cannot exist in Kenya. There is no Workmen's Compensation Act, for instance, and Africans in Kenya are more liable than workmen in this country to meet with accidents from unfenced machinery.'

[5] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 15.

smallpox, to undertake the training of dressers, to supervise out-dispensaries and to check and exercise control over the expenditure of stores. In addition he was responsible for the sanitary inspection of townships and trading centres and the district generally and expected to act as Medical Officer of Health and adviser to the Local Authority on all matters pertaining to the Public Health.[1]

For the first 30 years after the transfer of the territory to His Majesty's Government (1895) there is a consensus of opinion that mortality was very high and in some periods excessive. As regards the following 15 years the reports suggest that epidemics and famines were less severe, but they do not give the impression that the general standard of health has improved or that mortality in 'normal' years has declined.

1926. In certain directions town life offers advantages: for example epidemic disease is more strictly controlled, medical aid is more accessible. For certain classes housing and general sanitary conditions are of a more advanced type, and food is more abundant and varied. On the other hand a large proportion of town dwellers live in conditions of overcrowding and insanitation which are worse than anything experienced under 'natural' circumstances, while their food may be less abundant and less varied than normally in the Reserve.

There are no statistics by which comparison may be made of the relative healthiness of the native when living in a town, on a farm, or in the Reserve. Reliable statistics of these three classes of the native population are urgently needed; without these it is difficult to estimate the effect of civilizing influences on native health.[2]

1928. The findings to date indicate . . . that the state of the public health in the Reserves is generally at a low level and that the descriptions given in former reports are not unwarranted.[3]

Dealing first with the great African population, the most striking facts which are to be noted are its poverty and its ignorance. . . . As a direct consequence the conditions under which the African lives and under which children are reared are insanitary and unhygienic in the extreme. The ordinary conveniences of life are almost entirely lacking. It is hardly possible to over-emphasise the fact that the average native is born, lives and dies amongst the most insanitary conditions. His house is a mud-walled, grass-roofed hut, devoid of light and ventilation and infested with vermin.[4] Water supplies are almost everywhere either deficient or polluted, or both. The foodstuffs which are available in some districts are almost certainly deficient in quality and, though famine is not allowed to assume serious proportions, the actual amount of food available has a seasonal incidence varying between abundance and scarcity. . . .

With regard to the incidence of disease, the facts are broadly as follows: Almost every African native is infested with some type of intestinal worm. A large proportion suffer at one time or another from malaria. Over large areas plague and yaws are endemic. Syphilis appears to be becoming increasingly prevalent in certain districts. Pneumonia, broncho-pneumonia and tuberculosis take a large toll of life.[5]

1931. Ill-health and poor nourishment are to a greater or less degree the lot of all but a few members of the African population at the present time, and this regardless of the fact that in some years the incidence of the major epidemic diseases may be, relatively speaking, low. In 1931, it is true, plague was less evident than in 1930, and

[1] Ibid., p. 2. [2] Ibid. *1926*, pp. 9–10. [3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 7.

[4] See also ibid. *1931*, p. 32: 'It is a large question, involving the re-housing of some 3,000,000 people, or about 750,000 families, for at the moment not one in a hundred of these families is housed under conditions which are not insanitary to the last degree.' See furthermore Lord Moyne's statement: 'The native hut is an ideal habitation for carriers of infective disease such as rats and insects and other vermin' (*Report by the Financial Commissioner, May 1932*, p. 9).

[5] *Medical Report 1928*, pp. 33–4. See also *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1928*, p. 59; ibid. *1930*, p. 44; *1931*, p. 16; *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 19.

throughout the year the Colony remained entirely free from smallpox, while no explosive outbreak of malaria occurred. Nevertheless as usual pneumonia took its toll of deaths, malaria and intestinal worms were the causes of much invalidity, and poor food and maternal ignorance must have been the cause of much disability and sickness among adults and children.[1]

1932. In Nairobi the recorded death rates for all races have shown a marked decrease during the past ten years due largely to a decrease in the African death rate. This is what one would have expected from the very considerable sanitary improvements which have been carried out during these years, but in the absence of comparative figures for the age constitution of the population and much other data it would be unwise and probably misleading to attempt to evaluate precisely the degree of improvement in the public health.[2]

In Kenya we have a native population of about 3,000,000. Half of these people at least are actually suffering from the effects of intestinal worms, half from scabies, probably more than half from malaria and many thousands from ulcers and yaws. *Each one of these cases so long as it goes uncured is a focus of infection.* Clearly medical relief if it could be provided on an adequate scale might play a great part as a preventive measure, but at the moment not more than one in every three of the population visits even a dispensary dresser once in a year, while the proportion seen by a qualified medical man can hardly be more than one in thirty, or about 3 per cent. At the present time therefore well over 90 per cent of three million people almost all of whom must be sick at one time or another during the year, and of whom at least 50 per cent or more are known to be sick throughout the year, are never seen by a qualified medical man. The figures for treatments given are undoubtedly large and satisfactory considering the smallness of the staff available, but they sink into insignificance in comparison with the numbers of folk left untreated, and treatment under these circumstances cannot, except in the cases of a few diseases, be a generally effective preventive measure. But unless treatment on an adequate scale can be made available disease will remain with us at a high rate of incidence till environmental and cultural conditions here have been even more radically improved than has been the case in Europe where, in spite of all the sanitary progress there has been, the proportion of practitioners required in the rural areas even to-day is, according to a recent report, one to two thousand of the population, or fifty to one hundred thousand. In Kenya we are fortunate if we can afford even one medical officer per hundred thousand of the population who in addition to being the medical practitioner for the population must carry out the functions of a health officer and a propagandist as well. By the standards of Europe therefore where the folks are less sick than here we should require to multiply our existing medical staff alone some fifty times if we are to provide efficient medical relief, and this apart altogether from the business of public health administration and sanitary propaganda. But at the present time it is a question not of multiplying staff but of whether Government can retain what small staff it has.[3]

1933. Of the public health of the Colony in 1933 as compared with the public health in 1932 there is little to be said, since in 1933 as in 1932, and as will be the case for a good many years to come, accurate data with regard to general mortality and invalidity are still lacking. It would therefore be unwise to say more than that while in 1933 just as in 1932 no very unusual epidemic outbreaks of disease occurred, that while in 1933 just as in 1932 only an insignificant mortality was due to plague and none to smallpox, and while there is perhaps some reason to suppose that the incidence of yaws is still, as we thought in 1932, decreasing, yet we have no reason to suppose that either pneumonia or malaria were less dire in their effects, intestinal worms less universal, ulcers less common, or the people appreciably better nourished in 1933 than in the preceding year.[4]

This is the 33rd Annual Report to be written on the health of the population

[1] *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1931*, pp. 16–17.
[2] Ibid., p. 33. See also ibid., p. 39; *1936*, p. 1.
[3] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 31.
[4] Ibid. *1933*, p. 8.

of the territory now known as Kenya since the Uganda Railway first reached Nairobi and established easy communication between a large inland area of Africa and the sea. Thirty-three years ago trade, so far as most of our three millions of population are concerned, first began to be possible, and for the first time easy communication with Europe, and with European culture, was established. In the interval many changes have taken place throughout the territory, and, though on this point it would be unwise to be dogmatic, possibly the health of the people has improved. Be this as it may, of two things at least we can be sure, firstly, that a high standard of health in the near future ought not to be an impossibility, and, secondly, that nothing approaching even a moderately good average standard of health has yet been attained.[1]

The position of the average peasant family is . . . as follows:—

(*a*) that they cannot produce on their own holding all the various foodstuffs which they require for the maintenance of health, and,

(*b*) that while for the maintenance of fairly healthy home conditions a minimal cash expenditure of at least £18 per annum would appear to be necessary on additional food supplies, and on the 'means of cleanliness', the available income falls short of such expenditure by at least £13, perhaps by much more.

In these circumstances a high standard of public health is unattainable for neither cleanliness nor good feeding are attainable; poverty and ignorance stand clearly in the way.[2]

Probably two millions at least out of our population of three million Africans suffer to some degree from infection with worms while each year we treat only about 30,000 and not improbably each year a large proportion of the treated become re-infected. What we are doing has undoubtedly great value as propaganda and also great value in that to 30,000 folks at least some respite, however short, is given from the results of infection, but the amount of the treatment provided is deplorably insignificant in comparison with what is required.[3]

1935. Excellent crops and an increase in prosperity were perhaps more notable in the South Nyeri District of the Central Province than in any other native reserve during 1935, but if the general standard of health in that area was better on that account the improvement was to no small extent offset by the occurrence of some 400 cases of plague in that district alone, as against none in the previous year.

Grazing was better in Masailand in 1935 than for some years past, and there was undoubtedly an improvement in the nutrition of the cattle as a result, and in Masailand such improvement always affects the people, but this was probably offset, to some degree at least, by a severe outbreak of malaria. Elsewhere in the endemic and hyperendemic areas of the Colony malaria remained endemic, or hyperendemic as of old. Throughout the country as a whole pneumonia remained, as it has always been, the 'captain of the men of death', and we have no reason to believe that either the incidence or the severity of this disease was notably less than in the preceding year.

Cases of cerebro-spinal fever occurred sporadically throughout the year in more areas than in 1934, while in some areas there were outbreaks of considerable magnitude.

Again such surveys of samples of the population as were made during the year showed no smaller incidence of intestinal worms, of skin and eye diseases, or of malaria than had been revealed by other surveys in similar areas elsewhere in former years. The incidence of these conditions appears therefore to be unchanged.

On the other hand, changes may have taken place which were prejudicial to the public health, while there are several diseases of importance with regard to which, and their effects on the public health, we have but little knowledge.

These changes and these diseases may be doing more harm than we know, and they may well have done more harm in 1935 than in 1934.

Among changes which are undoubtedly taking place and may possibly be harmful re the great changes in dietary to which almost all Africans are subjected when

[1] Ibid., p. 11. [2] Ibid., pp. 13–14. [3] Ibid., p. 37.

they leave their reserves to work, either on a European estate, or in a town. In the latter case the change is, in many instances at least, almost certainly for the worse, and in the former case, though the change is often perhaps for the good, it is doubtful if it is always so.

Another change which may be of outstanding importance with regard to health is that every year more Africans are being subjected to an increased mental strain, in schools, in offices, in industry, and as a result of the many changes which make it increasingly necessary for almost every adult African to obtain each year either as wage earner, producer, or trader a return for his labours in cash. . . .[1]

The people remain, as before, infected by a welter of diseases, while the state of nutrition of a large proportion, and possibly of almost all, would appear to be far from satisfactory . . . .[2]

As in other colonies health conditions apparently deteriorated during the war. One cause was the depletion of an anyway inadequate medical and sanitary staff.

Even before the outbreak of war our headquarters staff was much smaller than it had been prior to the economic depression of 1931–32, and was hardly adequate for the supervision and execution of services then in existence, and these services covered but a part of what is ordinarily recognized as the field of public health activity. During the three years war period 1939–1942, there has been no increase of the headquarters staff and only reduction in the provinces.[3]

The diseases which attracted particular attention were malaria, sleeping sickness, and tuberculosis.

Malaria. 1940. Malaria was epidemic during part of the year in most of the highland areas, and in the capital town of Nairobi and in the native reserves of the Central Province it took severe toll of the people. This epidemic, it may be noted, was in no wise the result of war conditions, or in any way whatsoever connected with the movement or importation of troops. Nor did the troops in epidemic areas suffer to any notable degree from the disease, as the use of mosquito nets was made obligatory for all ranks, including Africans, and certain other precautions were instituted with what, under all the circumstances, must be regarded as remarkable success. The epidemic was expected and foretold by the Medical Department. It took a large toll in Nairobi, because the experience of the past had gone unheeded, and the municipal anti-malaria organization was, as it had long been, inadequate. In the native reserves the disease took a very heavy toll indeed, and this for two main reasons. Firstly, the Department has never had sufficient staff to acquire a detailed knowledge of those topographical or entomological factors which govern the incidence of malaria in many of the great reserves, or sufficient to enable us to keep up to date in every area our knowledge of those environmental changes which may favour the spread of malaria or result in its occurrence in epidemic form. Secondly . . . the staff is inadequate to provide timely and adequate medical intelligence with regard to the incidence of unspectacular disease. The epidemic was most severe in the large native reserves of the central highlands, where ordinarily the incidence of malaria is low. We were, of course, aware at an early date that an epidemic was occurring, the evidence being provided by the rise in the number of hospital admissions, and arrangements were accordingly made for the distribution of quinine on a considerable scale, but as there was no staff available for outdoor work, and no machinery whereby deaths were automatically recorded, the severity of the epidemic was not fully appreciated at the time. When, ultimately, extra staff became available a count was made in certain areas which showed that among one population of about 350,000 some 6,000 deaths had occurred from malaria alone during the four months of the epidemic.[4]

[1] *Medical Report 1935*, pp. 4–5.
[2] *Report on Native Affairs 1935*, p. 91.
[3] *Medical Report 1942*, pp. 3–4.
[4] Ibid. *1940*, p. 3.

1942. The most important feature of the year was the occurrence of a considerable outbreak of malaria in epidemic form in part of the higher country of the Masai Reserve, in the adjoining high country of the Kericho District and in the Kisii highlands. So far as we are aware this is the first occasion on which malaria has occurred in this part of Masailand and it probably represented an extension of the spread of malaria from the lower and hyperendemic area of the basin of the Victoria Nyanza into the surrounding highlands, which would seem to have been going on for some years past. It is not improbable that, if staff could be detailed for the investigation of the causes of this spread into these highland areas, measures could be devised, not only to prevent further spread, but to clear the recently infected areas of the disease. The matter is one of major importance and proposals for dealing with it will be submitted to Government during 1943.[1]

1943. Malaria continues to be our most important disease, although no marked increase in incidence occurred in 1943. Its increasing tendency to spread into the highland areas of the Colony is a matter of concern and one which merits further investigation when staff becomes available.[2]

1944. There was further extension of malaria into the highlands and a small but severe outbreak occurred at Timboroa at an altitude of 8,300 feet. The problem of highland malaria is a serious one and is receiving close attention.[3]

Sleeping-sickness. The Acting Director of Tsetse Research, Tanganyika Territory, S. Napier Bax, in his *Report on a Visit to Uganda and Kenya, Made at the Request of the Standing Committee on Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Research* stated in 1944:

The *gambiense* form of sleeping sickness is still endemic in Central and South Kavirondo. This is in marked contrast to the conditions around the Uganda and Tanganyika shores of Lake Victoria. In the Eastern Province of Uganda the last case occurred in 1932 (no reference is made here to the present *rhodesiense* outbreak); in the Western Province of Uganda the last case was in 1926, though there have been sporadic cases since that date, but in every case it was clearly established that the patient came from another sleeping sickness area, mainly the west Nile. In Tanganyika there is no *gambiense*, unless a few cases occur right on the Tanganyika-Kenya border.

Uganda and Tanganyika, although having much longer coast-lines, have been successful in freeing their shores of *gambiense*, while Kenya has remained content merely to control the disease.[4]

In Kenya the population has never been removed to break the contact with *G. palpalis*, but in areas on the lake shore a multiplicity of clearings have been made which must have some effect in that direction. Regular examination of the population is carried out very completely in places, but I think not in others. There is no motor-boat patrol.

When anti-*gambiense* measures were instituted in Uganda and Tanganyika it was probably never expected to succeed to the extent of eliminating *gambiense*. But in fact that desirable end has come about, in spite of there still being some contact between *G. palpalis* and the population. I feel that if Kenya increased the efficiency of her anti-*gambiense* campaign, we might see the end of *gambiense* around the whole lake area. It may be asked what advantage this would be, with *gambiense* present on the west Nile and in other places in Uganda. The answer is of course that the Kenya focus is sandwiched in between clean Uganda and clean Tanganyika shore-lines and the chances of infection from her of the enormous Uganda *palpalis* belt and the foci of *palpalis* in Tanganyika are far greater than from elsewhere.[5]

[1] Ibid. *1942*, p. 9. [2] Ibid. *1943*, p. 4.

[3] Ibid. *1944*, p. 3. See also *Report of the Development Committee* (*1946*), vol. i, p. 66.

[4] *Report*, p. 61.

[5] Ibid., p. 62. The Medical Report for 1944 stated (p. 4): 'A limited outbreak of Gambian sleeping sickness occurred in South Kavirondo. A survey was carried out by a medical officer in January and a programme of clearings was instituted. . . .'

Tuberculosis. 1940. Tuberculosis is another disease with regard to the incidence of which our information is meagre and unsatisfactory, and for the treatment of which facilities are particularly inadequate. As has been usual for many years past, there was again an increase in the number of hospital admissions, 1,778 cases being treated as against 1,443 in the previous year.[1]

1942. 1,938 cases were treated as against 1,859 in the preceding year.[2]

1943. The incidence of tuberculosis showed a marked increase as compared with 1942, and the control of this disease is undoubtedly one of the major problems to which more attention must be paid in the immediate future.[3]

1944. No general investigation into the pressing problem of tuberculosis was possible. A small survey carried out during the year at Kerugoya disclosed that 62 per cent of male adults in this rural area are positive reactors to the Mantoux test and returns leave no doubt that infection is now widespread throughout the Colony.

The actual rise in recorded cases is not large and this is at variance with the impression of medical officers who generally consider that the disease is rapidly increasing. The suggestion has been made that many Africans have now come to regard the disease as incurable and in consequence do not attend hospital and come under notice. It has to be admitted that this conclusion is entirely justified by the outcome in the great majority of cases. There is general agreement on the initial measures required to deal with the problem. The necessary resources do not at present exist.[4]

Malnutrition was also discussed at length in recent official reports.

1942. As regards the actual average standard of the public health as measured by the physical fitness of the population of the Colony as a whole no data are available to indicate whether there has been improvement or regression. Most certainly there is none indicating that there has been any radical change. We can, however, say that judging from what we know of dietaries of the African peoples in the majority of the agricultural areas whether European or African, and of the African populations in urban areas, and from what we know of the availability and prices of the protective foodstuffs, such as meat, milk, butter, ghee, fresh vegetables and fruits, and from what we know of the skill and economic position of the peasant, and from the results of inquiries carried out during the year with regard to the wages of labourers in urban areas, it would be surprising indeed if the nutritional state of the African population were high. That in fact it is not high, and that undernourishment and malnutrition are widespread and, directly or indirectly, the cause of much unfitness and ill health is clearly indicated by the results of every physical or nutritional survey of these people which has so far been carried out. That great improvement in health, in physical condition, in physical capacity, and in resistance to disease, can be obtained among Africans of almost every tribe by the provision of an adequate and well balanced diet has been amply indicated by the results which in the army have followed the provision of such a diet during these three years of war to the African soldier.[5]

1943. The food shortage which existed throughout the year and which became acute on several occasions gave cause for much anxiety. Although the Colony managed to weather the storm by the organized distribution of supplies which could be obtained, famine was more than a threat in several areas, and although deaths from starvation were probably few, the general nutritional state of the African population left much to be desired and there was a considerable amount of evidence to show that their powers of resistance to disease were markedly lowered. Although conditions improved somewhat towards the end of the year, the position remains unsatisfactory and research on nutritional problems in general is a matter of importance and urgency.[6]

[1] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 3. [2] Ibid. *1942*, p. 7.
[3] Ibid. *1943*, p. 4. [4] Ibid. *1944*, pp. 4–5. [5] Ibid. *1942*, p. 6.
[6] Ibid. *1943*, pp. 3–4. See also ibid. *1944*, p. 3: 'The number of cases of malnutrition reported from native hospitals is increasing. In part this may represent an actual increase resulting from

The Food Shortage Commission of Inquiry appointed in 1943 said:

Scope and Extent of Food Shortage. From the evidence we have heard we are left in no doubt that, although there has been a serious food shortage amongst the natives, the shortage did not amount to a famine except in a few isolated areas. We are also left in no doubt that although there has been a shortage in some commodities (wheat, beans, fowls, eggs, ghee, bacon, meat, sugar, butter, potatoes, rice and fresh vegetables) for several months, the non-natives of Kenya have been no more than inconvenienced. The natives are the only section of the community who have been at all seriously affected,[1] mainly because of the shortage of maize, and on that account maize will predominate over all other foodstuffs in this Report.[2]

Concerning 'Nutrition and Dietetics' in general the Commission reported:

With regard to the native population, we had valuable evidence from the Director of Medical Services and officers of his Department, and the benefit of perusing many memoranda produced by them. We have also had evidence from an independent medical man of long experience in this country. In all this evidence there is complete unanimity that both in regard to natives in the reserves and those in employment outside the reserves there is a marked degree of malnutrition resulting from an unbalanced diet; too much emphasis being placed on starch food, particularly maize, with a corresponding deficiency in foods providing the necessary quantities of protein, mineral salts and vitamins.[3]

We have had evidence that the undue prominence of maize in the native diet (and therefore in his agricultural economy) has been a development of the last 30 years or so. From the early days of European settlement the practice has become established of giving 2lb. of maize meal per day as the basic ration for employed labour. Although some employers, realizing the importance of a better balanced diet, do now issue some additional food, the tradition of the 2lb. of maize meal still persists.

The increasing number of natives in employment resulted in an increasing demand for maize. The native thus found that he had a ready market for maize grown surplus to his own requirements and reacted by growing more maize to the exclusion of other food crops in many areas. He could always sell maize to meet his cash requirements. Surpluses of other foodstuffs had not such a ready market and less and less were grown.

We have no doubt, from the evidence before us, that this tendency was highly unfortunate both from the agricultural and the nutritional points of view.[4]

the recent successive years of drought but in part it is undoubtedly an indication of more accurate recognition of the varied manifestations of this condition.'

[1] However, this section constituted 97 per cent. of the community.

[2] *Report*, p. 4. The repatriation of about 10,000 natives from Nairobi to native reserves (see p. 151, above) increased the difficulties in certain rural areas.

'Generally we agree with Government's policy of getting the natives back to their reserves, because there was more likelihood of their being able to get foodstuffs there than in the towns. But we consider that it would have been better to have adopted this policy at an earlier stage rather than to have waited until the food shortage became really acute. That it was delayed is due no doubt to a late appreciation of an actual shortage, the time the shortage would last and the seriousness of it. This probably necessitated the policy of repatriation being decided upon without adequate time being available to consider its repercussions.

'For instance, we had much evidence that with regard to some locations in the native reserves, the food available was insufficient for the natives already there, without the extra burden of an increased population. Such, for instance, was the case in Maragoli in the Nyanza Province, which had been very badly hit by the food shortage . . . .'

(Ibid., p. 61; see also ibid., p. 62.)

[3] Ibid., p. 57.

[4] Ibid., p. 58. See also Margery Perham: 'We may save Africans from the old periodic famines, but it is possible that in the intervals they enjoyed a fuller and more varied diet than they do now' (Huxley and Perham, p. 214).

The Health, Hospital Services, and Nutrition Sub-Committee of the Development Committee, in its report dated 10 April 1946, said:

That grave malnutrition exists throughout the Colony is a fact that cannot be controverted. Such malnutrition is due in great part to the lack of a balanced diet rather than to a lack of bulk, although the latter condition is not unknown at certain periods in some districts in drought years. The medical implications of malnutrition include deficiency diseases, lowered resistance to disease, high incidence of sickness, a great severity of illness and a higher mortality rate; and, further, it manifests itself in lowered general vitality and a lack of vigour. All these conditions can be found abundantly among the African population of Kenya and also among the Asian population. Deficiency diseases appear mainly as skin diseases, ulcers, generalized nutritional oedema, arrested development, both physical and mental, bleeding or unhealthy gums, to mention those that are all too common.

. . . A small balanced diet, rich in vitamins, will result in greater health and well-being than a large bulky diet deficient in vitamins. The Sub-committee is of opinion that this is the main problem in Kenya.[1]

Malnutrition in Kenya is an urgent problem of enormous extent, the consideration of which should not be further postponed. It is reasonable to presume that there is a far higher percentage of ill-nourished people than of people who are normally and adequately nourished, and the Sub-committee wishes to stress that a comprehensive nutritional survey (and this includes an early and complete census) is essential if any real progress in the tackling of this problem is to be made.[2]

An improvement of the physical standard of the people would undoubtedly result in efficiency and stimulate production in all directions. The effect of a balanced ration combined with Army training on recruits is spectacular. It is the general experience that they gain rapidly in weight, health, vigour and hardiness. The future labour supply of the country and the quality of its people depends largely on nutrition.[3]

The Committee itself did not think that a nutritional survey should include native labourers in European employment and was sceptical as regards the effects of a more balanced diet on output.

The Committee would . . . observe that there is reason to believe that any malnutrition existing is probably more prevalent among Africans resident in native areas than among Africans who leave their reserves and are employed outside them. Generally speaking, it is true to say that much more attention is now being paid to the feeding of employed labour than was the case a few years ago. There is still a long way to go before a balanced diet will be general among such labour, but much progress is being made. Equally satisfactory progress cannot be reported among Africans in the native areas, and it is in regard to these that a nutritional survey on a sample basis will prove to be most valuable.

. . . the Committee would like to stress that, although it attaches great importance to the provision of a balanced diet, the provision of a balanced diet does not in itself provide a full incentive to increased output, which is of primary importance. Similarly, experience has shown that improving the physical condition of the worker does not necessarily increase output. In order to increase output the *will to work* must be there, and unless incentives to promote such a frame of mind can be found, better feeding, which in itself will send up costs, constitutes an economic hazard.[4]

The effects of housing on the health of natives in towns have been described in a report dealing mainly with Nairobi. A few quotations may illustrate the conditions.

[1] *Report of the Development Committee*, vol. ii, p. 153.
[2] Ibid., p. 154. [3] Ibid., p. 155. [4] Ibid., vol. i, p. 63.

Until 1930 the only distinct native housing as such in Nairobi open to the general native population was Pangani village, where the lodging house keeper was indistinguishable from the brothel manager. Its removal in 1938 was one of the major social improvements effected in the history of native administration in Nairobi. . . .[1]

In 1939, Mr. E. R. St. A. Davies, as Municipal Native Affairs Officer, by means of special return called for under the Statistics Ordinance collected certain information which he laid before the Municipal Council. In tabulated form that information showed these facts:—

(*a*) That the number of natives in the town engaged on legitimate employment of some kind, together with their dependants, was approximately 40,000.
(*b*) That of this 40,000 some 15,000 required to be housed in the native locations.
(*c*) That the housing available in the locations is for roughly 9,000 natives, and that the minimum degree of overcrowding is, therefore, in the region of 6,000.

The basis of these figures was a return by the employer stating the number of employees and their dependants, the wages they earned and whether they were housed. The return did not show the amount of housing but only the number of occupants in the housing that happened to be provided. The figure of 6,000 given above is therefore really the number of natives who must look for unauthorised sleeping accommodation somewhere. Mostly they sleep in the Locations. Of the amount of overcrowding on employers' premises there is no accurate estimate. It is certainly severe, for the Chief Registrar of Natives, in his analysis of the returns on which Mr. E. R. St. A. Davies based his calculations, writes as follows:—'It has been stated that the accommodation available for natives provides for about 22,000 (actually 21,802). If that estimate is correct, some 18,000 to 19,000 persons appear to be able to find sleeping accommodation in what must be highly overcrowded and unhealthy conditions. It should be remembered that the figure of 22,000 for available accommodation is an estimate and that no accurate calculation has ever been made of the proper capacity of existing private native housing, including boys' quarters. All that is known of the housing of Africans by private employers is the number housed and the degree of overcrowding in such housing. That overcrowding exists is certain, but its severity would not be shown in the figures called for in the special return and can only be guessed at.

Certain detailed counts of the numbers occupying houses in Pumwani carry out Mr. Davies' conclusions; for example, the Superintendent of Native Locations made a count at night of the numbers sleeping in certain houses in Pumwani. These houses, of which the permitted number of occupants is 171, were found to contain 503 on a certain night in 1938 and 481 on a certain night in 1941. The counts were surprise counts and the days chosen were not days when the town would be abnormally full.[2]

The nutritional state of the native, to which so much attention has lately been directed, is not by any means the only factor concerned with his physical and economic worth. There are others of great importance, especially housing.[3] Bad housing and overcrowding facilitate the spread of infectious disease, a notable example being tuberculosis, the increasing extent of which locally is becoming alarming. There follow also the psychological effects of overcrowding, and the

[1] *Report by Senior Medical Officer of Health and Municipal Native Affairs Officer on the Housing of Africans in Nairobi* (1941), p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 2.

[3] See also 'Summary of Recommendations, stated or implied, in the Reports of the Sub-Committee on Social Welfare, Information and Mass Education', *Report of the Development Committee* (1946), vol. ii, p. 225: 'That, having regard to the fact that the great majority of the non-European population of the Colony is underfed, badly housed and poorly educated and can consequently neither play a proper role in the development of the Colony nor achieve that degree of well-being which a well organized society should aim to provide for its members, the improvement of this position be accepted as the immediate and major object of social policy and economic development in the Colony.'

feeling of worry, anxiety and frustration, and of impotence in the face of environmental difficulties. All these factors are probably as potent causes of ill-health as faulty diet, and the prime evil is bad housing.[1]

The Medical Report for 1944 summarized the position as follows:

The outstanding feature of the health records for the year is the rising tide of African patients presenting themselves for treatment. There is no reason to think that this represents any actual increase in disease or that the total is still more than a part of the massive ill-health which prevails among the African population. No more evidence is required of what remains to be accomplished in the physical well-being of this group than a brief comparison of the fine physique of the African soldier with that of his peasant brother. Many common diseases from which the African suffers are preventable and it is no part of medical policy that cure should bear the disproportionate relation to prevention which circumstances have compelled. The balance will be restored when this is possible. But a great deal of the prevailing ill-health is not preventable by any measures which can properly be regarded as medical and arises from malnutrition, from unfavourable environment and from ways of life inimical to health.[2]

Infant Mortality. Since the current birth registration data are utterly defective, the only source of information concerning infant mortality are the sample studies made in 1922–33.

1922. The investigation in the Central Kavirondo District revealed that of the 7,843 children born to 2,591 women 786 had died within a few days of birth, and altogether 3,241 or 413 per 1,000 in the first year of life. Deaths from 1 to 16 years numbered 1,231.[3]

The huge infantile mortality rate is probably to no little degree influenced by the faulty methods of infant feeding which obtain among the Kavirondo. It is an error to suppose that the native baby, at any rate in Kenya Colony, is entirely breast fed; at the age of a few weeks supplementary artificial feeding is resorted to in the shape of weak gruel made from flour of the various food grains or of yams and bananas which are chewed up by the mother and then given to the child. The Medical Officer who conducted the investigations is of opinion that the beer drinks which take place at the gathering of the crops have a distinct influence on the infant mortality in that the children are left at home while almost the whole adult population takes itself off and devotes itself to feasting and drunkenness. Another factor which may have a bearing on the infant mortality is the custom of keeping the newly-born infant for some days in the close and stuffy hut with the possibly increased liability to lung complaints. The cause of a large proportion of infant deaths is given by the mothers as being due to chest trouble.[4]

Although the findings of this investigation comprised numerous infant deaths which had occurred many years ago they were taken by the Principal Medical Officer as representing present infant mortality, and present infant mortality not only in the Central Kavirondo District but throughout the Colony.[5]

1925–7. House-to-house inquiries made in the town of Kisumu yielded results which were published as follows:[6]

[1] *Report on the Housing of Africans in Nairobi*, p. 4.
[2] *Medical Report 1944*, pp. 2–3.
[3] See ibid. *1922*, p. 21.
[4] Ibid., p. 20. See also ibid. *1923*, p. 91.
[5] See ibid. *1922*, p. 63; *Report of East Africa Commission*, p. 54.
[6] See *Medical Report 1925*, p. 14; *1926*, p. 18; *1927*, p. 24.

	Births			*Deaths under 1 year*			*Infant mortality rate*		
	1925	*1926*	*1927*	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*
African population excl. railway employees	196	119	131	23	33	31	118	277	237
Africans employed by Kenya and Uganda Railway .	104	85	91	3	17	17	29	200	188
Indian population excl. railway employees	35	42	36	7	13	15	200	314	417
Indians employed by Kenya and Uganda Railway .	16	34	28	1	7	2	63	206	71

The Medical Department made the following comments:

1925. The figures though small are of interest in that they appear to reflect the result of improved housing, as the housing provided by the Uganda Railway both for Asiatics and Africans though by no means ideal is far and away better than that occupied by the general native population of the township or the crowded dwellings in the Indian Bazaar.

1926. Though the figures on which these rates are based are small and of doubtful accuracy the increases in the infantile mortality rates which are suggested cannot be viewed but with disquietude. That these increases were due in part at least to an increase in the incidence of malaria is not improbable but unfortunately the data available is insufficient to allow of analysis. The table is only quoted in this report with a view to illustrating the imperative necessity for the institution of accurate registration of births and deaths.

1927. The figures on which these rates are based are small and of doubtful accuracy, but they indicate a high incidence of infantile mortality. They also serve to illustrate the imperative necessity for the institution of registration of births and deaths. They may be an indication of the value of improving housing.

1930–1. The records kept by a mission in the Teita Hills and covering 698 families were examined and the results regarding infant mortality were published as follows:[1]

	1920	*1921*	*1922*	*1923*	*1924*	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*	*1928*	*1929*	*1930*	*1931*
Births . .	72	83	69	95	99	92	112	119	114	134	93	64
Deaths under 1 year . .	6	8	12	20	32	22	14	11	15	19	11	12
Infant mortality	83	96	174	210	323	240	125	92	131	142	118	188

It has to be remembered that the above figures concern a picked population, who live in a state of civilization probably at a considerably higher level than the native under ordinary conditions; they probably give no indication of the general infant mortality among natives. Figures obtained previously from other sources have shown a very much higher rate.[2]

[1] See ibid. *1930*, p. 15; *1931*, p. 19.

[2] Ibid. *1930*, p. 15. *Medical Report 1932*, p. 25, contains an extract from the report of the Medical Officer of Health for the Teita Reserve which shows that in the Bura area, 'a fairly progressive area, where, however, there were only thirty improved huts', there occurred among 1,170 families 'Christian and pagan' 106 births and 16 infant deaths.

1931. The investigation among the Masai showed that of the 2,817 children born to 907 women, 1,260 had died.[1] As the age at death is not given it is impossible to tell how many died under one year. Infant mortality may not have been excessive but it probably was high.

A Masai custom gives the child a very bad start in life. During the last three months of pregnancy all Masai women have to go on starvation diet.[2]

Their bad start, while yet in utero must be a terrible handicap when at birth they have to contend with gastric disorders from highly unsuitable food, disease imbibed from fly polluted milk, and lack of sufficient sunlight. Lack of cleanliness brings in its train scabies, sores and staphylococcal infections to the skin. Thus attacked, internally and externally, the wonder is that any of them survive . . .[3]

1932–3. According to the investigations in the Digo District infant deaths numbered 94 from June to November 1932 and 174 from October 1932 to September 1933, the computed infant mortality rates being 148 and 107 respectively.[4] The Medical Report suggests that the infant deaths in the earlier period include a number of deaths of children over one year and thinks that the data for the later period are more accurate since 'for 1933 the majority of the infants that died had already been registered at birth, so their actual ages were known'.[5] It draws the conclusion that the infant mortality rate of the Wadigo 'is by African standards probably low'.[6]

The Department summarizes the results of all the investigations made so far in Kenya by stating: 'The lot of from 10 per cent to, in some areas, even 40 per cent of African infants is to die before they reach the age of one year.'[7]

It is obvious that the available data (which, as a whole, do not suggest a very high mortality) are far too scanty to be conclusive, and it should be noted that, as in other East African colonies, so in Kenya, mortality in early childhood—rightly or wrongly—is believed to be excessive. The Acting Director of Medical and Sanitary Services spoke before the Land Commission of 'the waste represented by an infant mortality of 500 per 1,000'.[8] The Statistician stated: 'There is a very high infant mortality. I am given to understand that the medical authorities consider that half the children die before they reach the age of 2½ or 3.'[9] The Chief Registrar of Natives said: '. . . we know that (according to Dr. Vint) approximately 50 per cent die within two years of birth.'[10] Apparently the only dissenting opinion was recently expressed in the *Interim Report on Development* which said that the health services 'have reduced mortality, particularly

[1] See *Medical Survey Masai Province, 1930–1*, p. 26A; *Medical Report 1933*, p. 16.

[2] *Medical Survey Masai Province, 1930–1*, p. 12.

[3] Ibid., p. 42. Merker, as far back as 1904, reported (pp. 333–4) that child mortality among the Masai (in German East Africa) was high.

[4] See *Medical Report Digo District 1932*, p. 8; Kenya, *Medical Report 1932*, p. 15, *1933*, pp. 18–19.

[5] Ibid., p. 19. [6] Ibid., p. 25. [7] Ibid., pp. 11–12.

[8] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3211. See also Orr and Gilks, p. 19: 'No vital statistics are available. It is believed, however, from observations made in limited areas, that the infantile death rate in the native reserves amounts to between 400 and 500 per 1,000.'

[9] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3036.

[10] Ibid., p. 3040.

infant mortality, in many areas'.[1] It is to be regretted that the Committee did not give any facts.

Adult Mortality. It will be remembered[2] that the Statistician in 1928 estimated the death-rate of native male adults at 20 per 1,000 and that the Chief Registrar of Natives accepted this rate as 'a very reasonable one, considering the various epidemics, famines, etc., to which natives have been subjected since 1921'. Eight years later he reported that 'in some quarters it is held that a death-rate of 35 per 1,000 would be nearer the correct figure'. No data whatsoever are available to support either of the two estimates, but it seems unbelievable that the rate was actually as high as 35.

Population Growth. The official estimates suggest that the native population of Kenya (present area) decreased from about 3,500,000 in 1897 to about 2,300,000 in 1921 and increased to about 3,800,000 by the end of 1944. It is possible, of course, that the population is now about the same as before the advent of the British, and it is quite likely that the population in 1921 was smaller than both in 1897 and in 1944, but as no census has ever been taken it is impossible to tell even approximately for any year what the population actually was.[3]

Sir Arthur Hardinge, who in 1897 made the first estimate, expected the population to increase:

> It seems probable that the population . . . being composed of vigorous races, will especially, if they continue to be protected by Government against the deteriorating and destructive effects of alcohol, show in future a tendency to increase, now that the inter-tribal wars, the slave-hunts, and the Masai and Somali raids which, within a very recent period desolated the country almost up to the sea-board, are suppressed by the establishment of a civilized Administration. These in former days, combined with a foe even more difficult to conquer, but whom improved communications and the advance of the railway will make it easier for us to contend with, namely, famines, long kept the population down . . . .[4]

Hardinge could not anticipate that only a few months later probably the most devastating famine which ever befell Kenya would, in conjunction with an epidemic of smallpox, kill off a considerable proportion of the population and that a few years later sleeping-sickness would invade the country. But Eliot, in 1903, was not less optimistic than his predecessor.

> Whenever the subject of our East African possessions is discussed in England, there arises a natural inquiry whether it is worth while to incur so great an annual expenditure with so little immediate return. What has really been accomplished in East Africa? What solid hopes does it afford of commercial and financial progress?

[1] *Interim Report* (1945), p. 4.

[2] See pp. 141–3 above.

[3] While the *Blue Book* for 1944 put the native population at 3,825,533, the Development Committee and its Sub-committees assumed in 1945–6 that it did not exceed 3,500,000 (see *Report of the Development Committee*, vol. i, p. 61; vol. ii, pp. 101–2, 150). But Mrs. Watkins (European Elected Member) said on 11 Jan. 1946 in the Legislative Council: 'The Labour Office . . . has taken the basic figure to be 3½ million, I understand. That was a guess a decade or so ago, and now it is an anachronism as well as a guess, for it is quite an old figure. The abnormal increase caused by European intervention in matters of famine and so on has probably increased the native population, as we guess, and our guess is as good as yours, up to about 4½ million.' (*Debates 1945–6, Fourth Session*, col. 779.)

[4] *Report on the East Africa Protectorate to July 1897*, p. 25.

Firstly, modern East Africa is the greatest philanthropic achievement of the later nineteenth century. Perhaps philanthropy and politics ought to be kept separate: perhaps political philanthropy is never quite disinterested; but when a Government can point to the triumphant accomplishment of the great work of humanity there is no reason why it should not receive due recognition.

After having described how, before the advent of the Europeans, the natives were plagued by slave-hunts, tribal wars, and famine,[1] he went on:

How great is the difference now! A rumour that a single child has been kidnapped sends men-of-war cruising all along the coast, and the Government are much concerned at isolated murders. Famine we have still to fear, but private charity has provided a fund to meet the next outbreak, and the facility with which provisions can be transported will probably prevent future droughts from occasioning the mortality which prevailed in the past. I do not say that the natives admire our good deeds as much as we admire them ourselves .... But there can be no doubt of the immense progress made in rendering the civilization of the African at least possible, and it is a progress which need occasion no regrets, for we are not destroying any old *or interesting system, but simply introducing order into* blank, *uninteresting*, brutal barbarism.[2]

Two years later (1905) he wrote:

I am happy to say that, with the abolition of the slave trade, a distinct increase of population is beginning to be felt.[3]

Sub-Commissioner Ainsworth, in 1905, was very confident as regards the recuperation of the Kikuyu and Kamba after the great famine of 1898–9.

The decrease in the numbers of the Wakikuyu and Wakamba was very considerable. I calculate, however, that the average excess of births over normal deaths is about 4 per cent., and such a rate of increase quickly makes up for ravages caused by famine, &c.[4]

[1] See p. 190 above.

[2] *Report on the East Africa Protectorate*, dated 18 Apr. 1903, p. 29. (Seven years later W. Scoresby Routledge and Katherine Routledge deplored 'the tendency to destroy local administration' and 'the short-sighted desire of the English authority to destroy the native administration of justice'; *With a Prehistoric People*, pp. 219, 332. See also Hobley, *Kenya*, p. 183: 'Perhaps the most unfortunate result of the impact of European culture has been the way in which both Government and missionary effort has, with the best intentions in the world, resulted in impairing the effectiveness of the indigenous system of native government.')

[3] Eliot, *The East Africa Protectorate*, p. 57; see also ibid., p. 191.

[4] *Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 26; see also ibid., p. 5. According to Ainsworth the Kikuyu 'are probably the most prolific' tribe of the Ukamba Province (ibid., p. 34). Tate in 1904 likewise stated that the Kikuyu 'are extraordinarily prolific and possess recuperative faculties as a tribe which make them quite inextinguishable'; he did not consider that the Kamba were so prolific as the Kikuyu (see 'Notes on the Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes', pp. 132, 137). Dr. Leakey, however, possibly referring to a later period, expressed in 1932 the following opinion (Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 676):

'The reason for the great overcrowding to-day, to my mind, is that the last fourteen or fifteen years have seen a tremendous change in native custom as it affects birth and population. Formerly, no Kikuyu woman was allowed to conceive a second child until the first child had stopped suckling, which was usually not until after the end of the second year, so there were generally intervals of about three years between the children. That has been broken down entirely. It used to be considered unlucky, but now they have discovered that is not true, and children are being born now—according to figures from the Kabete Mission—about one every one-and-a-half years.

'Secondly from investigations and inquiries I made just at the beginning of 1919 over not a very big area (only one ridge), I estimated from the information I was given that the number of deaths before puberty compared with the children born was about 60 per cent; that is, nearly two-thirds of the children born died before puberty at that period. From figures I have got now,

Such a rate of increase would indeed quickly make up for ravages caused by famine, &c., but it is evident that Ainsworth's calculation must have been wrong.[1]

When the estimates based on tax registers yielded a much smaller total population than the earlier estimates there was apparently at first a tendency to distrust the new figures. Thus the Economic Commission in 1919 declared that the official figure of 2,700,000 was 'probably far too low'.[2] But from 1921 on it was generally believed that the earlier figures had been overestimates.[3] As regards the actual development of the population in the first 25 or 30 years of British administration opinions vary widely. The most favourable view was taken by the Superintendent of the 1921 census who thought that even in the period 1911–21 the native population had not declined, and that the decrease in the official estimates, from 3,000,000 to 2,483,500, was entirely fictitious.

> The apparent reduction in the Native population between 1911 and 1921 is attributed to an over estimate in 1911, which has been corrected by improved methods of computation adopted in recent years.[4]

The most unfavourable view was taken by Dr. Leys (1924):

> The writer believes that there has been a steady and rapid fall in the African population of Kenya during the past twenty-five years, amounting altogether in that period to a third of the former number of inhabitants.[5]

Dr. Leys's argument was to this effect: The war of 1914–18 has destroyed more life than a generation of tribal wars; famine is a great evil still, and the long absence from their homes of numerous natives employed by Europeans reduces the birth-rate, creates chronic food shortage, and throws an excessive share of the work of cultivation on the women, with consequent injury to their young children; some old diseases are now

anyway as regards those who are affected by missionary influences, the death-rate is very much lower indeed.'

As regards the Kavirondo—to mention only one other tribe—Johnston said (1902) that 'the women are prolific', but that 'there is much mortality amongst the children, and it frequently occurs that a woman loses all her offspring one after the other' (*The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 748). 'Foaker [an administration officer] considers the Bantu Kavirondo to be distinctly on the increase' (ibid., p. 749). Johnston endorses this statement and adds: 'Happily the nation remains up to the present free from that scourge, syphilis, which has so checked the population of Uganda' (ibid., p. 750).

[1] I do not know of any case where a population has had for a series of years a birth-rate of 60 per 1,000. But even if this should have been true of the Kikuyu and the Kamba, their death-rate cannot have been as low as 20 per 1,000, because (with a birth-rate of 60) this would presuppose an unbelievably low mortality in childhood. Ainsworth, however, says (*Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate*, p. 5) that they have 'a fairly high rate of infant mortality', and that 'the physical condition of the people was perhaps better then [before the British administration] than it is now' (ibid., p. 27).

[2] See *Final Report*, Part I, p. 7.

[3] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 10; statements of Hon. T. J. O'Shea and Dr. J. W. Arthur in the Legislative Council, 14 Aug. 1925, *Debates 1925*, vol. ii, pp. 525, 533; *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 16; Dilley, p. 8. But the Medical Officer Dr. Leys (p. 282) said even with regard to the official estimate of 4,000,000 (of which he rightly stated that it 'was the generally accepted figure and was given in all books of reference') that he believed 'it to have been, if somewhat overestimated, not hopelessly wide of the mark'.

[4] *Census Report 1921*, p. 10.

[5] Leys, p. 282.

more widespread than in former times, and new diseases, both of animal and of man, have come to the country with the Europeans.[1]

In the first half of the 1920s the prevailing official opinion was that the population was stationary or even declining. The Medical Report for 1922 pointed out that even a change in the infant mortality rate of the Colony, which it estimated at 400 per 1,000 births, would not result in a population increase.

> Were the infant mortality rate to fall while the fertility rate and the sanitary standard remained the same as at present, no permanent increase of the population could reasonably be expected. A temporary increase there would be, but under existing sanitary conditions any considerable increase would but provide material for the constitution of an epidemic which would ravage the population to a degree unknown before.[2]

The Medical Report for 1924, after having confronted a recent estimate of 2,560,983[3] with the estimate in the 1921 census report of 2,483,500 stated:

> As will be seen from the figures given at the beginning of this section it is estimated that during the past four years the native population has increased by 3 per cent. The conditions, however, under which estimates of the native population are and must for some years continue to be made, are not such as to admit of any great degree of accuracy being attained and it is impossible to state with certainty that an increase has occurred. The figures given are nevertheless of interest in that they afford no support to any suggestion that the native population as a whole is decreasing in numbers.[4]

The Chief Native Commissioner, however, did not share this opinion.

> The Chief Native Commissioner considers that, when every allowance has been made for defects in the estimates, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the population has lately shown a tendency to decline.[5]

On the other hand, some unofficial members of the Legislative Council, in the debate on the motion for taking a native census (14 August 1925), expressed the view that the impression that the population was declining was all wrong and was only due to earlier overestimates.

> Hon. T. J. O'Shea: . . . Later on when the administration of the country permitted of something like more accurate counts being made, the figure was brought down, and to-day when we have a system of administration which permits of reasonably calculating, the figures show that the population is so low to what it was fifteen years ago that the impression is created that the native population of this country is decreasing as a result of disease, and the administration of this country has been challenged that it is not doing its duty by the natives and we are to some extent being held responsible for the policy which is supposed to decimate the native population. In view of that we should get some accurate figures of the native

[1] See Leys, pp. 282–90, 316. See also 'Memorandum Presented by the Kikuyu Central Association', Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, pp. 193–214.

[2] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 63.

[3] This is the estimate for 1924 given in *Colonial Reports, Kenya 1924*, p. 7, and in *Colonial Office List 1926*, p. 248, but the data supplied by the Chief Native Commissioner to the East Africa Commission (see *Report*, pp. 148, 185), the *Medical Report* for 1925 (p. 15), and a Memorandum prepared by the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services in 1930 (see *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 18) showed for 1924 a native population of only 2,495,065.

[4] *Medical Report 1924*, p. 10.

[5] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 185.

population and then in five or ten years' time we shall be able to show that the administration of this country is benefiting the natives and the medical services in this country are such that they are materially helping the natives.[1]

Hon. Dr. J. W. Arthur: . . . I think that probably we have got down to a minimum of the native population, because our statistics are fairly accurate at this time, which enables us to know the population that we have to deal with. At the same time I do think that there is undoubtedly an increase in the native population of this country. I cannot personally believe otherwise from having seen the efforts made for their social, medical and educational improvement. Undoubtedly the numbers are greatly on the increase . . . .[2]

It was probably in answer to these statements that the Medical Department in its report for 1925 pointed out that while the official figures prior to 1914 were mere guess-work, the 'more accurate' figures showed a decline from 2,797,475 in 1914 to 2,495,065 in 1924.

There would therefore appear to be some grounds for the anxiety which is not infrequently expressed with regard to the future.[3]

But while the Medical Department had no illusions about population trends in the past it suggested that no conclusions should be drawn regarding the future. 'The period 1914 to 1924 was one during which a number of severe strains were being experienced by the native population.'[4] 'Increase of population between the years 1904 and 1924 could under the circumstances hardly have been expected.'

From 1925 to 1929 the official estimates showed an enormous population increase. On 28 November 1927 the Colonial Secretary said in the Legislative Council:

We have every reason to believe that in this country the native population is increasing remarkably fast. I think that if a census were taken it would be a surprise to a great many people in this country to find what a large number of natives there is and how much larger that number is than the number which is usually estimated in Kenya.[5]

The Medical Report for 1929 said that apart from the official estimates which may overstate the increase[6] 'all the indications are that, taken as a whole, the native population of Kenya is increasing in numbers'.[7] A Memorandum prepared by the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services in 1930 showed rather conflicting views.

1. Any opinion which may have been expressed with regard to an increase or decrease of the native population in Kenya must be largely in the nature of guess-work. No proper census has ever been attempted in any district. Observations can only be largely the result of impressions and these, notoriously liable to inaccuracies in themselves, are subject to influences such as migrations in search of work, better pastures, more fertile land, etc., which, while producing local effect have no bearing on the numbers of the population generally.[8]

[1] *Legislative Council Debates 1925*, vol. ii, p. 525. [2] Ibid., p. 533.

[3] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 15. See also ibid.: '. . . it is probable that general opinion in Kenya is to the effect that, without specific instruction in sanitation, in midwifery, and in the elementary principles of hygiene, increase in the native population, or even the maintenance of that population at its present level, is unlikely to be secured.'

[4] See p. 202 above. [5] *Legislative Council Debates 1927*, vol. ii, p. 636. [6] See p. 146 above.

[7] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 14. See also ibid. *1930*, p. 15: "The indications are that an actual increase is taking place.'

[8] *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 17.

6. Apart from figures, all the indications are that, taken as a whole, the native population of Kenya has increased in numbers, at any rate of late years, but what the rate of increase is it is impossible to specify. It is also certain that there is considerable variation in the different districts. Varying local conditions will have influenced the rates of either increase or decrease. In certain areas the density of population is such that further considerable increase cannot possibly take place therein under existing conditions.[1]

The Deputy Director of Sanitary Service, in his report for 1931, showed even concern about the large population increase:

At the present moment owing in no small part to the call for increased production, which is an inevitable outcome of the impact of western civilization on a primitive people and one which is desirable and necessary not only in the interests of the world at large but of the African himself, population is increasing and pressing hard on the heels of production. This increase, however, both of folk and produce is taking place before methods of maintaining the fertility of the soil have been universally inculcated and the land in many areas is, in consequence, deteriorating, and in so far as this is so the prospects of prosperity and health are being jeopardized.[2]

But the report for 1932 was again more cautious. After having pointed to 'the progress of the public health in England during the past fifty years' it said:

We have been in East Africa now for about an equal period. For thirty years of that period there has been a railway through the land, and during the last ten years, at least, increasingly intensive administration. What have we to report of the state of the public health to-day? Has there been progress or regression in the last fifty years? Is the general population larger or smaller? Are birth rates decreasing, or increasing in any areas? And the general death rate, and the infantile mortality rates, what of them? What is the trend of the various diseases here? Are the people on the whole fitter, or less fit, either mentally, or physically than they were last year, or ten, thirty or fifty years ago? These are the type of questions which should be answered in a report on the state of the public health, or, if they cannot be answered, at least discussed; for they are important questions, and if the answers are still unavailable it is of importance to know why, and in the course of discussion we may perhaps discover whether our measures have been right or wrong, and our expenditure wisely directed, or perhaps not justified by the results.

But it is not easy to answer any of these questions with regard to the population of Kenya, while with regard to many, and these not the least important, not only are the answers still unknown but there are not even grounds for suggesting that the answers may be thus, or thus. We may know of reasons which might make a certain answer not unlikely, but we can seldom go further. For example up to the present we have in the first place no precise knowledge as to the trend of the population as a whole; we certainly know that factors are in operation which should retard increase, while equally we know of factors which should promote it, and we have some reason to believe that over great areas the latter are now the more effective, but our data are not general, and for most areas they are still far from precise. We have no knowledge whatsoever as to whether the general birth and death rates are increasing or decreasing, no information with regard to the trend of many of the most important diseases, and no knowledge as to whether the people as a whole are fitter or less fit than they were last year, or ten, or fifty years ago.[3]

[1] *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 18.
[2] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 22.
[3] Ibid. *1932*, pp. 9–10. None of the more recent annual reports of the Medical Department discusses the question whether the native population as a whole is increasing.

Lord Moyne, in his report of May 1932, took a different view:

Natives, poor and backward as they are when judged by European standards, are certainly far better off than before the British Government, by building the Uganda Railway, opened up the country and began the process of civilization. . . . Instead of living for the most part in a state of preventible disease and in constant fear of famine, slavery, and violent death, the Kenya native now enjoys liberty and security and in varying degree according to the district where he lives, is being gradually taught to improve his health and his standard of life.[1]

In a Memorandum submitted to the Kenya Land Commission in 1933, the Acting Director of Medical and Sanitary Services (Dr. Paterson) expressed also the opinion that the demographic situation had considerably improved:

Reviewing the situation and the probabilities in Kenya . . . the position probably is that, up to thirty or forty years ago, war, pestilence and famine served from time to time to reduce either the number of the population or the rate of increase.

After the advent of settled government, the operation of these checks to population was in certain cases and to a certain extent lessened, partly as the result of comparative peace, partly as the result of improved transport, and partly perhaps as the result of sanitary measures with regard to certain major epidemic diseases. On the other hand, the checks were on occasion probably facilitated.

The extent to which the checks were either abrogated or enhanced during the first twenty or thirty years of government cannot, however, be estimated with any degree of accuracy, and all that can be said with certainty is that during the first half of that period or more there would not appear to have been any notable increase or decrease of the native population taken as a whole, but that at the present time certain tribes are undoubtedly increasing in numbers, and that we know of no major tribe, with the possible exception of the Masai, which is decreasing in numbers or in which the rate of increase is becoming lower. Whether the rate of increase is now rising is probably unknown, but there is no evidence to suggest that on the whole it is falling.

Beyond that we have no certain knowledge. The essential facts may therefore be summarized as follows:—

In Kenya at the present date, following on the institution of orderly government and the establishment of certain specific welfare measures, but in the absence of certain other welfare measures on such a scale as might be expected to ensure any general immediate result in the direction of lowering the death rate, population is increasing.[2]

The opinion that the population of Kenya was increasing also received very much local support at the hearings of the Land Commission. Some claims in this respect were absolutely fantastic. The District Officer of Machakos District submitted two tables according to which the number of adults had increased from 74,332 in 1919 to 109,175 in 1931 and the number of 'Tax receipt tickets actually sold' from 44,724 in 1911 to 70,913 in 1931.

Table I shows the adult population as recorded year by year in the annual reports. . . .

Over the period 1919–1931 there has been an average increase of 3·6 per cent per

[1] *Report by the Financial Commissioner*, pp. 25–6. See also *Interim Report on Development* (1945), p. 7: 'The elimination of inter-tribal warfare, coupled with the provision of such health services as it has been possible to provide, has led to a marked growth in the African population.' See furthermore ibid., p. 4.

[2] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3220.

annum within Machakos District. There has also been a small exodus of squatters to farms in the Thika District during the past twenty years. These number approximately 2,000 adults at the present time. The total increase of adult Kamba of Machakos District, both those living within and without the district, would appear to be about 3·7 per cent per annum.

Table II gives the number of hut and poll tax tickets actually sold for each year from 1911 to 1931. These confirm that the population is increasing at a rate somewhat similar but slightly higher than that obtained from calculations based on Table I.

The District Commissioner in 1926, after close inquiry, came to the conclusion that the rate of increase since the War was approximately 4 per cent. This agrees very closely with the present computation (*see* Annual Report, 1926).[1]

The District Commissioner of Kitui District submitted revised population figures showing an increase from 104,855 in 1921 to 141,587 in 1931. He concluded 'that the population has increased by almost exactly one-third in the decade 1921 to 1931' in spite of an exodus due to a famine in 1929.[2] The Provincial Commissioner, Ukamba,[3] thought that the figure for 1931 was an underestimate and that the figure 152,584 for 1932 (indicating an increase of 46 per cent. since 1921 or an average yearly increase of 3·5 per cent.) was correct.[4]

It is obvious that if emigration actually exceeded immigration in the Machakos and Kitui districts, either the earlier or the later population returns must have been utterly wrong.

Other estimates, based on hut tax records, showed smaller increases,[5] the most interesting one being made by District Commissioner Fazan for Kikuyu proper.[6] From his 'Memorandum on the Rate of Population Increase of the Kikuyu Tribe' (which has not been published) he derived the conclusion that the population had increased since the famine of 1899 at a yearly rate of at least 1·2 per cent.,[7] that, to judge from the increase in the number of wives, the present rate of population increase was 1·6 per cent., and that since 'the children who are maturing now were born in unfavourable conditions, i.e., during the War period' the increase 'is likely to be rather more in the next fifteen years'.[8] He considers it 'as probable that the rate of increase will rise from the present figure of approximately 1·6 per cent per annum to approximately 2 per cent by 1941 and will continue at about that rate for the following decade but will ultimately decline, when the effect of a tendency to later marriages has made itself felt'.[9]

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. ii, p. 1297. [2] See ibid., p. 1301.

[3] The Ukamba Province then consisted of the Machakos and Kitui districts.

[4] See ibid., p. 1432.

[5] See, for example, ibid., vol. i, p. 558; vol. iii, pp. 2267–71, 2348–51; *Report of Kenya Land Commission*, p. 288.

[6] Kiambu District, Fort Hall District, and South Nyeri District (excl. Keruguya), with a total area of 1,285 square miles; see Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 974.

[7] See ibid., p. 966. This estimate, however, is not in agreement with the Commission's estimate that the number of Kikuyu in Kikuyuland was 451,562 in 1902 as compared with 600,000 Kikuyu living inside and outside Kikuyuland in 1931 (see *Report*, p. 26), since the latter estimate would imply a yearly increase of only 1 per cent., even if no Kikuyu had lived outside Kikuyuland in 1902.

[8] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 968. [9] Ibid., p. 1012.

I have decided that an assumption of a uniform rate of 1·8 per cent instead of a figure working up gradually from 1·6 per cent to 2 per cent and ultimately declining, will be sufficiently accurate for our purpose, and being a more conservative figure it is more likely to be believed. A small error will not affect the general validity of the conclusions, but will mean that the situations represented as occurring in 1947 and 1962 may actually come to pass two or three years earlier or later.

The years selected for examination are 1947 and 1962, and on the assumption of an increase of 1·8 per cent the total population of the area under review will be:—

	Population	*Estimated Population*	
	1931	*1947*	*1962*
Kiambu, Fort Hall and Nyeri District (less Keruguya) . .	397,091	528,131	690,003

Table 2 of Chapter I shows the number of squatters from these areas who were living outside the reserve in 1931 as 95,637. If they increase at the same rate and no movement in or out takes place, their numbers in 1947 will be 127,197 and in 1962, 166,183.[1]

In 'An Economic Survey of the Kikuyu Reserves'[2] he expressed the following opinion:

The future of the next thirty years or so may be imagined as a race between the tendency of a growing population to congest the land and a growing skill to make the same land support a larger population. During the earlier years of the period skill will be in the lead, and result in greater individual prosperity. But the rate of betterment will decline and it seems likely that in about twenty years from now (unless remedial measures are taken) approaching congestion will depress the standard of life as much as growth in skill will raise it. After that a long flat top to the graph is the best that we can expect. There is at least a possibility that depression may take place before equilibrium is established.

Exports from the reserve should go on increasing for several years after the standard of life has ceased to improve, but must ultimately decline if a general congestion takes place.[3]

The Land Commission, in their report, reprinted this opinion and added:

The survey was sent to the Director of Agriculture and the work of criticising it was entrusted to Mr. Blunt, Acting Deputy Director, whose reply, which is filed in evidence, indicates his full agreement with this opinion.

Mr. Vidal, the District Commissioner of Fort Hall, regards the figures as sufficiently accurate to justify conclusions being based upon them, while Mr. Pease, District Commissioner at Nyeri, states:—

> 'My general conclusion is that congestion in the more favoured areas of the Kikuyu proper is approaching rather more rapidly than is envisaged in the memorandum, since I think the increase in population reasonably certain and the increase in yield of foodcrops per acre distinctly problematic.'

We cannot but attach great weight to these opinions and the careful memoranda in which they are presented. Nobody pretends that the factors in the account are precisely ponderable or that fresh factors will not appear, but we cannot ignore what appears to be a well-grounded and apparently unanimous opinion by all the administrative and agricultural officers of the Kikuyu districts, that a state of general

[1] Ibid., pp. 1012–13. [2] Reprinted ibid., pp. 971–1039. [3] Ibid., p. 1032.

congestion such as will result in a depression of the standard of life is threatened within thirty years.[1]

It should be noted, however, that Mr. Fazan's computations of population increase in the past, on which his conclusions as to the future population increase were based, were not received without scepticism. The Chief Registrar of Natives told the Commission:

With regard to Mr. Fazan's economic survey of the Kikuyu, at the time Mr. Fazan was preparing this he came to my office and obtained various data and estimates from my records. I can only say that I agree entirely with the remarks made by Mr. Fazan in his Chapter 4 (I am not concerned with any other), and the inferences he has drawn from my figures. A great deal of this is to a certain extent guesswork, because there are no definite details available, but I think it is as near a guess as can be procured. I mean, a guess based upon information given in my section. I should consider it to have a sufficient substratum of fact to entitle it to be called an estimate.[2]

The Statistician, Mr. Walter, made the following comment:

Mr. Fazan has certainly made very good use of the small amount of definite information which is available, but the problem of criticism can hardly be considered strictly one for the Statistical Department. Practically every factor on which he has based his estimates, viewed from a purely statistical point of view, must be considered as unknown. The death rate amongst children, the death rate in the total population, the birth rate, are all problems which have never been very closely investigated. The true adult population can also hardly be considered an accurate measure if comparisons are made between the population returns which are sent in from year to year.

I can only conclude that Mr. Fazan's guesses are as good as any which could be made by anyone else, if we do not take into consideration his specialized knowledge of native conditions. When his specialized knowledge of native conditions is taken into consideration, his guesses are naturally better than any I could possibly put forward.[3]

As I had no access to Mr. Fazan's 'Memorandum on the Rate of Population Increase',[4] I must confine myself to raising a few points:

(1) Kiambu District. Assuming that the figures concerning the increase in the number of wives were as correct as Mr. Fazan thinks they are,[5] it would still be impossible to draw from them conclusions as to the increase of the total population. Leaving out of consideration immigration and emigration, the total population increased, say, in 1921–31 by the total number of births and decreased by the total number of deaths occurring in that period, while the number of wives increased by marriages and decreased by deaths of husbands and wives. Changes in fertility and infant mortality between 1916 and 1931, which could have had no effect whatsoever on the increase in the number of wives in 1921–31 may have affected considerably population increase. (What is true of Kiambu is true, of course, also of the other districts.)

[1] *Report of the Kenya Land Commission*, pp. 143–4.

[2] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, pp. 3037–8.

[3] Ibid., vol. i, p. 1099.

[4] It is very much to be regretted that this Memorandum was not reproduced in the volumes of *Evidence and Memoranda* and that they contain not even an extract showing the basic data (numbers of wives) from which the increase rates were computed. (Another sin of omission which must be resented by everyone who wants to study this most valuable publication covering 3,458 pages is that there is no Index.)

[5] See p. 135 above.

(2) Fort Hall District. After having stated that the figures for Kiambu are accurate, Mr. Fazan said: 'As far as Fort Hall goes, I feel the position is not so reliable. It is not accurate until the last few years, owing to a large number of factors.'[1] The District Commissioner of Fort Hall, Mr. Vidal, stated:

> The average rate of increase in the past in the reserve has been at the very low figure of ·4 per cent and although I think this is an under-estimate I can produce no proof of figures to gainsay it, on the other hand I am confident that the future rate of increase of 1·7 per cent [suggested by Mr. Fazan] is not exaggerated.[2]

But the Provincial Commissioner, Mr. La Fontaine, who had been District Commissioner of Fort Hall in 1927–30, assumed a future average rate of only about 1·25.

> The present population is 171,852. In thirty years time it should be in the neighbourhood of 250,000.[3]

(3) South Nyeri. Mr. Fazan says: ' . . . generally speaking, the figures were not reliable. In some cases I had to calculate on an analogy of the figures from other districts. That might be justifiable as long as one did not base conclusions on them.'[4] Yet, he based his conclusion that the population of Kikuyu proper would increase from 397,000 in 1931 to 690,000 in 1962 on the assumption that the population increase in the South Nyeri areas was similar to that in the other two districts.[5]

(4) Squatters. Mr. Fazan says: 'While the average rate of increase among the squatters [from Kikuyu proper] has been 6·2 per cent over the whole decade [1921–31], since 1927 it has only been about 1 per cent, or less than its own natural increase, which indicates that, on balance during those years, more persons have returned to the reserve than have left it.'[6] In fact, nothing is known about the natural increase of the squatters, but if actually more persons have returned to the reserve than have left it this would account for part of the past population increase in Kikuyu proper.

(5) Even if the past population increase in Kikuyu proper were known and if all the data which the Statistician declared indispensable (birth-rate, death-rate, infant mortality rate) were known, it would be absolutely impossible to draw therefrom any conclusions concerning the future population increase, as long as other factors such as the age composition of the population are unknown. This would be true of every country in the world but is particularly true of Kikuyu where the age composition has been so much modified first in 1898–9 and again in 1917–19.

The Land Commission was, of course, concerned in particular with the population increase in various reserves. But it discussed briefly also the

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. i, p. 964.
[2] Ibid., p. 1068.
[3] Ibid., p. 958. Mr. Fazan and Mr. Vidal put it at 285,000.
[4] Ibid., p. 964.
[5] He would have found quite another total increase if he had assumed, for example, that conditions in South Nyeri were similar to those in the Embu District, another district of the Kikuyu Province. There the number of wives and widows *decreased* from 30,112 in 1921 to 29,459 in 1931 (see ibid., p. 558).
[6] Ibid., p. 976.

population increase in general. The Statistician expressed the following opinion:

I think there is no means really of estimating the increase of the population, based on any section of the population, but it is not pertinent to the present inquiry. There is no doubt that the population has, and probably is increasing at the rate somewhere between 1 and 1·5 per cent.[1]

With reference to this statement of the population increase in the Colony as a whole the Chairman asked the Chief Registrar of Natives various questions.

Chairman: You would naturally suppose that in the more remote areas, such as Turkana, and possibly some of the ex-slave areas or where the population is below the optimum density, such as Pokomo and parts of Masai, that the rate of increase would be less?

Mr. Imbert: Yes; and in the more advanced areas it would be more. For instance, Kiambu, where they have medical services, etc., and where the natives are more advanced, is likely to show a considerably greater increase. I should think it would be nearer 2 than 1 in Kikuyu, in order to balance the lowness of increase in the other areas.

I think you have to take into consideration that in Turkana there is very little food to be acquired.

Taking the more remote districts, such as Kisii, Nandi, and Lumbwa, I should imagine they have a very good birth-rate, fairly consistently, and the Kavirondo particularly is more prone to run to a doctor for medicine, etc., than other tribes are.

Chairman: Would you say that the position was that on both sides of the optimum you got a tendency to depress the population?

Mr. Imbert: Yes, and therefore the optimum density is most friendly to a high rate of increase.[2]

The Land Commission came to the following general conclusion:

All the evidence before us points to a high rate of increase among the native population, and we cannot discern any good reason for expecting any slackening of the rate within the next two decades. It appears more likely that it will increase as a result of the improved conditions of life. It has been suggested to us that the later marriages, which may be expected to occur as a result of mission teaching, and possibly also as a concomitant of a higher standard of life, may cause decline in the rate of increase. But having regard to the fact that at present marriages commonly occur before the age of maturity is fully reached, we are not convinced that a retardation by a year or two, which is all that can be expected, would have that result. For any decrease which there may be in the birth-rate will probably be more than counteracted by an increase in the survival-rate both among children and among mothers.[3]

The recent reports by the Development Committee and its Sub-Committees take it likewise for granted that the native population is increasing rapidly.

Views have been put before us as to the problems faced by the Colony as a result of the growth of population which has occurred and the further increases that are expected. The Committee has, therefore, had prominently in mind the issue posed by an increasing population. From the economic point of view the decisive factor is whether resources and man power can be combined in a sufficiently effective manner to increase wealth in a more favourable ratio than population. Whether such a

[1] Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*, vol. iii, p. 3033. But see also ibid., p. 3036: 'I think the probabilities are that the population is increasing about 1 or 1·5 per cent, or it may be a little more.'

[2] Ibid., p. 3038.

[3] *Report*, p. 349. But see pp. 223–4 above.

desirable end can be achieved depends upon the full utilization of existing physical resources and the discovery of new raw materials (i.e. through a comprehensive geological survey) together with the degree of success achieved by the gospel of 'all must work'. A further relevant point is that in certain countries it has been proved that a rise in the standard of living has resulted in a fall in the birth rate and a more stable population.[1]

From figures now available it appears that there are some 100,000 children in each yearly age-group.[2] Some authorities state that the yearly population increase can be taken as two per cent, but figures obtainable from some districts suggest that this is too low for the African population of Kenya. For the purpose of this plan it has therefore been assumed to be 2½ per cent, which gives the children's yearly age-group population as approximately 160,000 in twenty years.[3]

Anyone familiar with vital statistics would, of course, have dissuaded the Committee from making such a fantastic assumption for the purpose of its development plan.

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics

Europeans. It is doubtful whether registration, particularly of deaths, has ever been complete, but there is no doubt that both birth and death registration have been very incomplete at least from 1929 to 1939.[4] The numbers of births and deaths registered in 1929–39 suggest a mean birth-rate of 18 or 19 and a mean death-rate of 6 or 7. It is impossible to estimate the omissions in the birth records, but they probably were numerous, since the proportion of young women among the total European population is high. It is impossible also to say whether the much higher birth figures during the war came near the truth. As regards deaths it seems safe to assume that prior to 1942 not more than one-half, as a rule, were registered. Mortality of European officials has been low since 1919. The Medical Report for 1934 summarizes health conditions of the Europeans in Kenya as follows:

> The figures at our disposal with regard to the European population are, as is the case of the Asian population, either too small, unreliable or incomplete to merit analysis and again one must have recourse to general impressions.
>
> That the standard of health which prevails among Europeans in Kenya is very much higher than that which prevails among either Asians or Africans, there can be no doubt.
>
> How the standard of health which prevails might compare with the standard prevailing among a similarly constituted population living in Europe, it is impossible to say with certainty. Having regard to the fact that general sanitary amenities in Kenya are still poor, compared with those of England, and that there is constant

[1] *Report of the Development Committee* (6 July 1946), vol. i, p. 11.

[2] See 'Report of the Education Sub-Committee', ibid., vol. ii, p. 101: 'Taking the African population at 3½ millions and assuming that 3 per cent of the population is to be found in any one year of the school age group, we would find that there are approximately 100,000 children available for the schools in any single year.'

[3] Ibid., vol. i, p. 44. The rapid population growth was also emphasized in the 'Report of the Joint Agricultural and Veterinary Services Sub-Committee' (see ibid., vol. ii, pp. 22–31) and in the 'Report of the Sub-Committee on Industrial Development' (see ibid., pp. 184, 192).

[4] No data for the Colony have been published for 1925–8. The official birth- and death-rates published in *Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa*, vol. i, Part I, p. 35, convey a wrong picture of the changes in the birth- and death-rates because the population figures to which the numbers of births and deaths are related are incorrect; see p. 147 above.

contact with a large native African population which suffers from a welter of communicable diseases, one would expect the general standard to be lower in Kenya than among a similarly constituted population in Europe, and both lay and medical opinion would probably be to the effect that this is the case, but it is doubtful indeed whether many would suggest that it is much lower, while beyond doubt as healthy and well-grown children are to be seen all over the highlands of Kenya, as are to be seen anywhere in England.

Perhaps one can best and most safely sum the situation up by saying that the general standard of Europeau health in Kenya, though it still leaves much room for improvement is good and if more attention were to be paid to certain simple laws of hygiene and more care taken with regard to many elementary points in domestic sanitation, it could undoubtedly be made much better.[1]

TABLE 10. *Registered European Births and Deaths, Kenya, 1911–44*[1]

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*
1911	92	42	1919	148	75	1931	361	107	1939	348	111
1912	85	45	1920	183	88	1932	323	120	1940	445	156
1913	108	53	1921	255	90	1933	315	109	1941	498	159
1914	156	62	1922	261	89	1934	302	130	1942	579	195
1915	142	82	1923	194	64	1935	331	153	1943	538	191
1916	162	57	1924	209	81	1936	295	144	1944	619	192
1917	179	90	1929	304	73	1937	313	119			
1918	140	84	1930	339	80	1938	331	122			

[1] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 37; *1913*, p. 124; *1914*, p. 55; *1915*, p. 55; *1916*, p. 45; *1917*, p. 55; *1918*, p. 15; *1919*, p. 16; *1921*, p. 16; *1922*, p. 16; *1924*, p. 4; *1929*, p. 39; *1930*, p. 40; *1931*, p. 49; *Registrar General's Report 1935*, pp. 5–6; *1937*, p. 5; *1938*, pp. 24–5, 27–8; *Blue Book 1939*, Section 15, to *1944*, Section 15.

TABLE 11. *Deaths of European Officials, Kenya, 1910–37*[1]

	Number				*Number*		
Year	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*
1910	424	365	3	1924	1,280	898	4
1911	470	388	4	1925	1,433	1,001	6
1912	567	423	4	1926	1,683	1,195	6
1913	1,088	682	7	1927	1,753	1,240	6
1914	1,217	821	3	1928	2,171	1,513	3
1915	1,031	777	3	1929	2,297	1,629	3
1916	993	820	4	1930	2,280	1,717	7
1917	968	703	3	1931	2,228	1,647	5
1918	909	691	10	1932	1,919	1,497	3
1919	1,118	663	15	1933	1,756	1,340	3
1920	1,259	746	4	1934	1,846	1,380	4
1921	1,353	1,011	4	1935	1,819	1,367	2
1922	1,337	940	5	1936	1,796	1,412	6
1923	1,190	846	4	1937	1,865	1,430	6

[1] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 19; *1915*, p. 26; *1918*, p. 15; *1921*, p. 93; *1924*, p. 11; *1927*, p. 27; *1930*, p. 16; *1933*, p. 38; *1936*, p. 17; *1937*, p. 18.

Asiatics. Prior to 1929 birth registration was optional, and scanty use was made of this opportunity.[2] In 1929 birth registration became compul-

[1] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 9.

[2] The total number of Asiatic births registered was 25 in 1912 (see ibid. *1912*, p. 37). No data whatsoever seem to have been published for 1913–23. For some of the following years the Medical Reports gave data for Mombasa and Nairobi.

sory, and data for the Colony were published for 1932–8, but as registration was by no means strictly enforced the figures are incomplete, and it is impossible to draw any conclusions concerning the fertility of Asiatics.

TABLE 12. *Registered Asiatic Births and Deaths, Kenya, 1932–8*[1]

	Births						*Deaths*					
Year	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Seychellois*	*Arabs*	*Others*	*Total*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Seychellois*	*Arabs*	*Others*	*Total*
1932	255	77	24	2	3	361	280	20	7	152	6	465
1933	291	76	26	3	17	413	394	26	11	106	5	542
1934	281	70	27	2	9	389	363	23	12	107	3	508
1935	403	81	29	---	8	521	373	25	11	98	3	510
1936	435	107	24	3	9	578	448	19	10	92	2	571
1937	450	98	37	2	13	600	468	33	10	125	2	638
1938	436	114	40	1	12	603	445	25	11	44	6	531

[1] See *Registrar General's Report 1935*, pp. 5–6; *1937*, p. 5; *1938*, pp. 24–5, 27–8; *Report on Native Affairs 1938*, p. 142.

Although registration of Asiatic deaths was declared compulsory as far back as 1906 it has never been strictly enforced,[1] and even for recent years the figures are too incomplete to permit the drawing of any conclusions concerning the mortality of Asiatics. The Medical Reports frequently suggested a high infant mortality rate among Asiatics.[2] The report for 1934 summarizes health conditions of the Asiatics as follows:

> The Asian population is widely scattered over the Colony and any figures available are in all cases either too small, or too unreliable or incomplete to justify detailed analysis. The majority of the Asian community are far from being well off, well housed or well acquainted even with all the more elementary laws of hygiene, and the general impression which one gathers is that the average standard of health which prevails is poor.[3]

[1] The total number of Asiatic deaths registered was 364 in 1912 (see ibid. *1912*, p. 37). No data whatsoever seem to have been published for 1913–21. From 1922 on figures (based in part on death notifications) have been published for some towns in the Medical Reports and the Annual Colonial Reports.

[2] See, for example, ibid. *1925*, pp. 10, 14; *1926*, p. 18; *1927*, p. 24.

[3] Ibid. *1934*, pp. 8–9.

CHAPTER IX

UGANDA

I. CENSUS-TAKING

PRIOR to 1931 censuses were taken in the Uganda Protectorate without any special legal enactment.[1] But in 1931 it was decided to place a definite Act among the Statutes, and with this end in view an Ordinance,[2] similar to the Kenya Census Ordinance, 1925,[3] was passed. The Statistician to the Conference of East African Governors was appointed Superintendent of the 1931 Census on 25 April 1931,[4] and an Order by the Governor in Council of 13 May[5] directed that the census be taken on 28 May.

No information is available concerning the methods and forms used in enumerating the non-native population in 1911 and 1921, but the following Notice[6] throws some light on the procedure followed in 1931:

IT IS HEREBY NOTIFIED that it is proposed to take a census of the entire population on the 28th May, 1931. Every non-native head of a household will be required to complete a schedule in respect of his household, including all natives resident on his premises. All such persons are earnestly requested to ensure that they obtain from the local District Commissioner or Executive Officer of the Township Authority a schedule or schedules for this purpose. All persons are required by the Census Ordinance, 1931, to give full, complete and accurate information to the Enumerators with regard to all particulars required, but such information will be accepted in strict confidence and will be used for statistical purposes only. All persons are asked to make certain that they have been counted, and that they have been counted once only.

2. A count of the native population, except of those natives living on non-native premises, will be undertaken by the various native authorities.

3. For some time before and after the census Administrative Officers in whose hands the census organization has been placed will be occupied with it exclusively and members of the public are notified that it will not be possible during that period to give them such careful attention as they usually have a right to expect.

4. Members of the public are invited to co-operate with the authorities in helping to make the census as complete, accurate and expeditious as possible, and all such co-operation will be cordially welcomed.

As regards the 1911 count of natives the Letter of Transmittal accompanying the *Census Returns* says:

In a country like Uganda it was obviously impossible for the native census to be taken in one day, and special arrangements had to be made. During the month of

[1] The first census taken in 1911 was 'made up in terms of the circular despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies dated 17th November 1909' (*Census Returns 1911*, Letter of Transmittal). The 1921 census returns were 'compiled according to the instructions contained in the Secretary of State's circular despatch of the 25th May, 1920' (ibid. *1921*, p. 5). The *Official Gazette* did not carry a single Notice concerning either census.

[2] No. 2 of 1931 (15 Apr.), 'An Ordinance to make Provision for taking the Census of Uganda as and when may be required', reprinted in Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances, &c., 1931*, pp. 3–5, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate* (Revised Edition 1935), vol. i, pp. 216–17.

[3] See pp. 96–7 above.

[4] See Legal Notice No. 50 of 1931, *Ordinances, &c., 1931*, Second Part, p. 45.

[5] See Legal Notice No. 52 of 1931, ibid., p. 47.

[6] General Notice No. 154 of 1931 (20 Apr.), *Official Gazette of the Uganda Protectorate*, 30 Apr. 1931, p. 121.

March, the Saza Chiefs recorded all the natives permanently resident in their county and during a period, called the 'period of census', any who had left or died were written off and any who had been omitted or were temporarily resident in the county during that period were added. This period of census was limited to a few days prior to the first of April (usually two or three), on which date the census was to cease. The Saza Chiefs were thereafter to submit their returns, one schedule being used for each separate race within their county. . . .

In unadministered and partially administered districts of the Protectorate the population was estimated by the Administrative Officer.

Since in some counties the members of one race exceeded 50,000 the people returned on one schedule were very numerous. The Saza Chiefs, therefore, were not only responsible for taking the census but also, in the main, for compiling the results. The Letter of Transmittal accompanying the 1921 *Census Returns* does not say whether the same method was used in that year, but in 1931 the unit was much smaller.

. . . on the advice of the Statistician a group schedule was adopted, the principle underlying which was considered to be sufficiently simple to be followed by the Native enumerators. The family unit was too small for general adoption, and in the majority of districts in the Protectorate the group accepted was the Muluka, the smallest administrative unit.[1] The heads of information under which the Native enumeration was made were:—

(I) Tribes.

(II) Sex and Age groups: Below 1 year; 1 to 7 years; 7 to 18 years; poll tax payers and aged.

(III) Condition as to marriage distinguishing single and married under Native, Christian and Mohammedan law.

(IV) Religion distinguishing Protestant, Roman Catholic, Mohammedan and Pagan.

(V) Occupations.

(VI) Infirmities.[2]

As regards the heads of information the main difference from the earlier counts apparently was the closer distinction of ages. The 1911 Letter of Transmittal had stated:

With regard to ages, it was found possible only to divide into four sections, *viz.*:—in the case of males, those over 18 years of age and those under that age; in the case of females those over 15 years of age and those under that age. These ages were adopted as marking distinct periods which would be well known to the Chiefs, as in the case of males they are liable for Poll tax when 18 and in the case of females 15 may be considered as a marriageable age.

The *Census Returns* for 1911 (and 1921), therefore, distinguish only the males under and over 18 and the females under and over 15. But the *Census Returns* for 1931 actually distinguish also only the males under and over 18 and the females under and over 18. The attempt to obtain a more detailed classification was evidently unsuccessful.

As regards the completeness and accuracy of the native counts it is difficult to form a judgement. The 1911 Letter of Transmittal stated: 'In many of the districts the schedules do not contain a single mistake in

[1] There were 622 gombololas in the Protectorate (see *Medical Report 1930*, p. 15). According to Mair, *An African People in the Twentieth Century*, p. 200, the muruka chiefs in Buganda Province 'number perhaps twenty in each gombolola'. The average number of persons entered on a schedule may, therefore, have been about 300.

[2] *Census Returns 1931*, Introductory Note.

any of the columns of information supplied.' But since the Census Officer got the complete tables (schedules) from the Saza Chiefs, this remark can only mean that in the schedules of many districts the totals tallied with the items. The 1921 *Census Returns* were published without any comment, but the Medical Report for 1932 relates:

> The population figures of districts appearing in the 1921 census appeared to be generally acceptable as a basis for those of subsequent years. . . .
>
> From 1922 onwards, the district population figures (and their summation, the Protectorate population) published in the Blue Book and in this Report were obtained by a kind of annual unofficial census collected by minor chiefs and passed forward through Gombolola and Saza Chiefs to the District Officer, who, after having collected the figures so obtained, submitted them through the usual channels. The resulting figures did not appear unreasonable although annual variations occurred which could not be explained by a natural excess (or deficit) of births over deaths, but which could be readily understood if the migratory tendencies which have been displayed by the natives of this and surrounding territories since the Great War were borne in mind.[1]

When the first results of the 1931 count (the total population by districts) became known they were received with considerable distrust by the Medical Department.

> In many districts a considerable discrepancy was apparent between the census population of 1931 and the estimated population appearing in the Blue Book for 1930 . . . .
>
> In some instances the increase of population over the decennium [1921–31] is so high that it can hardly be accounted for by excess of births over deaths. In Busoga, for instance, an annual increase of population of 55·7 per thousand per annum is recorded, and in Toro the annual incremental rate is 51·3 per thousand per annum. In other instances, the census figures for the decennium are directly opposed to general belief based upon observation and vital statistics, as in the instance of Bunyoro, which has always been regarded as a district with a decreasing population. The census shows that the population of Bunyoro has increased from 98,573 in 1921 to 114,220 in 1931, an annual rate of increase of 14·8 per thousand.[2]

But the fact that the results of the 1931 count agreed neither with the preceding annual 'unofficial censuses collected by minor chiefs' nor with the figures obtained by adding to the 1921 returns the excess of registered births over registered deaths in the intercensal period nor with 'general belief based upon observation and vital statistics' is no proof whatsoever that the 1931 returns were inaccurate. Furthermore there is no evidence that the Statistician, who was the Superintendent, considered the count particularly inaccurate, and it certainly is most regrettable that no report of his has been published. As late as 1932 he wrote: 'A full report on this Census is in preparation and will be published by the Uganda Government.'[3] But the Introductory Note to the Census Tables, 'Published by Command of His Excellency The Governor' in 1933, said:

> After examination of Mr. Walter's covering report with the figures submitted, it was realised that while the principal totals in the tables relating to natives were in the main reasonable, there still existed so many inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the details as to render it impracticable to base any scientific analysis on the figures.

[1] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 29. [2] Ibid. *1931*, p. 16.
[3] *Report on the Statistical Department of the Conference of East African Governors 1931*, p. 5.

The amount of explanatory matter necessary in view of these discrepancies would have made it a very lengthy document and the expense of its publication, especially in view of the fact that it could not by the nature of the data reviewed be conclusive, was not held to be justifiable. In consequence, the more detailed enumeration returns have been omitted from this publication.

This argument is by no means convincing. The *Census Returns* (Tables) cover 108 folio pages, and I am not aware of any other census publication where paper has been wasted in such a futile manner. In the tables showing the natives (not residing on non-native premises) by tribe and sex (p. 57), by tribe, sex, and conjugal condition (pp. 64–5), and by tribe, sex, and religion (pp. 72–3) there appear among the tribes indigenous to Uganda, the Angola, the Batusi, the Sudan, and the Uganda Natives (not stated), and among the tribes not indigenous to Uganda the Embu, the Kakamega, and the Nyasaland, but in each column there is a bar (—). Other tribes—the Comorian, Masai, Muro, and Somali—are represented by one person each. A table covering not less than 30 pages (pp. 79–108) shows for each county the males and females under and over 18 by tribes. But this table, as it stands, is useless since it gives no totals for the Protectorate. In order to find the total number of males and females under and over 18 the reader must add the totals for the 133 counties spread over 30 pages, i.e. add 532 figures,[1] and if he wanted to know the number of males and females under and over 18 for each tribe he would have to add 6,440 figures. If, however, he refrains from making these colossal additions he will find the tables showing the population by tribes and conjugal condition useless, because the fact that, say, among the 126,388 female Bairu 61,229 were not married does not mean anything if one does not know how many of the female Bairu were adults.[2] If the age data had been given in the same manner as the data on conjugal condition, i.e. (1) for each county, and (2) for each tribe, they would have covered 4 instead of 30 pages and they would have been more useful.[3] But the waste of paper is more appalling still in the 56 pages of tables dealing with the 17,267 non-natives. These non-natives are subdivided into 2,001 Europeans, 13,026 Indians, 1,124 Goans, 515 Arabs, and 601 unclassified non-natives (mainly children). Every single detail is given for each group. Thus eight tables covering 8½ pages show nothing else but the numbers of unclassified non-natives by Districts, age groups, and sex; by years of age, conjugal condition, and sex; by (33) occupations, nature of employment, and sex; by (33) occupations, age groups, and sex;[4] by country of birth, nationality, and sex; by years of residence, age groups, and sex;[5] by Districts, relation to head of family, and sex; finally the unclassified non-native children by

[1] Table 6 below shows these totals.

[2] The omission of totals is the more incomprehensible as the Introductory Note emphasizes that the totals were in the main reasonable and the details inaccurate and inconsistent.

[3] The best solution, of course, would have been not to give any separate table at all for ages but to distinguish non-adults and adults in the tables referring to conjugal condition.

[4] Two whole pages are devoted to the classification of 601 unclassified non-natives by occupation although 523 had no occupation.

[5] One whole page is devoted to this classification of the unclassified non-natives by years of residence although for 480 of them the years of residence were 'not stated'.

years of age, nature of their education, and sex.[1] To quote only one other example: the returns concerning the 115 female Arabs are shown in 59 columns with 2,250 entries of which 1,779 are bars (—) and only 471 figures (of which a great many are repetitions). It is no exaggeration to say that without any appreciable loss the tabular matter concerning natives could have been reduced by one-half, and that concerning non-natives by three-quarters, and that the expenditure thus saved would have covered several times the cost of publishing a 'very lengthy' explanatory report. The reader then would have been in a position to judge whether the devastating criticism in the Introductory Note was justified or not.

The Government had stated that while the principal totals in the tables relating to natives were in the main reasonable, there existed so many inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the details as to render it impracticable to base any scientific analysis on the figures. But the Medical Department which in 1932 had distrusted the accuracy of the count when it knew only the principal totals, changed its opinion when in 1933 it got the chance of examining the details.

No detailed census figures for 1931 were available during 1932, but a comparison of the gross 1931 figures with corresponding figures for 1921 gave rise to grave doubts as to the accuracy of one or the other. For example, the population of two districts to which no abnormal immigration had been noted, had increased during the decennium at a rate of over 50 per 1,000 per annum, which, in the absence of mass immigration, of necessity implied a birth rate of over 70 per 1,000 per annum. There were so many anomalies of this nature that it was provisionally decided not to use the census figures as a basis for the calculation of the rates for 1932, but to revert to the old method previously adopted in inter-census years. . . .

In May, 1933, when this Report was in preparation, the detailed figures of the 1931 census were received. It was then too late to include in the Report the results of comparison of these figures with the 1921 census, or indeed to make any but a most cursory investigation of the two. A few facts were noted, however, which suggested that some at least of the apparent anomalies would disappear on further investigation. A comparison of the gross census figures for 1921 and 1931 of the native population of the Mengo District of the Buganda Province indicated that during the decennium the population had increased at the rate of 7·2 per thousand per annum whereas the number of recorded births and deaths for the three years 1930, 1931 and 1932 indicated that the population of this district was decreasing at the rate of 5·4 per thousand per annum. When, however, from the detailed census returns, consideration was given to the indigenous natives only of the Mengo District, *i.e.*, the Baganda, the census figures for 1921–1931 showed that these people had actually decreased in the district at the rate of 7·4 per thousand per annum over the decennium. The increase in the gross population during this period was due to immigration of natives non-indigenous to the district.[2] A further study of the returns of the non-indigenous population of the district in 1931 revealed the fact that 80 per cent. of them were males and the implication of this is that the majority of them were a floating population not settled in the district, and outside its tribal

[1] The unclassified non-natives (like the other four groups) are classified furthermore in five summary tables covering 10 pages by Districts and sex; by years of age and birthplace; by Provinces, (33) occupations, and sex; by religion and sex.

[2] I do not understand how the Medical Department came to this conclusion. The number of Baganda in Mengo District increased between 1921 and 1931 from 284,829 to 297,582, and the number of non-Baganda from 47,162 to 59,199 (see *Census Returns 1921*, p. 14; *1931*, pp. 1, 79–80).

organisation. It is, therefore, clear that what appeared to be an inexplicable anomaly between birth and death returns and census figures when gross figures only were considered disappeared when detailed figures were considered.[1] It remains to be seen if all the apparent anomalies can be similarly explained.[2]

This single observation helped to restore confidence in the figures provided by the 1931 census, and it was decided to use them as the basic figures for the calculation of birth and death rates . . . .[3]

One year later, the Medical Department stated:

There is no doubt that the census figures can be criticised on several points, mostly of a minor nature, but there remains the fact that the yearly rate of increase of the population since the census appears reasonable and accords well with forecasts based on the composition of the population as determined by the census . . . .[4]

II. Total Population

1. *Native Population*

1878–1944. Stanley, in 1878, estimated the population of 'Uganda proper' at 750,000 (excluding islands of the Victoria Nyanza).[5] Apparently in 1879 the Rev. C. T. Wilson, the first missionary in the country, estimated the population of Uganda proper (including the islands), 'after very careful calculations', at 5,000,000.[6] The doctor and anthropologist Felkin, in 1886, endorsed Wilson's estimate,[7] but the Rev. R. P. Ashe, in 1889, considered it far too high: 'I very much question . . . if the whole population of Buganda proper amounts to as much as one million of souls.'[8] Captain Lugard (1893) apparently accepted Wilson's estimate of 5,000,000 for 1878, but thought that the population was less than 2,500,000 in 1893.[9] Some months earlier, however, Sir Gerald Portal,[10] in a report to the Earl of Rosebery dated 24 May 1893, expressed the opinion that the population was only 400,000 or 500,000.[11] He corrected and amplified his

[1] However, the detailed figures themselves inspire little confidence; see footnote 1 to p. 254 below.

[2] The anomalies in the returns from the Busoga and Toro Districts mentioned above seem to defy any explanation; see pp. 321–2 below.

[3] *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 29–30.

[4] Ibid. *1933*, p. 23; see also *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1933*, p. 8.

[5] See Stanley, *Through the Dark Continent*, vol. i, p. 401. He estimated the total population of the 'empire of Uganda' at 2,775,000, and added: 'But it is to be understood that it is only a rough estimate, made by a traveller who has had to compile his figures by merely taking into consideration the number of the army assembled at Nakaranga, and enumerating districts and villages along the line of his travels.'

[6] See Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, vol. i, p. 150. The Intelligence Division of the War Office said that 'this must be an over-statement as he only estimates the males at 1,400,000' (*Handbook of British East Africa*, 1893, p. 53). It was no doubt an over-statement, but not because Wilson estimated the males at only 1,400,000. His starting-point was the total population of 5,000,000, and he arrived at the figure of 1,400,000 males because he thought that the females were so much more numerous; see p. 253 below.

[7] See Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 700.

[8] Ashe, *Two Kings of Uganda*, p. 296.

[9] See Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, pp. 426, 432–3; see also footnote 1 to p. 433: 'The "Times" correspondent, 6th July 1893, says that four-fifths of Uganda is now uninhabited and the population vastly over-estimated.'

[10] Sir Gerald Portal, Consul-General at Zanzibar, was dispatched in Dec. 1892 to Uganda as Special Commissioner. On 1 Apr. 1893 he assumed on behalf of the British Government the obligations and responsibilities of the British East Africa Company in Buganda.

[11] *Reports relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal*, p. 12.

statements regarding the population in a book published in 1894 (after his death).

As to the total population of Uganda proper it is difficult to arrive at any very accurate conclusion, though it may safely be said that it has been vastly overstated by several enthusiastic writers and speakers during the last few years. . . . In 1875 the population was estimated by Mr. Stanley as under one million; in 1879 an English missionary put it at five millions; more recently I am informed that one of the authorities of the British East Africa Company[1] announced that the country contained three millions of inhabitants, while a member of the Church Missionary Society[2] has been heard to state that in Uganda are nearly a million Protestants out of a total population of a million and a half. On the other hand, another officer of the East Africa Company, of local experience,[3] held the opinion that there were not more than 250,000 people in the whole country. A careful, but at present incomplete, calculation of the number of inhabitants, taking village by village, and province by province, has been carried on during the last few years by some of the French missionaries in Uganda, and these gentlemen told me that their labours had now progressed far enough to enable them to predict that they would find the total population to amount to about 450,000, but certainly to fall short of half a million. We may, therefore, in default of more accurate statistics, take 450,000 as the figure, which gives us an average of about thirty per square mile.[4]

Sir Harry Johnston,[5] in 1901, estimated the population of Buganda at 1,000,000.[6]

1878	*1879*	*1886*	*1889*	*1893*
750,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	<1,000,000	1,500,000

1893	*1893*	*1893*	*1901*
250,000	<2,500,000	450,000	1,000,000

These various estimates of the population of Buganda are most bewildering, but it must be realized that they do not all refer to the same area. Thus Stanley, in estimating the population (including the Sesse islands) at about 770,000, reckoned with an area of 30,000 square miles,[7] while Portal accepted the estimate of 450,000 for an area which he put at 15,000 or 16,000 square miles.[8] As regards Williams's low estimate of 250,000, he may have counted with only 10,000 or with 12,292 square miles, the area given by Lugard[9] with whom he collaborated so closely. The differences in the average density per square mile, between these three estimates, therefore, are not very great. Johnston's figure of 1,000,000, on the other

[1] Portal refers here probably to Lugard.
[2] Portal refers here possibly to Roscoe.
[3] This was Captain Williams; see *Reports relating to Uganda*, p. 12.
[4] Portal, *British Mission to Uganda*, pp. 187–8.
[5] Sir Harry Johnston was sent out by the British Government at the end of 1899 as Special Commissioner to reorganize the administration.
[6] See *Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda 1901*, p. 15.
[7] See Stanley, vol. i, pp. 400–1.
[8] See Portal, p. 179. But see also Macdonald, p. 171: 'The best authorities gave the total population of Uganda at this time at about 400,000, which, for an area of 10,000 square miles, would give an average of 40 per mile.'
[9] See Lugard, vol. ii, p. 556.

hand, may have referred to an area of 19,600 square miles, since this is the area shown in the 1902 *Statistical Tables* for the Colonies (where the native population, it is true, is given as only 667,872). I shall discuss the actual changes in population in Section VII of this chapter, but may say here that I do not think that the population of Uganda proper at any time can have exceeded, say, 1,500,000.

Uganda proper was proclaimed a British Protectorate on 19 June 1894. In 1895 Unyoro was conquered, and 'in 1896 the Protectorate was extended to most of the other regions which are now included within the present "Uganda"'.[1] As regards Unyoro, Stanley put its population at 500,000,[2] while others estimated it at 2,500,000.[3] For the Protectorate as constituted in 1896 there are, of course, no earlier population estimates. Stanley, in 1875, put the population of the 'empire of Uganda' at 2,000,000,[4] and in 1878 at 2,775,000,[5] but this empire was much smaller than the future Protectorate.[6] Lugard said that Ankoli had about the same population as Uganda proper, and thus apparently assumed that Uganda proper, Unyoro, and Ankoli, taken together, had a population of at least 6,000,000, but these three districts comprised an area much smaller even than the 'empire of Uganda'.

The first official estimate of the extended Protectorate seems to have been made in 1900. In a report dated 27 April, Sir Harry Johnston wrote to the Marquess of Salisbury:

> I estimate the total population of the countries included within the limits of the Uganda Protectorate . . . to be under 4,000,000.[7]
>
> If a census were taken of the Protectorate at the present day, it would probably be found that half of its population was concentrated in the Kingdom of Uganda

[1] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1938*, p. 4. See also *Chronological Table of the Laws of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. vii: '. . . Unyoro and the part of the British sphere of influence lying to the west of Uganda and Unyoro was placed within the limits of the Uganda Protectorate on 30th June 1896, which Protectorate was at the same time declared to include also Usoga, and the other territories to the East under the administration of His Majesty's Commissioner and Consul-General for the Protectorate.'

[2] See Stanley, vol. i, p. 401.

[3] *Handbook of British East Africa*, 1893, p. 73, says that 'the population [of Unyoro] was estimated by Wilson, in 1879, at 2½ millions', and Lugard, vol. i, p. 432, says that Felkin 'gives 2½ millions for Unyoro, p. 79 (Proc. Royal Society, Edin., vol. xiii)', but I found such a statement neither in the book of Wilson and Felkin nor in Felkin's articles in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society, Edinburgh*, vol. xiii. Lugard himself apparently accepted the estimate of 2,500,000 and said: 'Unyoro is probably more populous than Uganda.'

[4] See his letters to the *Daily Telegraph* and the *New York Herald*, Stanley, vol. i, p. 210.

[5] Uganda proper (from Ripon Falls to Katonga River) 750,000; Uddu 100,000; Bwera 30,000; Koki 70,000; Usoga 500,000; Ukedi 150,000; Unyoro 500,000; Usagara or Ankori 200,000; Karagwé 150,000; Usui 80,000; Uzongara, including Ihangiro and Bumbireh 200,000; Sesse Island 20,000; Uvuma 15,000; All other Islands 10,000.

[6] Stanley says: 'This number [2,775,000] gives about thirty-eight persons to the square mile throughout the empire of Uganda.' This would imply an area of 73,000 square miles, while the Protectorate as constituted in 1896 was about twice as large. Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. i, p. v, stated that the territories which were comprised within the limits of the Uganda Protectorate during the time of his administration had an area of some 150,000 square miles. Lugard, *The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 54–5, said: 'The population was estimated by Mr. Stanley at from two to two and a-half millions, including the islands of the Lake, as well as all the country that is now part of the Uganda Protectorate, with the exception of the densely populated district of Kavirondo, and the remainder of the country to the east of the Lake.'

[7] 'With the data at my disposal I calculate it at about 3,800,000.'

and the adjoining provinces or districts of Ankole, Toru, Unyoro, Busoga, and Kavirondo.[1]

A year later Sir Harry Johnston wrote to the Marquess of Lansdowne:

In my Preliminary Report . . . I gave the approximate total of that population at under 4,000,000, a total, I believe, much below previous estimates and considered inadequate by some of our officials. I may, of course, have under-estimated the native population of one province, but I over-estimated, I believe, the population of others, and I think I am fairly correct in my suggested total.[2]

Another official estimate put the population in 1901 at 4,500,000.[3] On 1 April 1902 the Eastern Province with perhaps 1,000,000 inhabitants[4] was transferred to the British East Africa Protectorate, and the estimate of 4,500,000 was correspondingly reduced. In the *Colonial Office List* the native population was given for each of the years 1903–6 as 3,500,000.[5] But this estimate was considered rather too low by the Administration of the Protectorate.

The population of the Protectorate has been estimated at between three and four millions,[6] but taking into consideration the density of the population in parts of the unadministered portions of the Protectorate, notably in the interior ranges of Mount Elgon, it is possible that this estimate has been put too low.[7]

The *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire*, which for 1904 had put the population at 3,532,000,[8] thereupon raised its estimate for 1905 to 4,000,000.[9] But the Administration was still not satisfied.

The estimated population of the Protectorate is about four millions, but this is probably too low.[10]

Finally the *Colonial Office List* also accepted the view that the native population of the Protectorate exceeded 3,500,000 and reported for 1907, 1908, and 1909 that the natives numbered 3,500,000 in the 'administered portion'.[11]

However, just as in Kenya, the 1911 count yielded a much lower total than had been expected, namely 2,840,469 natives (including 378,000 in

[1] *Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 5. See also *Précis of Information concerning the Uganda Protectorate, Sept. 1902*, p. 4.

[2] *Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 15.

[3] See *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire 1890 to 1904*, p. 1; *1891 to 1905*, p. 1; *1892 to 1906*, p. 1; *1893 to 1907*, p. 1; *1894 to 1908*, p. 1; *1895 to 1909*, p. 1.

[4] See p. 144 above.

[5] See *Colonial Office List 1905*, p. 372; *1906*, p. 364; *1907*, p. 370; *1908*, p. 384.

[6] See also *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1903*, p. 830: 'From information received in September, 1905, the population was stated to be between three and four millions at the end of 1904. . . .'

[7] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1904–5*, p. 22.

[8] See *Statistical Abstract 1890 to 1904*, p. 1.

[9] Ibid. *1891 to 1905*, p. 1.

[10] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1905–6*, p. 22.

[11] See *Colonial Office List 1909*, p. 383; *1910*, p. 396; *1911*, p. 378. *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1906*, p. 360, gave the coloured population during the year ended 31 Mar. 1906 as 2,665,740 exclusive of the 'population (estimated to number 1,250,000 persons) of an unadministered Tract in Nile Province and neighbourhood of Lake Rudolf'. *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire 1892 to 1906*, p. 1, gave the total population for 1906 as 2,540,405 'excluding the population of unexplored districts numbering about 1½ million persons'. But *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1907–8*, p. 20, gave somewhat less—3,520,000, including 400,000 in Unadministered Districts.

unadministered Districts).[1] For 1913–44 the native population has been estimated as follows:[2]

Date	*Natives*	*Date*	*Natives*	*Date*	*Natives*
31 Mar. 1913	2,889,561	31 Dec. 1923	3,119,645	31 Dec. 1934	3,623,591
31 Mar. 1914	2,904,454	31 Dec. 1924	3,136,769	31 Dec. 1935	3,644,245
31 Mar. 1915	2,923,031	31 Dec. 1925	3,137,602	31 Dec. 1936	3,668,793
31 Mar. 1916	2,883,382	31 Dec. 1926	3,123,581	31 Dec. 1937	3,692,127
31 Mar. 1917	2,950,504	31 Dec. 1927	3,135,985	31 Dec. 1938	3,725,798
31 Mar. 1918	3,357,080	31 Dec. 1928	3,241,543	31 Dec. 1939	3,769,758
31 Mar. 1919	3,313,908	31 Dec. 1929	3,396,323	31 Dec. 1940	3,809,178
31 Mar. 1920	3,057,075	31 Dec. 1930	3,497,650	31 Dec. 1941	3,844,981
Apr. 1921	3,064,735	28 May 1931	3,536,267	31 Dec. 1942	3,868,714
31 Dec. 1921	3,059,583	31 Dec. 1932	3,568,886	31 Dec. 1943	3,901,440
31 Dec. 1922	3,125,522	31 Dec. 1933	3,604,135	31 Dec. 1944	3,926,528

The annual estimates between the counts of 1911 and 1921 show some quite erratic variations. They indicate an aggregate increase of 110,000 in the period 1911–17, a jump of over 400,000 in the year ending 31 March 1918, and a drop of 300,000 in the two following years. There is no reason to assume that the population increased in 1917–18,[3] and while it declined somewhat in 1918–20, owing to the influenza epidemic and a severe famine, it certainly cannot have dropped by as much as 300,000. But the aggregate change for the intercensal period 1911–21—an increase of 224,266 or 7·9 per cent.—does not seem unreasonable, though it was probably smaller.

Between 1920 and 1927 the estimates varied very little. But from 1927 to 1930 they increased by 11·5 per cent., and this rise in three years cannot be accepted as genuine. The 1931 return was higher still, and it exceeded the 1921 figure by 471,532 or 15·4 per cent. Moreover, the area of the Protectorate had been reduced (in 1926) by the transfer of the Rudolf Province from Uganda to Kenya. The population of this Province, it is true, was very small according to the Kenya statistics.[4] But it figured in the 1921 *Census Returns* of Uganda with 150,000 native inhabitants, and if the Rudolf Province is excluded from the 1921 totals it appears that the increase of the native population from 1921 to 1931 was not less than 621,532 or 21·3 per cent. Such an increase could be accepted as genuine only if there had been an enormous immigration. That there

[1] See *Census Returns 1911*, p. 3. It should be noted that all 'estimates', made prior to the 1911 count, for the unadministered and most of the administered areas had been wild guesses. The population of the (administered) Busoga District, for example, had been put for 1904 at 100,000 males and 200,000 females, for 1905 at 150,000 males and 200,000 females, for 1910 at 95,000 males and 196,000 females, while the count of 1911 showed 102,106 males and 141,297 females. The figures for Buganda, on the other hand, were apparently based on some kind of counts. (According to Roscoe such counts had been made in Buganda in pre-European days for tax purposes; see *The Baganda*, pp. 244–6; *Twenty-Five Years in East Africa*, p. 94; 'Uganda and some of its Problems', pp. 221–2.)

[2] See *Colonial Office List 1914*, p. 397, *1915*, p. 401, *1916*, p. 405, *1917*, p. 406, *1918*, p. 407, *1922*, p. 431; *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1917–18*, p. 7, *1918–19*, p. 4, *1919–20*, p. 4, *1921*, p. 5, to *1927*, p. 5; Uganda Protectorate, *Blue Book 1928*, p. 85, *1929*, p. 91, *1930*, p. 103, *1932*, p. 109, *1933*, p. 119, *1934*, p. 127, *1935*, p. 130, *1936*, p. 123, *1937*, p. 124, *1938*, p. 122, *1939*, p. 16, *1940*, p. 16, *1941*, p. 14, to *1944*, p. 14; *Census Returns 1931*, p. 1.

[3] See p. 295 below.

[4] See p. 146 above.

was some immigration is beyond doubt.[1] But this influx cannot account for more than a very small proportion of the apparent increase of 621,532. It would seem, therefore, that either the 1921 returns were far too low or the 1931 returns far too high.

The population figures published since the 1931 count indicate a much slower growth than those of the late 1920s, the total increase for 1931–44 being 390,261 or 11·3 per cent. But this change in the apparent increase was due exclusively to a change in method. While prior to 1931 the estimates 'were obtained by a kind of annual unofficial census collected by minor chiefs', and, imperfect as they were, tried to take account both of the actual natural increase and the excess of immigration the figures for 1932–44 were arrived at by simply adding the excess of registered births over registered deaths since 31 December 1931 to the total of the 1931 count. Thus the population for 31 December 1932 was computed as follows:

	Population 1931 count	*Registered*		*Population 31 Dec. 1932*
		Births 1932	*Deaths 1932*	
Protectorate excl. Karamoja District	3,470,689	98,484	65,865	3,503,308
Karamoja District	65,578	—[1]	—[1]	65,578
Total	3,536,267	98,484	65,865	3,568,886

[1] No birth or death figures have ever been submitted from the Karamoja District.

No account has been taken of births and deaths from the census date to the end of 1931,[2] and no account whatsoever of immigration and emigration. It was assumed moreover that birth and death registration was fairly complete. The estimates since 1931, therefore, are more uncertain still than those of the 1920s. The Medical Department, it seems, did not realize that they became more uncertain every year.

The accuracy of the figures is questionable, but the margin of error has been more or less constant since the 1931 Census.[3]

Migration. How much the population estimates suffered from the neglect of migrations it is impossible to say, but there is no doubt that in

[1] See pp. 241–2 below.

[2] The excess of registered births over registered deaths in 1931 was 25,798.

[3] *Medical Report 1944*, p. 7. How uncertain the figures actually are may be inferred from a comparison of the data concerning the total population (including non-natives) given for 1943 in the *Blue Book* and in the *Report on Livestock Production* (p. 1).

	Blue Book	*Rep. on L. Pr.*
Buganda Province	929,797	1,172,600
Eastern Province	1,306,093	1,510,100
Western Province	1,694,834	1,645,700
Total	3,930,724	4,328,400

It should be noted that the Veterinary Officer in his comprehensive report gives many details, otherwise not available, concerning the population of smaller administrative units.

the last decade migrants were numerous. These movements apparently started in the early 1920s. The 'Committee of Enquiry into the Labour Situation in the Uganda Protectorate' reported in 1938:

The abolition of the *kasanvu* labour levy in Buganda at the end of 1921 (and elsewhere 12 months later), resulted in a shortage of labour for public works;[1] and, primarily with a view to the recruitment of labourers for Government purposes, a Labour Commissioner was appointed in 1922. Men looking for work, from outdistricts and from Belgian territory, were beginning to make their way towards Buganda, and the new Government labour organization did much to familiarize them with the main routes and to stimulate the flow. . . .

In the ten years (1922–31) following the inception of a labour organization great changes had come over labour conditions in Uganda. Head-porterage had been largely replaced by motor transport using an ever-expanding road system. Voluntary immigration, for the most part to Buganda and often to work for Baganda farmers, had become a part of the economic life of large numbers of the inhabitants of Belgian Ruanda and the Tanganyika Territory, and to a less extent of the West Nile District.[2]

The important part which those immigrants played in the economic life of Uganda was also emphasized in the Medical Report for 1927:

When one speaks of labour in Uganda, one means unskilled labour and this is broadly divided into Government Labour, Private Labour and Casual Labour. Practically all the labour employed is immigrant, and is for the most part of recent arrival. The great majority come from the South West, our own districts of Ankole and Ruanda supplying a very small percentage of the total, which is mainly made up of natives from the mandated territories of Ruanda, Urundi and Belgian Congo.[3]

Figures about the numbers of immigrant labourers at that time are scanty.

It was estimated that in 1928 a total of 57,646 men entered the Western Province and Masaka for the purpose of finding work, of whom 35,000 were said to have emanated from Belgian territory . . . . The estimate of the numbers of men coming from Ruanda-Urundi yearly was placed at approximately 46,000 in 1928.[4]

The numbers of immigrants were evidently smaller from 1929 onwards. The Administration at first thought that the reduction would be only temporary. The Colonial Report for 1931 said:

For many years there has been a constant stream of native labour from Belgian Ruanda into Uganda.[5] Of late the stream has slackened, but there appears to be a

[1] See also *Medical Report 1925*, p. 71: 'It does not appear to be generally appreciated that the Baganda are unlikely to devote themselves to unskilled labour if they can find better occupation. It is recognised that in most countries unskilled labour is the least sought-after occupation and everyone strives for other and better employment. Here under the compulsory labour arrangements 'Kasanvu', unskilled labour had a bad name and came to be looked upon as degrading and to-day only the poorest will adopt labour as an occupation. Moreover it is not fully understood that in no circumstances are the local inhabitants likely to volunteer as unskilled labourers at the wages that used to be paid to the pressed man.'

[2] *Report of the Committee*, p. 9.

[3] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 67.

[4] *Report on an Investigation into Conditions affecting Unskilled Labour* (1937), p. 32. The number of Congo labourers arriving in 1928 via West Nile District is given ibid., p. 28, as 2,623.

[5] Temporary migration of labourers from Ruanda to Uganda had apparently been customary when Ruanda was part of German East Africa (see *Rapport présenté par le Gouvernement belge au Conseil de la Société des Nations au sujet de l'Administration du Ruanda-Urundi pendant l'année 1933*, p. 123). According to the reports by the Belgian Government temporary migration from Ruanda to Tanganyika and Uganda was large in 1925, less in 1926, and still less in 1927, but, owing to famines, extraordinarily large in 1928 and 1929. The Administration estimated the number of emigrant labourers in 1929 at about 50,000 Banyaruanda and about 5,000 Barundi. But when the food situation in Ruanda improved in the latter part of 1929 very many returned,

greater tendency now for these immigrants to settle permanently in the country with their families. Labourers from the West Nile spread all over the Protectorate, and it may be possible that a similar immigration from the Congo to the West Nile and so over the Protectorate is occurring and being followed by permanent settlement.[1]

It seems, however, that immigration for some years more remained small. For 1935 the Colonial Report repeated still what it had said for the preceding four years:

Up to 1923, the local labour supply was generally sufficient, and no foreign labour was required. . . . From 1923 to 1927, a shortage of labour was experienced and a considerable amount of labour was admitted, mainly from Belgian Ruanda.[2]

But the Report for 1936 said:

Numbers of Banyaruanda and Barundi enter each year seeking work. The figure for this year is 87,553, and in addition about 19,110 labourers of other tribes came from Tanganyika.[3]

The Reports for 1937 and 1938 contained similar statements.

1937. 97,692 labourers came from Ruanda-Urundi to find work, and about 14,000 from Tanganyika.[4]

1938. 90,000 labourers came from Ruanda-Urundi to find work, and about 11,000 from Tanganyika . . . .[5]

The figures for labourers coming in 1936 and 1937 from Tanganyika are higher than those given in other reports, but the Uganda migration statistics are confusing also in other respects. The *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee* contains the following table (p. 243).[6]

and emigration in 1930 was small. See ibid. *1925*, p. 85; *1926*, p. 86; *1927*, p. 64; *1928*, pp. 10, 63; *1929*, pp. 74–5; *1930*, p. 91. The 1921 report complained about the flight of shepherds who drove the cattle entrusted to them from Ruanda to Uganda and settled there with their ill-gotten property (see ibid. *1921*, p. 9).

[1] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1931*, p. 9.

[2] Ibid. *1935*, p. 22. See also ibid. *1931*, p. 24; *1932*, p. 23; *1933*, p. 25; *1934*, p. 24.

[3] Ibid. *1936*, p. 22.

[4] Ibid. *1937*, p. 26.

[5] Ibid. *1938*, p. 23. The Belgian Administration estimated the numbers of labourers from Ruanda-Urundi, temporarily present in Tanganyika and Uganda on 31 Dec. of the years 1930–8, as follows:

	1930	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
Ruanda .	2,965	4,170	2,030	6,834	11,149	26,476	20,949	28,722	28,724
Urundi .	4,250	2,699	10,836	14,042	5,639	12,811	29,391	20,535	27,706
Total .	7,215	6,869	12,866	20,876	16,788	39,287	50,340	49,257	56,430

(See *Rapport 1931*, p. 93; *1932*, p. 96; *1933*, p. 124; *1934*, p. 113; *1935*, p. 120; *1936*, p. 119; *1937*, p. 125; *1938*, p. 134.)

These figures cover only temporary migrants. The report for 1933 said (p. 124) that there were in Uganda about 9,000 natives from the territories of Gabiro and Kibungu who had left Ruanda several years ago and were not expected to return. See also ibid. *1934*, p. 113.

The report for 1934 said (p. 113) that the figures for natives temporarily absent at the end of the year had become more complete in the course of time and that this explained in part the increase in the Ruanda figures between 1932 and 1934. It should be realized, moreover, that the figures relating to 31 Dec. indicate merely net emigration on a given date. The total number of natives who had migrated in the course of 1930 from Ruanda to Uganda was estimated at 30,000 (see ibid., p. 22). Sometimes the figures may also have been particularly low or particularly high on 31 Dec. The natives from Urundi temporarily present in Uganda numbered 12,811 on 31 Dec. 1935, about 20,500 in August 1936, 29,391 on 31 Dec. 1936, about 43,500 in August 1937, and 20,535 on 31 Dec. 1937 (see ibid. *1937*, p. 124; see also ibid. *1936*, pp. 20, 119).

[6] *Report*, p. 12.

Arrivals in and Departures from Uganda of Immigrant Labourers (Banyaruanda) from the Belgian Mandated Territories by the two Main Routes

	1934	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943 (Jan.–June)*
To Uganda:										
Kakitumba Bridge—(Ruanda-Urundi–Uganda)	No returns available				60,464	13,331	71,682	65,194	42,113	12,066
Kyaka Ferry—(Tanganyika–Uganda)	4,381	3,545	4,698	7,683	11,000	11,488	3,342	8,206	26,707	10,716
Total Recorded Arrivals	4,381	3,545	4,698	7,683	71,464	24,819	75,024	73,400	68,820	22,782
From Uganda:										
Kakitumba Bridge	No returns available				47,776	32,912	20,708	52,388	42,910	11,168
Kyaka Ferry	12,962	17,767	45,163	82,841	60,000	64,057	29,797	48,382	50,057	12,072
Total Recorded Departures	12,962	17,767	45,163	82,841	107,776	96,969	50,505	100,770	92,967	23,240

This table calls for some comments:

(1) The title is misleading. The table does not comprise only labourers from the Belgian Mandated Territories, but also natives from Tanganyika.

Natives of the Tanganyika Territory entering and leaving Uganda by the Kyaka Ferry numbered—

	1936	*1937*
Entering	4,696	7,632
Leaving	19,110	13,963

The Sleeping Sickness Regulations which are imposed upon persons coming into, but not upon those departing from, Uganda, by this route, lead many to seek other ways of entering the country. It is probable that some Tanganyika natives make the Kakitumba Bridge their point of entry. The Kyaka Ferry is far more popular for the homeward journey.[1]

(2) For 1934–7 the 'Total Recorded Arrivals' are not comparable with the 'Total Recorded Departures' because the former exclude the Banyaruanda while the latter include numerous Banyaruanda.

It is estimated that not less than 100,000 Banyaruanda enter Uganda in the course of each year;[2] and that the following numbers left Uganda during the years 1936 and 1937—

	1936	*1937*
Via Mbarara (which includes most of those passing out *via* the Kakitumba Bridge) and Kabale .	61,500	28,812
Via Kyaka Ferry	26,053	68,878
TOTAL	87,553	97,690[3]

In 1934 and 1935 the numbers of Tanganyika Natives entering Uganda by the Kyaka Ferry were 4,381 and 3,545 respectively and those leaving Uganda 7,185 and 7,284. The numbers of Banyaruanda leaving by the Kyaka Ferry were 5,777 and 9,483 respectively.[4]

For 1936 and 1937 the entries in the above table should read:

		1936	*1937*
To Uganda:	Kakitumba Bridge	87,553	97,692
	Kyaka Ferry	4,698	7,683
	Total Recorded Arrivals . . .	92,251	105,375
From Uganda:	Kakitumba Bridge	61,500	28,812
	Kyaka Ferry	45,163	82,841
	Total Recorded Departures . .	106,663	111,653

[1] *Report of Committee of Enquiry 1938*, pp. 31–2. See also *Inspectorate of Labour Report 1940*, p. 1; *1941*, p. 3.

[2] See also *Report of Committee of Enquiry 1938*, p. 17: 'In 1937, 90,000 Banyaruanda (the term is normally inclusive of natives of Urundi) passed into Uganda by way of the Kakitumba bridge and it is estimated that 10,000 at a minimum enter by other routes.' See furthermore ibid., p. 49: 'The bridge over the Kakitumba River near Merama Hill is the point of entry of perhaps 90% of the Banyaruanda immigrants.' See finally *Inspectorate of Labour Report 1938*, p. 4: 'It may be said that anything up to 100,000 Banyaruanda come to Uganda each year in their search for work. Unless they are in possession of a pass from the medical authorities of Tanganyika, they are forbidden to enter by way of that territory owing to Sleeping Sickness Regulations and so most of them cross the Kagera by the Kakitumba bridge.'

[3] *Report of Committee of Enquiry 1938*, p. 31.

[4] *See Report on an Investigation into Conditions affecting Unskilled Labour*, p. 33.

(3) The table covers only the people coming from or returning to Ruanda-Urundi and Tanganyika by the two main routes. But these were not the only immigrant labourers.

Two areas supply the bulk of the unskilled labour—the West Nile District with adjacent regions of the Congo Belge and the Sudan, and the Belgian Mandated Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Subsidiary sources of supply are the Samia county of the Budama District, the Ankole and Bugishu Districts, the Kavirondo Districts of Kenya, and parts of the Tanganyika Territory.[1]

During the five years 1933–1937, 58,750 labourers left the West Nile District for work elsewhere in Uganda, while 43,389 returned. The composition of this labour was—

	Leaving	*Returning*
From West Nile District	33,272	32,109
From Congo Belge and Sudan . . .	25,478	11,280
Total	58,750	43,389[2]

In 1937, some 14,300 men in all passed out of the West Nile District for work elsewhere in the Protectorate. Of these, about 6,500 were natives of the District; while approximately 5,500 were natives of Congo Belge and 2,300 of the Sudan.[3]

Kenya natives come into Uganda for the most part during the cotton-ginning season and obtain employment in the Eastern Province. The number employed outside Busoga, Budama and Bugwere is negligible—under 1,000. All are either Jaluo or Bantu Kavirondo living along the Uganda–Kenya border. The total number working in ginneries, saw-mills and plantations at the height of the cotton season would not be more than between 2,000 and 2,500 men.[4]

In order to obtain the total number of immigrant labourers who arrived in 1937 it is necessary therefore to add to the 105,375 recorded arrivals shown in the above table about 10,000 Banyaruanda who did not come via Kakitumba Bridge, 7,800 labourers coming from the Belgian Congo and Sudan through the West Nile District, and several thousand coming from Kenya. The total arrivals, therefore, may have been 125,000 or 130,000.[5]

Only a small minority of the immigrant labourers arriving within a given year settled in Uganda, but in the course of time the number may not have been unimportant.[6] The 1938 Committee of Enquiry reported:

The following figures supplied by the Provincial Commissioner, Buganda, as the

[1] *Report of Committee of Enquiry 1938*, p. 16.

[2] Ibid., p. 32. In 1933, 15,200 labourers left the West Nile District 'of whom only 1,200 were said to emanate from the Congo' (or the Sudan); see *Report on Unskilled Labour*, p. 28.

[3] *Report of Committee of Enquiry 1938*, p. 16.

[4] Ibid., pp. 17–18. There were, on the other hand, Uganda natives working in Kenya; see ibid., p. 17: 'The average numbers absent from the [Bugishu] district for work elsewhere in Uganda at any time in 1937 amounted to 3,350, while a further average of 3,250 men was in employment in Kenya during the same period.'

[5] This estimate is, of course, very uncertain. See Orde Browne, *Labour Conditions in East Africa* (1946), p. 89: '. . . accurate figures are quite unprocurable, since, although the Uganda Government collects statistics at the main points of entry, these do not cover the undoubtedly large numbers who utilize the numerous hidden crossings of the boundary in order to avoid official supervision in the form of customs etc.'

[6] See in this connexion *Medical Report 1942*, p. 7: 'The number of immigrants in the country must be steadily rising for annually large numbers of people from Ruanda Urundi, Tanganyika, the Belgian Congo and the Sudan enter in search of work and not a few of these settle permanently in the country.'

result of an enumeration in the first half of 1937, throw some light upon the extent to which settlement is a potent factor in the situation in that province—

Countries of origin	*Intending to return; casual and contract*	*Working on estates for two years or more*	*Settled in homesteads*	*Total*
UGANDA:				
Eastern Province	1,781	1,828	6,110	9,719[1]
Northern Province	7,198	5,281	5,518	17,997[2]
Western Province	11,256	2,662	5,491	19,409[3]
OTHER BRITISH TERRITORIES:				
Tanganyika	12,188	1,247	1,917	15,352
Kenya	427	344	778	1,549
BELGIAN TERRITORIES:				
Ruanda-Urundi	34,798	3,922	7,649	46,369
Congo Belge	1,209	653	501	2,363
UNCLASSIFIED	894	278	140	1,312
Total	69,751	16,215	28,104	114,070

[1] 50% Bagishu. [2] 50% Banyoro. [3] 60% Banyankole.

It should be added that a number of the immigrants shown as coming from the Northern Province are in fact Congo Belge natives who, having come into Uganda by way of the West Nile District, have been classified as of Uganda origin.[1]

The bulk of the labourers coming from the Belgian Congo and Sudan are not included in this table as they are working outside Buganda. The Committee's Report after having shown migration between the West Nile District and the rest of Uganda in 1933–7 says:

From these figures it would seem that practically all the 15,000 odd from this quarter who have remained 'down country' during these five years are natives from outside Uganda. Many of them are to be found settled on the big sugar estates and on plantations in Buganda where they form the nucleus of a permanent labour force.

. . . some Congo Belge natives are making their homes on the tea estates in Toro. In Ankole there is a considerable settlement of Banyaruanda near the Mwirasandu tin mine, where most of them find employment.[2]

With regard to the Banyaruanda the Committee states:

For the most part these Banyaruanda do not remain in the country for more than six months after which they return home with their earnings, and it is improbable that more than 60,000 are actually at work in Uganda at any one time. The main periods of immigration are from November to January and again from June to August.[3]

It has been estimated that about 5% of the natives of Ruanda-Urundi entering Uganda fail to return to their home districts.[4]

[1] *Report*, pp. 30–1. [2] Ibid., p. 32. [3] Ibid., p. 17.

[4] Ibid., p. 31. This is probably an under-estimate, since many fail to return because they die within a short time after their arrival in Uganda. The *Report on an Investigation into Conditions affecting Unskilled Labour* (1937) stated (p. 34): 'Many Banyaruanda are now settled in Buganda, and it is understood that a considerable number have brought their families with them, intending not to return to their own country.' See also in this connexion 'Record of discussion with the representatives of three large labour-employing concerns at a meeting of the Labour Advisory

The following table shows for 1938–45 the numbers of non-Uganda labourers travelling via Kakitumba Bridge, Kyaka Ferry, and West Nile District:[1]

Route	*Main country of origin*	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*	*1945*
				ARRIVALS					
Kakitumba Br.	Ruanda-Urundi	60,464	13,331	71,682	65,194	42,113	38,572	18,456	41,509
Kyaka Ferry	Tanganyika	11,052	11,488[1]	3,342	8,206	26,707[2]	21,008	23,581	59,632
West Nile Distr.	Congo, Sudan	..	5,046	5,517	3,143	3,449	..	2,342	3,548
	Total . .	..	29,865	80,541	76,543	72,269	..	44,379	104,689
				DEPARTURES					
Kakitumba Br.	Ruanda-Urundi	47,770	32,912	20,708	52,388	42,910	22,451	13,272	17,365
Kyaka Ferry	Tanganyika	22,865	24,499	29,797	48,382	50,057	32,003	28,446	30,414
	Ruanda-Urundi	36,669	39,558						
West Nile Distr.	Congo, Sudan	..	5,150	4,170	3,299	2,266	..	1,745	2,405
	Total . .	..	102,119	54,675	104,069	95,233	..	43,463	50,184

[1] '11,488 labourers entered by the Kyaka Ferry, that is from Bukoba in the Tanganyika Territory to Masaka in Buganda across the Kagera river: practically the same number as last year. These are mostly of Tanganyika domicile but some are from Belgian Territory' (*Inspectorate of Labour Report 1939*, p. 3).

[2] '. . . immigrants from Ruanda-Urundi . . . comprise 96% of the total of 26,707' (ibid. *1942*, p. 3).

The 1938 Committee of Enquiry had assumed that immigration of Banyaruanda would continue on a large scale.

There seems little reason in present conditions to visualize any appreciable diminution of the flow from this source. The congestion of population in Ruanda-Urundi is such[2] that, even if a considerable expansion in the production of native-grown crops were to take place in that territory, substantial numbers of the male population are likely to continue to be dominated by an urge to go out to look for work. Although economic developments in neighbouring territories are attracting numbers of Banyaruanda, it seems clear that Uganda has its own appeal, and that they will continue to come here unless confronted with far greater obstacles than at present beset their path.[3]

But far greater obstacles soon beset their path. The monthly migration of Banyaruanda via Kakitumba Bridge in 1938–45 was as follows:[4]

Committee on the 9th June, 1943' (*Third Report of the Labour Advisory Committee, Supervision of Labour and other matters relating to Conditions of Employment in Uganda*, pp. 17–18):

'Mr. Vedd [representing Lugazi Sugar estates] . . . doubted whether the Banyaruanda would ever settle permanently.

'They come here for their taxes and they always want to return to their homes. Banyaruanda generally have no wish to settle here. The West Nile people sometimes do.

'Mr. Temple Perkins [Labour Commissioner] stated that according to his figures there were about 15,000 Banyaruanda settled in Buganda which rather contradicted the statement that they preferred to return to their homes.'

[1] See *Inspectorate of Labour Report 1939*, Appendix, Tables II–IV; *1940*, pp. 4–6; *1941*, pp. 3–5; *1942*, pp. 3–4; *Labour Department Report 1944*, pp. 9–10; *1945*, pp. 9–10. I am not giving figures for labourers coming from Kenya, because I found data only for 1939: 'Mention is necessary also of some 1,400 Kavirondo and Jaluo who enter the Eastern Province from Kenya' (*Inspectorate of Labour Report 1939*, p. 4).

[2] Ruanda-Urundi has an area of only 21,000 square miles and a population estimated for 31 Dec. 1939 at 3,800,000; see *Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations 1942/44*, p. 14. See also *Rapport par le Gouvernement belge 1926*, p. 85; *1927*, pp. 62–4; *1928*, p. 62; *1929*, p. 74; Orde Browne, *Labour Conditions in East Africa* (1946), p. 13.

[3] *Report*, p. 48.

[4] See *Inspectorate of Labour Report 1939*, Appendix, Table II; *1941*, p. 3; *Labour Department Report 1944*, p. 9; *1945*, p. 9. Some figures arouse suspicion; the numbers of arrivals and of departures are the same for June and Aug. 1941.

Month	Arrivals							
	1938	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*	*1945*
Jan.	5,603	3,202	701	10,332	7,014	2,031	296	2,245
Feb.	6,816	1,989	1,747	6,411	5,445	1,831	50	2,318
Mar.	7,484	2,328	2,351	3,487	6,652	3,214	—	3,389
Apr.	4,952	1,068	4,351	4,595	4,720	1,818	—	4,282
May	4,287	808	3,083	4,721	2,816	1,824	10	3,868
June	4,644	638	1,650	3,913	2,056	1,798	167	3,642
July	4,176	587	3,270	3,870	1,382	2,343	1,499	3,056
Aug.	3,460	345	8,093	3,912	1,984	3,121	3,329	4,520
Sept.	3,206	182	10,001	4,559	2,338	4,003	4,395	3,870
Oct.	3,598	60	8,289	4,659	2,289	5,052	3,807	3,921
Nov.	6,891	225	11,896	5,179	2,316	5,314	2,688	3,272
Dec.	5,347	1,899	16,650	9,555	3,101	6,673	2,305	3,126

Month	Departures							
	1938	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*	*1945*
Jan.	2,222	1,942	984	1,478	2,134	2,716	1,325	1,185
Feb.	2,042	2,698	1,176	1,967	2,272	1,535	1,013	912
Mar.	4,140	3,980	2,376	5,376	1,913	1,858	1,601	1,432
Apr.	3,640	3,920	1,506	4,703	4,929	1,931	872	1,628
May	4,958	3,542	1,321	5,516	4,899	1,524	886	1,713
June	6,614	3,885	2,093	7,527	4,485	1,604	979	2,184
July	7,738	3,634	2,501	7,576	4,914	3,466	1,218	1,522
Aug.	5,821	3,317	2,378	7,527	4,237	2,272	1,055	1,451
Sept.	3,683	2,287	1,705	3,697	3,779	1,984	1,420	1,310
Oct.	2,984	1,606	1,931	3,175	3,767	1,532	1,101	1,614
Nov.	2,080	1,008	1,488	2,026	3,081	1,635	1,031	1,039
Dec.	1,854	1,093	1,249	1,820	2,500	1,394	771	1,375

It appears that the number of arrivals became small early in 1939 and that there was hardly any immigration at all during the summer of that year. The *Labour Inspectorate Report* gave the following explanation:

> . . . there was . . . a check in the inflow of Banyaruanda and Barundi labour. Industrial and agricultural expansion in their own country, offering prospects of better wages nearer home, is tending to absorb the Banyaruanda, and Congolese generally, in indigenous enterprises, especially mining; moreover more are now kept busy growing food crops as a security against famine. There was also, for some time, apprehension that any foreign African who entered a Protectorate of Great Britain at war would be conscripted.[1]

Immigration of Banyaruanda rose again in 1940, was particularly large in the winter of 1940–1, but was considerably smaller from August to December 1941 than in the same months of 1940. It was smaller still in 1942[2] and 1943 and stopped altogether in January 1944. This stoppage

[1] *Report 1939*, p. 1.

[2] It may be, however, that a particularly large proportion of labourers was excluded from the statistics. See 'Report of the Sub-Committee Appointed by the Labour Advisory Committee on 21st December, 1942', *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee*, p. 38:

'The District Commissioner, Ankole, told the Committee that last year 42,000 Banyaruanda entered Uganda at Kakitumba and 43,000 returned.

'This, he said, was the first time for many years that the outgoing figure had exceeded the

was due mainly to the food shortage in Uganda[1] which made it the more necessary to check immigration as food shortage prevailed also in Ruanda-Urundi. Governor Dundas told the Legislative Council on 15 December 1943:

> In connection herewith [food shortage in Uganda] another unfortunate circumstance is that severest dearth prevails in the Ruanda country, and as a consequence large numbers of Banyaruanda are reported to be coming into Uganda, many in desperate state, and among them unusual numbers of women and children. I have been in communication with the Belgian authorities with a view to suspending temporarily immigration from that region, and their response has been most prompt and accommodating. . . .[2]

Five days later the Chief Secretary said:

> Your Excellency has authorised me to state that in view of the critical situation you have been compelled, as a temporary measure, to suspend immigration of Banyaruanda labour and its dependents over our South-Western frontier and have warned the authorities in the Belgian Congo and Tanganyika Territory that restrictions to this end will be imposed as from the 1st January next.[3]

The Labour Department reported:

> The closing of the border was quickly reflected in the state of the labour market and very soon representations were received from the larger employing concerns, particularly the sugar companies, on the difficulty in maintaining output. In March therefore, when the internal food situation in Uganda had eased, it was decided to re-open the border, it being thought that, as the rains had fallen in Ruanda-Urundi, that the position there, which led to women and children immigrating into Uganda, was no longer acute. This proved however not to be the case, as the famine had been more severe than was appreciated, with the consequence that the Belgian Authorities could not see their way to allow able-bodied men to emigrate in search of work until the food position was restored in their country and the future safeguarded against a recurrence of famine conditions. It was not until towards the end of August that the flow of labour into Uganda became more or less normal though even so a large number of 'families' were observed to be accompanying the workers.[4]

Immigration via Kyaka Ferry fluctuated also enormously in the first years of the war. The quarterly migrations in 1938–45 were as follows:[5]

	Arrivals							
Quarter	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*	*1945*
First	2,455	3,462	856	592	10,529	4,857	4,147	11,764
Second	2,567	5,938	988	865	6,356	5,059	6,914	17,696
Third	3,230	1,284	861	950	3,296	6,078	7,309	11,430
Fourth	2,800	804	637	5,799	6,526	5,014	5,211	18,742

incoming one. He also said that he thought about 20,000 a year passed through Kigezi, but that it was only a rough estimate. Some passed the border near Kisoro and some at Butala.'

Actually the outgoing figure had exceeded very much the incoming one in 1939.

[1] See *Labour Department Report 1944*, p. 2.

[2] Legislative Council, *23rd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, pp. 4–5.

[3] Ibid., p. 26.

[4] *Labour Department Report 1944*, pp. 3–4. Actually labour immigration in the second half of 1944 appears small if compared with 1936–8.

[5] See *Inspectorate of Labour Report 1939*, Appendix, Table II; *1941*, p. 3; *1942*, p. 3; *Labour Department Report 1944*, p. 9; *1945*, p. 9.

Quarter	Departures							
	1938	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*	*1945*
First	14,590	10,412	6,730	6,396	4,498	5,655	5,961	5,264
Second	13,012	22,387	7,932	14,768	11,957	6,417	6,516	7,665
Third	20,602	23,861	11,579	18,863	20,603	11,391	8,682	10,219
Fourth	11,330	7,397	3,556	8,355	12,999	8,540	7,287	7,266

The Labour Advisory Committee made the following comments:

For a period of rather more than two years from 1939 to 1941 there was a ban on the passage over the Kyaka Ferry of natives of Belgian territories and the western parts of Tanganyika. Some of these may have entered by the Kakitumba Bridge but numbers are believed to have used unauthorized crossings of the Kagera River. The ban was raised in the latter part of 1941.[1]

It will be noticed that from the 4th quarter of 1941 and for 1942 a considerable increase is observable entering Uganda. This was caused by the raising of the ban, imposed to prevent the spread of Rhodesian Sleeping Sickness across the Kyaka Ferry, on immigration from Ruanda-Urundi by this route.[2]

In 1945 immigration via Kyaka Ferry was apparently much larger than ever before.

As from Ruanda-Urundi immigration from the Belgian Congo and the Sudan was considerably reduced in 1939. The Commissioner of the Western Province reported:

The flow of labour from Belgian Ruanda ceased on the outbreak of war, probably as the result of fears, rumours and painful recollections of the last war; but before the end of the year had apparently resumed its normal volume.[3]

2. *Non-Native Population*

The number of Europeans ascertained at the census of 1911 was 640.[4] It seems to have exceeded 1,000 in 1914, but declined considerably during the war. At the censuses of 1921 and 1931 it amounted to 1,269 and 2,001 respectively. For recent years somewhat higher figures have been reported,[5] but the European inhabitants constituted all the time less than 1 per 1,000 of the total population.

[1] *Second Report*, p. 12. [2] Ibid., p. 39.

[3] *Report of the Provincial Commissioners, Eastern and Western Provinces, on Native Administration 1939*, p. 19.

[4] According to *Statistical Tables, British Colonies* (*1901*, p. 755; *1902*, p. 839; *1903*, p. 830; *1904*, p. 451; *1906*, p. 360; *1907*, p. 366; *1908*, p. 375; *1909*, p. 382), the number of Europeans was 244 'in the Year 1902', and 253, 254, 384, 397, 445, 507, and 560 respectively 'during the Year ended 31st March', 1903 to 1906, and 1908 to 1910.

[5] Not much importance should be attributed to the fluctuations in the official estimates for 1932–8. *Colonial Reports* (*1932*, p. 9; *1933*, p. 9; *1934*, p. 8; *1935*, p. 8; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 7) put the number of Europeans on 31 Dec. 1932–8 at 1,958, 1,854, 1,959, 1,994, 2,000, 2,100, and 2,111 respectively. While the Blue Books indicate a heavy drop from May 1931 to the end of 1932 and an increase in 1933, the Colonial Reports show a small decrease to the end of 1932 and a large decrease in 1933. The large increases shown in the Blue Books for 1936 and 1938 do not appear in the Colonial Reports.

The *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services* (1944), after having given the 1931 census figures, states (p. 6): 'At present Uganda has a very much larger European population made up of British Military personnel, Italian Prisoners of War, Internees of various nationalities and Polish refugees.' Governor Dundas, on 9 Dec. 1942, said in the Legislative Council: 'During the last quarter of the year refuge has been accorded to Polish citizens, predominantly women and children, who, by the misfortune of war, have been driven into exile and destitution. We

Asiatics have been always more numerous in Uganda than Europeans. There were 2,216 in the Protectorate at the 1911 census,[1] 5,604 at the 1921 census, and 15,266 at the 1931 census. For 31 December 1938 the number has been given as 19,141[2] and for 31 December 1944 as 27,573.

TABLE 1. *Non-Native Population, Uganda, 1911–44*[1]

Date	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Total*	*Date*	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Total*
2 Apr. 1911	640	2,216	2,856	31 Dec. 1928	1,978	11,846	13,824
31 Mar. 1913	823	3,110	3,933	31 Dec. 1929	1,995	12,539	14,534
31 Mar. 1914	1,017	3,651	4,668	31 Dec. 1930	1,973	14,002	15,975
31 Mar. 1915	903	3,560	4,463	28 May 1931	2,001	15,266	17,267
31 Mar. 1916	963	3,455	4,418	31 Dec. 1932	1,811	14,061	15,872
31 Mar. 1917	809	3,548	4,357	31 Dec. 1933	1,854	14,204	16,058
31 Mar. 1918	570	3,467	4,037	31 Dec. 1934	1,959	15,086	17,045
31 Mar. 1919	847	3,516	4,363	31 Dec. 1935	1,994	14,860	16,854
31 Mar. 1920	948	4,528	5,476	31 Dec. 1936	2,099	15,803	17,902
Apr. 1921	1,269	5,604	6,873	31 Dec. 1937	2,111	17,256	19,367
31 Dec. 1921	1,280	5,464	6,744	31 Dec. 1938	2,282	19,141	21,423
31 Dec. 1922	1,261	5,529	6,790	31 Dec. 1939	2,206	18,725	20,931
31 Dec. 1923	1,289	6,521	7,810	31 Dec. 1940	2,118	18,409	20,527
31 Dec. 1924	1,451	7,229	8,680	31 Dec. 1941	2,186	18,381	20,567
31 Dec. 1925	1,703	9,176	10,879	31 Dec. 1942	2,647	26,972	29,619
31 Dec. 1926	1,752	11,613	13,365	31 Dec. 1943	2,747	26,537	29,284
31 Dec. 1927	1,867	11,502	13,369	31 Dec. 1944	2,553	27,573	30,126

[1] See *Census Returns 1911*, p. 3, *1921*, p. 7, *1931*, p. 1; *Colonial Office List 1914*, p. 397, *1915*, p. 401, *1916*, p. 405, *1917*, p. 406, *1918*, p. 407; *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1917–18*, p. 6, *1918–19*, p. 4, *1919–20*, p. 4, *1921*, p. 5 to *1927*, p. 5; Uganda Protectorate, *Blue Book 1928*, p. 85, *1929*, p. 91, *1930*, p. 103, *1932*, p. 109, *1933*, p. 119, *1934*, p. 127, *1935*, p. 130, *1936*, p. 123, *1937*, p. 124, *1938*, p. 122, *1939*, p. 16, *1940*, p. 16, *1941*, p. 14 to *1944*, p. 14.

The number of non-natives has been all the time less than 1 per cent. of the total population.

have undertaken to receive 7,000 of these unfortunates' (*22nd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 6). Further details are given in *Medical Report 1942*, pp. 1–2; *1943*, p. 2; *1944*, p. 3:

1942. 'We have had to accommodate in the Protectorate several thousand Italian prisoners of war, something over a thousand Italian internees from Ethiopia and other internees from the Middle East, and so far five thousand Polish refugees. . . .

'The greater number of these people [Poles] are women and children, the men accompanying them are largely of advanced age or physically unfit.'

1943. 'The number of internees and refugees accommodated in the Protectorate has been increased by new arrivals until in December, 1943, there was a total of 1,407 internees and 5,773 refugees.'

1944. 'The refugee population increased to 6,114 with additions and transfers from neighbouring territories. The refugees, principally Polish women and children, are accommodated at Koja in Buganda and Nyabeya in Bunyoro. Their numbers were 2,574 and 3,540 respectively at each place.

'Internees, of whom the bulk is Italian, are similarly accommodated in camps at Entebbe, where the total was 956, and at Bombo 114. There are some women and children in the latter camp. A few internees were repatriated during the course of the year.'

It should be noted that, according to the Blue Books, the figures for 1941–4 in Table 1 exclude 'Refugees, Internees and Prisoners of War'.

[1] According to *Handbook of British East Africa 1893*, p. 53, there were at that time 200 coast Arabs in Uganda proper. *Colonial Office List* put the number of Asiatics in the whole Protectorate for 1903–5 at 500, for 1906–8 at 3,000, and for 1909 and 1910 at 3,057 (see *List 1904*, p. 364; *1905*, p. 372; *1906*, p. 364; *1907*, p. 370; *1908*, p. 384; *1909*, p. 383; *1910*, p. 396; *1911*, p. 377).

[2] The estimates in the *Colonial Reports* for 31 Dec. 1932–8 (14,302, 14,204, 14,086, 14,860, 15,000, 18,800, 17,256) differ again in part very much from those in the Blue Books. The figures in the Colonial Reports inspire little confidence. It is most unlikely that the number of Asiatics should have increased in 1937 from 15,000 to 18,800 and should have decreased in 1938 to 17,256.

3. *Population Density*

The area of Uganda is now usually given as 93,981 square miles including 13,680 square miles of water.[1] But in 1931 it was assumed to be 94,204 square miles including 13,616 square miles of (open) water, and, as the district boundaries have been changed since, I am using here the 1931 figures.

TABLE 2. *Population Density, Uganda, 1931*[1]

Districts	*Land and swamp sq. m.*	*Open water sq. m.*	*Natives*	*Non-natives*	*Total*	*Population per sq. m.*
Mengo	5,781	3,595	356,781	5,885	362,666	62·7
Entebbe	1,980	466	185,219	1,292	186,511	94·2
Masaka	4,173	3,998	175,404	1,002	176,406	42·3
Mubende	5,447	191	155,342	515	155,857	28·6
Buganda Province Total	17,381	8,250	872,746	8,694	881,440	50·7
Busoga	3,771	3,165	378,394	2,768	381,162	101·1
Budama	1,004	11	147,917	543	148,460	147·9
Bugishu	1,641	—	178,037	218	178,255	108·6
Bugwere	1,208	—	175,517	1,277	176,794	146·4
Teso	3,884	168	270,211	1,220	271,431	69·9
Lango	5,096	383	216,627	727	217,354	42·7
Karamoja	10,755	—	65,578	12	65,590	6·1
Eastern Province Total	27,359	3,727	1,432,281	6,765	1,439,046	52·6
Toro	5,200	237	193,714	310	194,024	37·3
Ankole	6,215	148	279,354	446	279,800	45·0
Kigezi	1,974	71	226,080	134	226,214	114·6
Western Province Total	13,389	456	699,148	890	700,038	52·3
Bunyoro	4,735	986	114,220	480	114,700	24·2
Gulu	6,739	142	96,553	186	96,739	14·4
Chua	6,777	—	78,974	108	79,082	11·7
West Nile	4,208	55	242,345	144	242,489	57·6
Northern Province Total	22,459	1,183	532,092	918	533,010	23·7
Total	80,588	13,616	3,536,267	17,267	3,553,534	44·1

[1] See Uganda Protectorate, *Blue Book 1931*, p. 103.

It appears that there were in 1931 on an average 44·1 persons to the square mile. The density varied between 6·1 in the Karamoja District and 147·9 in the Budama District. In a Dispatch of 30 September 1930 to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, the Acting Governor stated:

> Uganda could support a population of ten millions instead of three and a third, and the resources of this Government would be increased accordingly.[2]

[1] See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1938*, p. 3. But see also in this connexion *Joint Report of Finance Committee and Development and Welfare Committee on Post-War Development* (2nd ed., 1945), p. 59: 'The Uganda Protectorate covers approximately 80,000 square miles, excluding water. Of this area some 57,000 square miles have been topographically surveyed since 1900, but no planned revision of any of this has been made.'

[2] *Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, p. 39. See also Uganda Protectorate, Agricultural Survey Committee, *Report of the Nutrition Sub-Committee*, p. 16.

According to the 1921 count, Lira was the largest town with 24,718 people; the capital Entebbe had 5,669 inhabitants.[1] The 1931 *Census Returns* do not show the population of towns. Kampala Township, in 1931, had 5,628 inhabitants (including Makerere and Mulago).[2]

III. Composition of the Native Population

Country of Origin. According to the 1931 count, 3,516,135 natives belonged to 'Races or Tribes Indigenous to Uganda' and only 20,132 to 'Races or Tribes not Indigenous to Uganda'. But numerous immigrants from neighbouring territories may be members of tribes which are *also* indigenous to Uganda.[3]

Sex. During the first decade of this century it was apparently believed that the females exceeded the males by one-third or one-half.[4] The count of 1911 showed a ratio of 121·2 females to 100 males. By 1921 the ratio had decreased to 116·8, and by 1931 to 108·1. There is no doubt that the proportion of females had been over-estimated in the earlier years, but it is possible that owing to immigration the excess of females decreased between 1911 and 1931. However, a comparison of the 1921 and 1931 figures for the various Provinces arouses grave doubts as to the accuracy of the returns.

In the Buganda Province the ratio of females to 100 males dropped from 108·0 to 95·6. The number of males rose by 74,000 while the number of females increased by only 24,000. In the Mengo District the number of

[1] See *Census Returns 1921*, p. 7.

[2] See *Report of the Kampala Township Authority for 1938*, p. 5. The Report adds: 'No accurate figures are available for the present population, but the average increase is about 25 per cent.'

[3] In fact the 76,741 Banyaruanda were listed among the 'Races or Tribes Indigenous to Uganda'. See *Census Returns 1931*, p. 57.

[4] *Statistical Tables, British Colonies*, gave the following figures for the Districts under administration:

	1902	*1903*	*1905*	*1906*	*1907*	*1909*	*1910*
Males . .	732,854	664,854	957,100	1,131,799	1,120,574	1,110,724	1,005,716
Females .	1,075,018	980,018	1,324,700	1,500,725	1,543,067	1,546,386	1,393,991

Wilson and Felkin, in the 1880s, even stated that in Uganda proper the ratio of females to males was 3½ to 1, and attributed this preponderance of females to (1) an excess of female over male births, (2) the killing of men in war, (3) a constant influx of women into the country as prisoners of war; see Wilson and Felkin, vol. i, pp. 150–1, Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 744. It is possible, of course, that there was a considerable excess of females, but it certainly cannot have been as great as that. Even assuming that no Baganda women had been carried away as prisoners of war and that all Baganda warriors had been killed when Wilson and Felkin made their estimate, it is inconceivable that there should have been so few male children, slaves (who cannot become warriors), and old men as to produce a ratio of 3½ females to 1 male. But Wilson says (vol. i, p. 151) that out of 1,400,000 males 'probably from 500,000 to 600,000' were soldiers (Felkin says, p. 735, 'probably about 600,000'). If this was the case the proportion of males capable of bearing arms would have been very large and the war casualties in the preceding decade must have been very few. (Incidentally, if out of 5,000,000 natives 1,400,000 were males, the ratio of females to males would have been 2½ to 1.) That many administration officers, even after the cessation of inter-tribal wars, assumed an incredibly great excess of females in parts of the Uganda Protectorate can be inferred from the fact that for various districts the number of females was returned in 1904–6 as three times as large as the number of males. (For the Nimule District, 1905, the number of females was even given as 75,000 against 20,000 males.) See *Statistical Tables, Colonies 1903*, p. 830; *1904*, p. 451; *1905*, p. 416.

males increased from 161,000 to 187,000 while the number of females decreased from 171,000 to 170,000. It is difficult to believe that these figures represent the true conditions.[1]

TABLE 3. *Native Population by Sex, Uganda, 1911–31*[1]

1911[2]		1921[3]		1931					
				Indigenous races or tribes		Not indigenous races or tribes		Total	
Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1,113,047	1,349,422	1,313,413	1,534,322	1,686,206	1,829,929	12,904	7,228	1,699,110	1,837,157

[1] See *Census Returns 1911*, p. 3; *1921*, p. 7; *1931*, pp. 1, 74–5.
[2] Excluding 378,000 persons in unadministered Districts.
[3] Excluding 217,000 persons in unadministered Districts.

In the Eastern Province, excluding Karamoja, the ratio of females to 100 males dropped from 123·7 to 109·0. The number of males rose by 170,000 and the number of females by only 115,000. As the boundaries of the Districts changed considerably between 1921 and 1931, it is not possible to go into any local details.

In the Western Province the ratio of females to 100 males declined from 123·2 to 117·5. The numbers of males and females increased by 64,000 and 61,000 respectively. The figures do not seem to call for any comment. But an examination of two of the three Districts again arouses suspicion. In the Ankole District the number of males rose only from 117,587 to 124,700, but the number of females from 133,569 to 154,654. In the Kigezi District, on the other hand, the number of males rose from 83,863 to 103,896, while the number of females declined from 122,237 to 122,184.[2]

TABLE 4. *Native Population by Sex in Provinces, Uganda, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Province	Males 1921	Females 1921	Males 1931	Females 1931	Increase 1921–31		Females to 100 males	
					Males	Females	1921	1931
Buganda	372,525	402,228	446,190	426,556	73,665	24,328	108·0	95·6
Eastern excl. Karamoja	483,613	598,224	653,903	712,800	170,290	114,576	123·7	109·0
Karamoja District	..	..	31,734	33,844	31,734	33,844	..	106·6
Western	257,500	317,143	321,476	377,672	63,976	60,529	123·2	117·5
Northern	199,775	216,727	245,807	286,285	46,032	69,558	108·5	116·5
Total	1,313,413	1,534,322	1,699,110	1,837,157	385,697	302,835	116·8	108·1

[1] See *Census Returns 1921*, pp. 13–14, 20, 27, 31; *1931*, p. 1. The figures for 1921 exclude Rudolf Province transferred in 1926 to Kenya, and also the Karamoja District.

The Northern Province was the only one in which the excess of females increased. There were 108·5 females to 100 males in 1921 and 116·5 in 1931. Here the number of males increased by 46,000 and the number of

[1] In the Mengo District the number of males not belonging to the Baganda tribe increased from 25,376 to 44,296 while the number of females decreased from 21,786 to 12,218 (see *Census Returns 1921*, p. 14; *1931*, pp. 79–80). These figures exclude for 1931 the natives living on non-native premises; if they had been included the increase for the male non-Baganda would appear larger still.
[2] See ibid. *1921*, pp. 30–1; *1931*, p. 1.

females by 70,000. In the West Nile District the number of males rose from 77,960 to 107,546, and the number of females jumped from 84,839 to 134,799.[1] Natural increase, of course, cannot have been the cause of such a change in the sex ratio, and it is most unlikely that it could have been effected by migratory movements.

Age. The counts indicate a considerable increase in the proportion of children. The percentage rose in the administered Districts from 38·0 in 1911 to 41·5 in 1921. Assuming the age distribution to have been the same in the unadministered Districts as in the administered Districts the total number of children would have increased from 1,080,000 to 1,271,000, the total number of adults would have increased from 1,760,000 to 1,794,000, and the increase in the number of adults would have practically been confined to the male sex. I cannot conceive any cause which could possibly have had this effect, and do not think that the apparent increase in the proportion of children was genuine. The comparison of the proportion of children in 1921 and 1931 must be confined to males, because girls between 15 and 18 were allocated in 1931 to children while in 1921 they had been considered adult. The proportion of boys (under 18) which

TABLE 5. *Native Population by Age and Sex, Uganda, 1911 and 1921*[1]

Children					
Males under 18		*Females under 15*		*Total*	
1911	*1921*	*1911*	*1921*	*1911*	*1921*
459,084	585,161	477,795	595,771	936,879	1,180,932

Adults					
Males over 18		*Females over 15*		*Total*	
1911	*1921*	*1911*	*1921*	*1911*	*1921*
654,963	728,252	871,627	938,551	1,526,590	1,666,803

[1] See *Census Returns 1911*, p. 14; *1921*, p. 13. Persons in unadministered Districts (378,000 in 1911, 217,000 in 1921) are excluded.

had increased from 41·2 per cent. in 1911 to 44·6 per cent. in 1921 rose further to 47·5 per cent. in 1931. In the Western Province the percentage rose between 1921 and 1931 from 48·5 to 54·8.[2] While the number of men increased here from 133,000 to 145,000, the number of boys increased from 125,000 to 176,000! It is doubtful, however, whether any conclusions at all may be drawn from the changes in the age composition ascertained at the various counts. In 1911 and 1921 the number of females under 15 exceeded the number of males under 18 by 4·1 and 1·8 per cent. respectively; in 1931 the number of females under 18 was 5·1 per cent. smaller than the number of males under 18.

[1] See ibid. *1921*, p. 36; *1931*, p. 1.

[2] It rose in the Toro District from 39·3 to 51·5, in the Ankole District from 47·0 to 52·4, and in the Kigezi District from 56·8 to 60·6 (see ibid. *1921*, pp. 28, 30–1; *1931*, pp. 96–100).

The preponderance of males among the non-adults at the 1931 enumeration may be due to the inclination to count married women as adults even if they are under 18. Some other ratios for the Protectorate as a whole—120 women to 100 men; 145 children (under 18) to 100 women—may also seem acceptable. But there are some differences between the results for the various Provinces which are very puzzling. It is hard to believe, for example, that the number of men should be only about half as large in the Western Province as in Buganda Province if the number of boys were actually about the same in both Provinces.[1]

Conjugal condition. Among the males over 18 years for whom the conjugal condition was ascertained in 1911, 16·5 per cent. were bachelors, 79·9 per cent. husbands, and 3·6 per cent. widowers. The corresponding percentages for 1921 were 19·7, 77·3, and 3·0 respectively. Among the females over 15 years for whom the conjugal condition was ascertained in 1911, 11·3 per cent. were spinsters, 83·7 wives, and 5·0 widows. The corresponding percentages in 1921 were 11·1, 82·8, and 6·1 respectively. It appears that for both sexes the proportion of single adults was small, and that the excess of wives over husbands—173,000 or 37 per cent. in 1911, 213,000 or 39 per cent. in 1921—was large.[2]

TABLE 6. *Native Population by Sex and Age in Provinces, Uganda, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Province	*Males 1921*		*Females 1921*		*Males 1931*		*Females 1931*	
	Under 18	*Over 18*	*Under 15*	*Over 15*	*Under 18*	*Over 18*	*Under 18*	*Over 18*
Buganda . .	150,090	222,435	137,682	264,546	173,804	267,799	163,047	262,340
Eastern excl. Karamoja .	217,029	266,584	231,036	367,188	315,820	335,541	288,531	423,687
Karamoja District	..	..	..	..	17,478	14,207	17,547	16,291
Western . .	124,957	132,543	136,074	181,089	175,573	144,757	170,803	206,390
Northern . .	93,085	106,690	90,979	125,748	119,693	125,498	121,526	164,682
Total . .	585,161	728,252	595,771	938,551	802,368	887,802	761,454	1,073,390

[1] See *Census Returns 1921*, pp. 13–14, 20, 27, 31; *1931*, pp. 79–108. The figures for 1921 exclude Rudolf Province transferred in 1926 to Kenya, and also the Karamoja District (31,734 males, 33,844 females in 1931); the figures for 1931 exclude 11,253 natives living on non-native premises (8,940 males, 2,313 females).

In 1931 the heads of information under which the enumeration of natives was made distinguished only single and married. It is impossible to tell to which group widowed persons were allocated, and as the sum of the single and married is equal to the total population, it is impossible to tell how

[1] It might be suggested that many men in the Western Province were counted as boys, and this would also explain why the ratio of women to 100 men was 143 in the Western Province as against 98 in Buganda Province, and the ratio of children to 100 women 168 in the Western Province as against 128 in Buganda Province (in spite of the apparent lack of men in the Western Province). The temptation to accept this suggestion is the greater in view of the colossal increase, from 1921 to 1931, in the number of males reported as boys. But the number of females reported as girls is nearly as large as the number of males counted as boys, and this fact makes it unlikely that the number of boys was grossly overstated.

[2] Not too much attention should be paid to changes between 1911 and 1921 because in 1911 the conjugal condition was not stated for 11 per cent. of the men and for 12 per cent. of the women.

TABLE 7. *Adult Native Population by Sex and Conjugal Condition, Uganda, 1911 and 1921*[1]

Year	*Males over 18 years*					*Females over 15 years*				
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Not stated*	*Total*
1911	96,276	467,688	21,193	69,806	654,963	86,747	640,210	38,314	106,356	871,627
1921	139,485	547,934	21,136	19,697	728,252	102,185	761,250	55,840	19,276	938,551

[1] See *Census Returns 1911*, p. 58; *1921*, p. 37. Persons in unadministered Districts are excluded.

TABLE 8. *Native Population by Sex and Conjugal Condition, Uganda, 1931*[1]

Conjugal condition	*Males*					*Females*				
	Buganda Province	*Eastern Province*	*Western Province*	*Northern Province*	*Total*	*Buganda Province*	*Eastern Province*	*Western Province*	*Northern Province*	*Total*
Single . .	264,307	375,268	190,511	143,738	973,824	230,655	333,387	187,983	148,054	900,079
Married . .	177,296	307,778	129,819	101,453	716,346	194,732	412,669	189,210	138,154	934,765

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 58–63. Natives living on non-native premises are excluded.

those for whom the conjugal condition was not stated were dealt with.[1] Of the males over 18 years 19·3 per cent. were 'single' and 80·7 per cent. 'married'. But the proportions vary enormously for the different Provinces. The percentage of single men was 33·8 in Buganda Province, 19·2 in the Northern Province, 12·0 in the Eastern Province, and 10·3 in the Western Province. The figures for women are difficult to interpret. Of the total female population 761,454 were reported as under 18 years and 900,079 as single. Even assuming that all persons under 18 years were spinsters, the single females over 18 years would have constituted not less than 12·9 per cent. of the female population over 18.[2] But it is possible that the 'single' females include the widows. The excess of wives over husbands was 218,000 or 30 per cent., i.e. proportionately very much less than in 1921. The excess was 9·8 per cent. in Buganda Province, 34·1 per cent. in the Eastern Province, 36·2 per cent. in the Northern Province, and 45·7 per cent. in the Western Province. The differences are evidently due in a high degree to differences in the frequency of polygamy. It seems, however, that, as in many other African colonies, the administration still to-day, on the whole, overestimates the prevalence of polygamy.[3]

The African in Uganda is polygamous, and although the Christian missions have during at least half a century made many converts to Christianity they have not had much influence in introducing monogamy except amongst a few, for many Africans who take their first wives according to Christian rites take others according to native custom or as concubines. What evidence is available goes to show that the first wife does not raise any objections to the taking of further wives and in rural areas fosters such takings as it adds to the importance of their husbands and themselves and gives them assistance in the cultivation of food and cash crops and in the performance of domestic duties.[4]

[1] Adequate information concerning conjugal condition was given in 1931 only for the 11,253 natives residing on non-native premises (see *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 76–7):

Males						*Females*					
Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
6,430	2,365	51	12	82	8,940	1,436	761	105	2	9	2,313

[2] In Buganda Province the percentage would have been 25·8.

[3] Opinions concerning the frequency of polygamy in early times vary considerably. As regards Buganda, Felkin stated that 'a large number of the poorer men are unable to marry' ('Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 744), and Roscoe related that 'peasants found it difficult to obtain even their one wife' (*Twenty-Five Years in East Africa*, p. 94), but Lugard said that 'even a peasant has 3 or 4' (*Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 30). As regards Unyoro, Felkin stated that 'polygamy is universal, even the poorest men having two or three wives' (Wilson and Felkin, vol. ii, p. 48), while Roscoe said that 'comparatively few men had more than one wife' ('Notes', p. 104). I have, of course, not the slightest idea who was right and who was wrong, but I find it difficult to believe that the Baganda constantly raided Unyoro for wives, thereby obtaining a large excess of women, and that at the same time even the poorest men in Unyoro managed to have two or three. (Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 642, says, it is true, that, apart from the raids, it was the custom of the Baganda 'to obtain large numbers of women by the slave trade', but I found nowhere else any reference to a purchase of female slaves by the Baganda.)

If the 1911 returns can be trusted polygamy had by that time become quite an exception among the Baganda since there were 128,687 husbands and 148,562 wives, while it was comparatively frequent among the Banyoro with 60,662 husbands and 84,710 wives (see *Census Returns 1911*, p. 58).

[4] *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services* (1944), p. 81.

IV. Composition of the Non-Native Population

Race. The non-native population enumerated at the censuses of 1921 and 1931 was as follows:[1]

Year	*Europeans*	*Goans*	*Indians*	*Arabs*	*Unclassified*	*Total*
1921	1,269	474	5,130[1]		—	6,873
1931	2,001	1,124	13,026	515	601	17,267

[1] 2,693 Mohammedans, 2,210 Hindus, 129 Sikhs, and 98 other Asiatics (excluding Goans).

The Indians constituted in 1931 three-quarters of the non-native population.

Birthplace. Of the 2,001 Europeans enumerated in 1931, only 131 were born in Uganda, 93 in the Union of South Africa, 79 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 11 elsewhere in Africa, 1,167 in British possessions in Europe, 330 elsewhere in Europe, 82 in British possessions in Asia, 12 elsewhere in Asia, 45 in British possessions in America, 26 elsewhere in America, 20 in British Oceania.

Of the 13,026 Indians 3,136 were born in Uganda, 476 in Kenya, 155 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 15 elsewhere in Africa, 9,161 in India, 6 in other British possessions in Asia, 25 elsewhere in Asia. The proportion of Indians not born in British territory is negligible.

Of the 1,124 Goans 241 were born in Uganda, 20 in other British Dependencies in East Africa, 2 in Portuguese East Africa, 48 in British possessions in Asia, 808 in Goa.

Table 9. *European Population by Country of Birth, Uganda, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Country of birth	*1921*	*1931*		
	Total	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Uganda	62	68	63	131
Kenya	10	23	17	40
Mauritius	5	8	11	19
Northern Rhodesia	—	1	—	1
Nyasaland	—	1	—	1
Seychelles	4	5	3	8
Southern Rhodesia	—	2	3	5
Tanganyika	—	3	1	4
Union of South Africa	53	56	37	93
Zanzibar	—	1	—	1
Abyssinia	—	1	—	1
Belgian Congo	—	2	—	2
Egypt	4	3	—	3
Madagascar	2	—	3	3
Other Foreign Possessions in Africa	4[2]	—	2	2
Africa Total	144	174	140	314

[1] See *Census Returns 1921*, p. 10; *1931*, pp. 35–6. [2] Reunion.

[1] See *Census Returns 1921*, pp. 7, 11; *1931*, p. 2.

Country of birth	1921	1931		
	Total	Males	Females	Total
England	596			
Wales	15	683	417	1,100
Scotland	101			
Northern Ireland	66			
Irish Free State		35	26	61
Gibraltar	5	4	2	6
Malta	3			
Austria	2	10	1	11
Belgium	9	4	3	7
Czechoslovakia	—	3	1	4
Denmark	1	5	4	9
France	94	72	15	87
Germany	9	15	6	21
Greece	6	4	—	4
Holland	48	50	34	84
Italy	50	44	30	74
Lithuania	—	3	1	4
Luxemburg	1	—	—	—
Norway	—	3	1	4
Rumania	1	—	—	—
Russia	2	3	—	3
Spain	—	—	6	6
Sweden	—	3	2	5
Switzerland	3	4	3	7
Turkey	1	—	—	—
Europe Total	1,013	945	552	1,497
Ceylon	2	5	2	7
India	26	42	22	64
Other British Dependencies in Asia	2[1]	8	3	11
Arabia	—	1	—	1
Armenia	1	—	—	—
China	3	5	—	5
Goa	—	1	1	2
Iraq	1	1	—	1
Japan	1	2	—	2
Persia	—	1	—	1
Asia Total	36	66	28	94
Canada	24	25	12	37
West Indies	6[2]	5	2	7
Other British Dependencies in America	—	—	1	1
Argentine	1	—	1	1
Brazil	—	—	3	3
Chile	2	—	—	—
Mexico	—	—	1	1
United States of America	24	10	8	18
Elsewhere in America	—	2	1	3
America Total	57	42	29	71
Australia	13	5	4	9
New Zealand	6	7	3	10
Other Australian Colonies	—	1	—	1
Oceania Total	19	13	7	20
Not stated	—	3	2	5
Grand Total	1,269	1,243	758	2,001

[1] 1 Cyprus, 1 Straits Settlements.

[2] 1 Antigua, 2 Jamaica, 3 Trinidad.

TABLE 10. *Non-European Non-Native Population by Country of Birth, Uganda, 1931*[1]

Country of birth	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Unclassified*
Uganda	3,136	241	126	482
Kenya	476	18	40	35
Tanganyika	83	1	5	3
Union of South Africa	5	—	—	—
Zanzibar	66	1	6	—
Other British Dependencies in Africa	1	—	—	29[2]
Abyssinia	—	—	—	1
Belgian Congo	9	—	—	2
Egypt	—	—	1	—
Italian Somaliland	3	—	8	—
Madagascar	2	—	3	—
Portuguese East Africa	1	2	—	—
Africa Total	3,782	263	189	553
Aden	4	2	63	1
Ceylon	2	—	—	12
India	9,161	46	10	6
Arabia	—	—	253	2
Goa	2	808	—	—
Persia	23	—	—	13
Other Foreign Countries in Asia	—	—	—	11[3]
Asia Total	9,192	856	326	45
America Total	—	—	—	2[4]
Not stated	52	5	—	1
Grand Total	13,026	1,124	515	601

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 37–8.
[2] 3 Mauritius, 26 Seychelles.
[3] 2 China, 1 Iraq, 8 Japan.
[4] 1 Brit. West Indies, 1 Other Brit. Colonies in America.

Of the 515 Arabs 126 were born in Uganda, 51 in other British Dependencies in Africa, 12 elsewhere in Africa, 63 in Aden, 10 in India, and 253 in Arabia.

Of the total 17,267 non-natives 4,117 were born in Uganda and 13,150 outside the Protectorate. But only 133 of those born inside the Protectorate were 20 years of age or older.[1]

Years of Residence. As in Kenya, the data concerning years of residence are not conclusive, because 23 per cent. of the non-natives did not state the period of their residence[2] and because the results were not shown separately for those born outside Uganda.

Nationality. Of the 2,001 Europeans 1,625 were returned as British born, 12 as 'South African Dutch', 8 as British naturalized, 92 as French, 76 as Italian, 18 as German, and 170 as of another nationality. Of the 13,026 Indians all but 27 were British born. On the other hand, only 5 of the 1,124 Goans were British born, but 304 of the foreigners were born in

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, p. 20. [2] See ibid., pp. 40–4.

TABLE 11. *Non-Native Population by Race, Sex, and Age, and by Race, Sex, and Conjugal Condition, Uganda, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Europeans		Indians		Goans		Arabs		Unclassified		Total		
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total
0–4	75	66	1,043	1,101	96	85	22	25	119	90	1,355	1,367	2,722
5–9	40	31	610	609	54	53	28	18	88	92	820	803	1,623
10–14	9	12	384	315	6	16	23	10	47	22	469	375	844
15–19	13	14	730	539	14	8	43	9	29	17	829	587	1,416
20–4	86	41	1,444	801	90	56	35	14	9	14	1,664	926	2,590
25–9	199	121	1,303	449	119	50	40	14	5	10	1,666	644	2,310
30–4	189	144	1,062	257	118	31	36	3	13	4	1,418	439	1,857
35–9	182	115	749	137	117	12	46	6	10	2	1,104	272	1,376
40–4	171	82	455	102	89	3	46	1	4	2	765	190	955
45–9	120	47	284	51	56	2	19	1	5	2	484	103	587
50–4	76	40	156	38	20	1	24	6	1	3	277	88	365
55–9	45	21	50	20	16	—	6	1	2	—	119	42	161
60–4	19	4	45	17	5	1	16	—	1	3	86	25	111
65–9	9	4	16	5	—	—	3	1	1	1	29	11	40
70–4	1	2	10	8	—	—	7	—	1	—	19	10	29
75–9	—	3	7	2	—	—	1	—	1	—	9	5	14
80 and over	—	1	8	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	11	2	13
Not stated	9[2]	10[2]	161[3]	57[3]	5[4]	1[4]	2[5]	6[4]	3[6]	—	180	74	254
Total	1,243	758	8,517	4,509	805	319	400	115	339	262	11,304	5,963	17,267
Single	740	369	3,723	2,080	457	163	179	57	301	217	5,400	2,886	8,286
Married	485	369	4,500	2,291	333	155	213	55	37	36	5,568	2,906	8,474
Widowed	15	19	239	136	15	1	4	3	1	8	274	167	441
Divorced	1	1	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	7	2	9
Not stated	2	—	49	2	—	—	4	—	—	—	55	2	57

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 8–17.
[2] 20–49 years 8 M., 9 F.; 50–59 years 1 M., 1 F.
[3] 0–9 years 9 M., 8 F.; 10–19 years 14 M., 6 F.; 20–49 years 138 M., 43 F.
[4] 20–49 years.
[5] 0–9 years 1; 20–49 years 1
[6] 10–19 years.

TABLE 12. *European and Indian Population by Sex, Age, and Conjugal Condition, Uganda, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Males						Females			
	Single	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Not stated	Total	Single	Married	Widowed	Total
EUROPEANS										
0–19	137	—	—	—	—	137	120	3	—	123
20–4	78	8	—	—	—	86	21	19	1	41
25–9	151	48	—	—	—	199	41	79	—	121[2]
30–4	88	100	1	—	—	189	52	92	—	144
35–9	71	108	3	—	—	182	40	74	1	115
40–4	71	96	3	1	—	171	31	45	6	82
45–9	55	62	3	—	—	120	18	29	—	47
50–4	41	34	1	—	—	76	20	16	4	40
55–9	28	15	2	—	—	45	14	5	2	21
60–4	12	5	1	—	1	19	3	—	1	4
65–9	5	3	1	—	—	9	3	—	1	4
70 and over	1	—	—	—	—	1	2	1	3	6
Not stated	2	6	—	—	1	9[3]	4	6	—	10[4]
Total	740	485	15	1	2	1,243	369	369	19	758[5]
INDIANS										
0–19	2,604	176	1	—	9	2,790	2,072	503	1	2,578[6]
20–4	604	811	21	—	8	1,444	3	791	7	801
25–9	267	1,001	32	—	3	1,303	5	438	6	449
30–4	107	917	35	2	1	1,062	—	245	12	257
35–9	53	659	32	—	5	749	—	122	15	137
40–4	28	384	42	1	—	455	—	84	18	102
45–9	14	241	26	2	1	284	—	33	18	51
50–4	9	126	18	1	2	156	—	17	21	38
55–9	—	41	9	—	—	50	—	7	13	20
60–4	1	36	8	—	—	45	—	6	11	17
65–9	3	9	4	—	—	16	—	3	2	5
70 and over	2	13	9	—	1	25	—	1	10	11
Not stated	31	86	2	—	19	138[6]	—	41	2	43[6]
Total	3,723	4,500	239	6	49	8,517	2,080	2,291	136	4,509[6]

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 8–11.
[2] 20–49 years 2 single, 5 married, 1 not stated; 50–59 years 1 married.
[3] Including 2 not stated.
[4] Including 1 divorced.
[5] 20–49 years 4 single, 5 married; 50–59 years 1 married.
[6] 20–49 years.

the British Empire. Of the 515 Arabs only 39 were British born, but 214 of the foreigners were born in the British Empire. Of the total 17,267 non-natives 15,051 were British; of the 2,216 non-British 743 were born inside and 1,473 outside the British Empire (812 in Goa, 252 in Arabia).[1]

Sex. The ratio of females to males has been changing as follows:[2]

	Europeans			*Asiatics*		
Year	*Males*	*Females*	*Females to 100 males*	*Males*	*Females*	*Females to 100 males*
1911	484	156	32·2	1,852	364	19·7
1921	883	386	43·7	4,099	1,505	36·7
1931	1,243	758	61·0	10,061	5,205	51·7

There were in 1931 among the non-native population only 52·8 females to 100 males. The preponderance of males existed in each race, there being 61·0 females to 100 males among the Europeans, 52·9 among the Indians, 39·6 among the Goans, and 28·8 among the Arabs.

Age. In 1931 the proportion of children (under 15) among the European population was only 11·6 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age (15–49) 28·6 per cent., and the proportion of old people (60 and over) only 2·1 per cent. Of the Europeans born in Uganda 91 per cent. were children, of those born outside the Protectorate only 6 per cent.

The proportion of children among the Asiatics was 30·9 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age 17·7 per cent., and the proportion of old people only 1·1 per cent.

TABLE 13. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Uganda, 1930–41*[1]

Date	*20–24 years*		*25–29 years*		*30–34 years*		*35–39 years*		*40–44 years*		*45–49 years*		*50–54 years*		*55– years*		*Age unknown*		*Total*	
1 Jan.	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
1930	15	1	83	1	97	6	92	8	110	10	53	5	28	—	15	1	16	6	509	38
1931	24	—	106	2	103	7	100	10	113	13	58	4	22	—	15	1	38	7	579	44
1932	27	—	91	1	109	5	92	6	93	13	63	6	23	1	21	1	24	7	543	40
1933	12	—	86	—	100	5	82	6	91	12	65	6	25	2	9	1	27	6	497	38
1934	8	—	72	—	100	5	90	5	86	9	83	6	21	1	6	—	7	5	473	31
1935	14	—	53	4	104	8	98	5	87	4	75	9	21	2	6	—	6	9	464	41
1936	18	—	52	8	109	8	98	4	90	4	76	9	28	3	10	—	10	12	491	48
1937	12	—	61	8	90	10	107	7	87	2	82	10	24	3	11	—	26	15	500	55
1938	7	—	63	10	91	11	117	7	81	1	91	6	30	4	12	—	43	16	535	55
1939	12	—	59	4	90	15	117	5	85	3	84	4	45	6	11	—	62	29	565	66
1940	13	2[2]	63	4	69	11	119	6	93	2	76	2	41	5	8	—	1	23	483	55
1941	11	2	57	2	68	9	117	9	89	2	73	2	43	5	9	—	3	20	470	51

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.
[2] Including 1 under 20.

Conjugal condition. Of the male Europeans over 15 years 55·2 per cent. were bachelors, 43·4 per cent. husbands, and 1·4 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans over 15 years 40·1 per cent. were spinsters, 56·8 per cent. wives, and 3·1 per cent. widows or divorced. The proportion of unmarried adults is very high for both sexes.

[1] See *Census Returns 1931*, pp. 35–8.
[2] See ibid. *1911*, p. 3; *1921*, p. 7; *1931*, p. 1.

Of the male Asiatics over 15 years 28·3 per cent. were bachelors, 68·1 per cent. husbands, and 3·6 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Asiatics over 15 years 3·0 per cent. were spinsters, 91·8 per cent. wives, and 5·2 per cent. widows.

The ratio of the number of wives to 100 husbands was 76 among Europeans, 51 among Indians, 47 among Goans, and 26 among Arabs.

V. Native Birth and Death Registration

Voluntary registration of native births and deaths has been provided for the whole Protectorate by the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance of 10 August 1904,[1] but it is doubtful whether any native has ever availed himself of this opportunity offered by the British Administration. However, as regards the kingdom of Buganda, compulsory registration had already been established by the following native law of 13 May 1904:[2]

1. This law may be called the Law for the Registration of Births and Deaths, 1904.
2. When a child is born the nearest or other relative shall within 30 days of the birth take the name of the child to the chief to be written in the book of the people.
3. When any person dies the nearest or other relative shall within three days of the death report the death to the chief to be written in the book of the people.
4. If any person neglects to obey this law he shall be guilty of an offence and be punishable with a fine not exceeding eight annas.

This law is in force still to-day as regards registration of deaths,[3] but as far as it related to the registration of births it was repealed by the following law enacted on 24 April 1923:[4]

(Translation)

Kingdom of Buganda.

A Law.

Enacted by His Highness the Kabaka of Buganda by and with the advice of the Lukiko of the Kingdom of Buganda and with the approval of His Excellency the Governor.

1. This law shall be called the Buganda Births Registration Law, 1923.
2. Every gombolola chief shall keep a register in the form in the Schedule hereto, and shall enter therein every birth of a child born alive within his gombolola area after the commencement of this law, whereof the prescribed particulars are reported to him.
3. In the case of every child born alive after the commencement of this law, it shall be the duty of the parents or the owner of the house in which the child is born, or his musigire, to give the required information to his mutongole chief or his musigire within three days from the birth of the child. The mutongole chief or his musigire will then pass the information through the muluka chief or his musigire to the gombolola chief for entry in the register.
4. Any person who by the provisions of this law is bound to report the birth of a child and fails to do so within the prescribed period, or refuses to state any of the prescribed particulars, or any person who wilfully gives any false information or

[1] See p. 272 below.

[2] Reprinted in *1927 Supplement to the Laws of Uganda*, p. 480.

[3] The maximum fine for neglect to report a death is now Sh. 1.

[4] See General Notice No. 282 of 1923, reprinted ibid., pp. 479–80, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate* (Revised Edition 1935), vol. vi, pp. 1484–5. The law came into force on 31 May 1923.

particulars, for the purpose of registration, shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding Shs. 20 or to imprisonment not exceeding two months. In case of any subsequent offence the said penalties may be doubled.

5. Any mutongole chief or his musigire or muluka chief or his musigire who, having received the required information, fails to pass it on to the chief above him, within seven days of the birth of the child, shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding Shs. 30 or to imprisonment not exceeding three months. In any case of any subsequent offence the said penalties may be doubled.

6. The Law for the Registration of Births and Deaths, 1904, is hereby repealed so far as it relates to the registration of births.

The Birth Register contains the following headings: Number; Date of birth; Place or Village of birth; Name (if any); Sex; Clan; Mother's Name; Nationality of Mother; Date of Registration; Signature of Gombolola Chief.

The provisions for the registration of births are much more elaborate than those for the registration of deaths. The latter do not even prescribe that the name of the deceased be recorded.[1]

As the numbers of live-births, still-births, and deaths have been submitted to the British Administration since 1910[2] not only from Buganda but also from Busago, Bunyoro, Ankole, and Toro it is safe to assume that some kind of compulsory registration was likewise established in these four districts before the first World War. From 1923 on Buganda reported also the number of deceased infants,[3] and in 1926 a form for recording live-births and infant deaths was introduced for the whole Protectorate (with the exception of Karamoja District).[4]

The returns are rendered by the minor chiefs through successive higher chiefs to the officer in charge of the district.[5]

Therefore, from 1926 on, the numbers of live-births and infant deaths have been available for nearly the whole Protectorate while, for some years more, data concerning still-births and total deaths were returned only from five administrative units comprising about one-half of the population. In 1930, however, the reporting of still-births and deaths was also extended to the whole Protectorate (except Karamoja). Probably with this object in view the Native Authority Rules, 1930,[6] provided that 'the compulsory registration of births and deaths' was from now on to be one of the purposes regarding which 'any Chief may from time to time issue orders to be obeyed by the natives residing within the local limits of his jurisdiction'.[7] All vital statistics had from 1930 on to be reported on the same form by each sub-county.

[1] See in this connexion *Medical Report 1926*, p. 14: 'In the kingdom of Buganda the registration of births by names has been made compulsory by native law.'

[2] See Thomas and Scott, *Uganda*, p. 307. [3] See *Medical Report 1923*, p. 6.

[4] See ibid. *1922*, p. 29. An attempt made in 1919 to extend the area of registration had failed (see ibid. *1919*, p. 9, *1921*, p. 9; *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1919–20*, p. 6).

[5] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 14.

[6] See Legal Notice No. 116 of 1930 (18 July), *Ordinances 1930 and Subsidiary Legislation*, Part 2, p. 129.

[7] See the Native Authority Ordinance of 28 June 1919 (No. 17 of 1919), reprinted in Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances, &c., 1919*, pp. 29–35, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1923*, vol. i, pp. 585–9 (cap. 60).

A new form of return for Vital Statistics was introduced this year and distributed throughout the Protectorate with the exception of the Karamoja district. A facsimile of this return is printed at page 18[1] in English only, the original form being printed in English, Luganda and Kiswahili. Registers are maintained at the headquarters of each Gombolola (sub-county) chief, who number 622. Arrangements are being made for the introduction of a common form of register. The Gombolola chiefs submit their returns to a Saza (County) chief of whom there are 106, and they after scrutiny forward the returns to Medical Headquarter office through the 17 District Commissioners and four Provincial Commissioners. The uncorrected totals for the whole Protectorate are set out in Table C by quarters and by Districts and Provinces.

The new return provides for a new 'rate' which has not been provided hitherto, this is the maternal mortality rate per 1,000 births and still-births. . . .[2]

UGANDA PROTECTORATE

ORIGINAL
DUPLICATE
TRIPLICATE

QUARTERLY RETURN OF VITAL STATISTICS

Province ..... District .....

County ..... Gombolola .....

FOR THE QUARTER ENDING .....19..(1)

....

Saza Chief *Gombolola Chief*

	Births				*Deaths*					
	(1) *Live Births*			(2)	(3) *Of children who die before they are twelve months old*			(4)	(5)	(6)
Month	*Male*	*Female*	*Total*	*Still Births*	*Male*	*Female*	*Total*	*Of women who die in child-birth*	*All other Deaths*	*Total Deaths*
1.										
2.										
3.										
Totals for Quarter										

TO THE PROVINCIAL COMMISSIONER TO THE HON. D.M.S.S.

Forwarded on ..... Forwarded on.....

....

District Commissioner *Provincial Commissioner*

NOTES:—

(1) PERIOD—This return will be rendered for the quarters ending March 31st, June 30th, September 30th and December 31st by Gombolola Chiefs to the Saza Chiefs. The Saza Chief will forward the complete returns of all Gombololas of his Saza to the District Commissioner. The D.C. will forward the returns of the whole of his district to the D.M.S.S. through the Provincial Commissioner not later than one month after the end of the quarter.

(2) STILL BIRTHS—Abortions and miscarriages should not be included.

(3) DEATHS OF CHILDREN—It is most important only to count the deaths of children who have not reached more than twelve months of age.

[1] See below. [2] *Medical Report 1930*, pp. 15–16.

(4) Deaths of Women in Child-birth—Only women who die within one month of child-birth and as a direct result of child-birth should be included.

(5) Other Deaths—This should include all adults except women included in note (4) and all children who die after they have attained the age of 12 months.

(6) Total Deaths—The total of (3), (4) and (5).

The Administrative Instructions published in 1940 stipulated:

46 (1) Quarterly returns of vital statistics of Africans, from all districts except Karamoja, must be rendered to the Director of Medical Services regularly and promptly within a month of the termination of the quarter to which they apply. The importance of these returns, which must be submitted separately in respect of each Gombolola, should be carefully impressed on Chiefs.

(2) Saza Chiefs should peruse all returns received from their Gombolola Chiefs, and query any figures which they have reason to believe are inaccurate, before submitting them, in duplicate, to the District Commissioner concerned.

District Commissioners will deal with the returns in the same way, and forward them to the Director of Medical Services through the Provincial Commissioner, retaining for reference a copy of each.[1]

The position regarding registration of native births and deaths in Uganda is unique. In the first decade of this century Native Laws have made registration compulsory in Buganda and probably also in other districts. In 1930 every Chief was authorized by the Administration to issue orders concerning compulsory registration to be obeyed by the natives within his jurisdiction, and every Saza Chief has to forward quarterly returns of vital statistics to the District Commissioner. Yet, from the standpoint of the Administration, registration is nowhere compulsory.

No legislation was enacted to make registration of births and deaths compulsory, as it was considered that it would be too difficult to enforce, and reliance was placed on existing tribal organization to render registration effective.[2]

For many years the returns of births and deaths furnished by the Native Authorities were not considered reliable.

Returns of births and deaths are rendered by certain of the Native Governments, but these are not sufficiently reliable to be used for statistical purposes.[3]

From 1917 on, the total figures of births and deaths in the five administrative units which supplied returns were accepted by the Administrative Officers as fairly accurate,[4] but no reason was given for this change of opinion, and new doubts arose in 1923. Infant deaths were reported in that year for the first time from Buganda, and although the infant mortality rate was high (227 per 1,000 live-births), and although the number of births

[1] Uganda Protectorate, *Administrative Instructions*, p. 23.

[2] Thomas and Scott, p. 307.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1911–12*, p. 13. See also, ibid. *1912–13*, p. 17; *Statistical Tables, Colonial Possessions 1908*, p. 375, *1909*, p. 382, *1910*, p. 377, *1911*, p. 391, *1912*, p. 383; *Medical Report 1912*, p. 18, *1913*, p. 20; Cook, *Uganda Memories*, p. 244. Only *Colonial Report 1907–8*, p. 3, expressed a different opinion, at least as regards Buganda: 'The Native Government of Buganda takes considerable pains to register births and deaths, and the returns that are supplied monthly by each county chief are considered to be fairly reliable'.

[4] See *Medical Report 1917*, p. 9, *1918*, p. 9, *1919*, p. 9, *1920*, p. 8; *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1920*, p. 7.

reported was higher than in any previous year, the Principal Medical Officer stated:

> These returns cannot be considered reliable. I believe that both the birth rate and the infantile mortality returns are considerably understated, particularly the latter. The significance of this first return is negligible, but in the future information given should be invaluable.[1]

In the second half of the 1920s, when the collection of vital statistics was extended over the whole Protectorate, there was a feeling of uncertainty as to the accuracy of the results obtained which, though not confined to, was particularly strong as regards the districts which had not yet reported,[2] and the first returns furnished on the new forms introduced in 1930 were received with a good deal of scepticism.

> One of the results of the introduction of the new method of recording Vital Statistics is that the rates for this year are not altogether in accordance with the trend of increase or decrease reported in previous years . . . . Many of the rates shewn are not so good as those given for last year, but it is hoped that this situation will be found to be wholly attributable to the novelty and strangeness to the chiefs of the new return and that as the new methods of compilation become more familiar to them, so the figures submitted will become more accurate. It is clearly recognised that the returns are not and will not be accurate for many years to come. The accuracy could be greatly improved by regular scrutiny, gombolola by gombolola, of the quarterly forms in which fallacious returns are often readily noticeable, but it is beyond the capacity of this department at present to undertake this scrutiny. It is felt that by accustoming the chiefs to render returns of Vital Statistics, the task of presenting accurate returns will be made easier at the time at which it becomes possible to undertake regular scrutiny and check.
>
> Birth and Death Rates. . . . The death rate of 13·42 recorded for Kigezi district is incredibly low. This district is an out-lying one and its native population is still very primitive.
>
> The West Nile district records a death rate of 10·79. The natives of this district are also very primitive and the return is obviously inaccurate.
>
> Still-birth Rates. . . . The rate for Buganda Province and the rates for Budama and Teso districts are extremely low and probably incorrect. In the Toro and Ankole districts in the Western Province, in which the still-birth rates in the past have always been in the region of 20%, the rates are recorded as 3·58 and 4·36 respectively. The discrepancy has been brought to light by the introduction of the new form and it remains for future investigation and reports to determine whether the old or the new rates are the more correct.
>
> Infantile Mortality Rate. . . . In the Eastern Province the rate shows a drop from 253·54 to 218·55, but the rate of 85·03 recorded by the Teso district is obviously inaccurate and the Lango and Bugwere rates are open to suspicion.
>
> The rate for the Northern Province has risen. This is due to an increase in the rate in the Gulu and West Nile districts. Previous rates recorded from the West Nile district were too low to be accurate for a primitive people.[3]

The Medical Report for 1932 presents a mixture of confidence and distrust as regards native birth and death registration and vital statistics. It says

[1] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 69.

[2] See ibid. *1926*, pp. 13–14; *1927*, pp. 14, 81; *1928*, p. 14; *1929*, p. 11.

[3] Ibid. *1930*, pp. 16–17. One specific, though certainly not the most important, reason for the incompleteness of registration was apparently the large influx of immigrants. 'Such immigrants would escape the payment of poll tax for a short time and would escape also the registration of births and deaths occurring amongst them for a longer time, because they would not immediately come within the tribal organisation of their adopted district' (ibid. *1931*, p. 17).

first that the rates obtained by means of the new returns supplied from 1930 on 'were liable to variation as a result of the irregularly varying population figures, but not to such an extent as to invalidate them, and they were regarded with a certain amount of complacence as giving valuable indications of the trend of growth of populations'.[1] After having then shown that the method of computing the population in intercensal years without taking account of immigration and emigration was possibly quite misleading, the report stated:

A further factor which depreciates the value of the vital returns is inaccuracy of registration of births and deaths. There is no short cut to improvement in this respect, and accuracy can only be obtained by years of constant and close supervision, particularly in the more backward parts of the Protectorate. Signs are not wanting that in the more enlightened districts the value of birth registration at least is appreciated, and it appears that it is only a matter of time before the returns will constitute a valuable record of trend of populations.

From what has been said above it is evident that it is unsafe to draw hard and fast conclusions from the figures now published. Nevertheless, it is felt that they do reflect some part of the truth and do deserve consideration.

Birth Rate and Death Rate. . . . The decrease in both rates for the Protectorate in 1932 is caused principally by the decrease recorded by the Western Province. This decrease is considered to be the result of faulty registration. The tendency to record births more accurately than deaths has been mentioned above, and it is probable that the considerable decrease in the death rate for 1932 recorded by the Eastern, Western and Northern Provinces is also due, in part at least, to neglect of registration.[2]

Finally Sir Albert Cook suggests in his report upon the work of the Lady Coryndon Maternity Training Centre that registration has been successful.

Birth Rate, Death Rate, Maternal Death Rate and Infantile Mortality. The data for these very important subjects come from the vital statistics prepared annually by the Government in Uganda. It is the custom to question the value of vital statistics derived from native sources and to doubt their accuracy, but a very good case might be made out for both the value and the comparative accuracy of the Baganda statistics.

To begin with, they have been compiled now for many years (20 or more) and the chiefs are well accustomed to enumeration. Like all animistic peoples they set great store by the events of life and death and their old ritual has always emphasized the importance of these occurrences.[3]

The Medical Report for 1933 says that 'the vital statistics submitted from the various districts are now thought to have attained some degree of accuracy except in a few backward areas',[4] but the Colonial Report for that year was more sceptical.

While it is not considered that the vital statistics now published are absolutely accurate, it may be that they are more correct than in former years . . . .

It is evident, however, that as yet it is unsafe to draw any definite conclusions from the current statistics, but at least they reflect some part of the truth and it is possible that each year they may become more reliable.[5]

[1] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 29.
[2] Ibid., p. 30.
[3] Ibid., p. 50.
[4] Ibid. *1933*, p. 23.
[5] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1933*, p. 8.

When the excess of births over deaths in the Protectorate dropped from 35,249 in 1933 to 19,456 in 1934, the Medical Report again mistrusted registration:

It is difficult to account for the difference in these figures. The total of births for 1934 was nearly 8,000 lower and of deaths nearly 8,000 higher than in the previous year. In the Eastern Province there were 6,644 fewer births and 3,295 more deaths, and, as in every district the figures fluctuated considerably, faulty registration in one year or the other is the probable explanation.[1]

When in 1935 the excess of births was 20,654, the Medical Report said:

This is in striking contrast to the returns for 1933 . . . . As, however, the figures for each Province for 1934 and 1935 show a close similarity, it is probable that some degree of accuracy in registration has now been achieved.[2]

In 1936–44 the excess of births over deaths fluctuated between 23,334 and 43,960. The comments of the Medical Reports on the accuracy of the birth and death figures were favourable still for 1936–8 but were somewhat more sceptical for 1943.

1943. Omissions and irregularities in the submission of returns from some of the remoter districts discount the accuracy of the figures, as in previous years.[3]

It seems, on the whole, that the Medical Department over-estimated the accuracy of the returns. As will be illustrated by some examples in Section VII of this chapter, the fluctuations from year to year were so great that registration must have been defective in many districts. Nor is there any indication that registration has improved in the course of the last decade.

An improvement of native birth and death records in Uganda could probably not be obtained by a change of the law. The system in use[4] is theoretically almost perfect. Notification of a birth or death has to be given to the landlord who passes the information through the Muluka Chief to the Gombolola Chief for entry in the register. The Gombolola Chief prepares a quarterly return which he sends to the Saza Chief who, after having perused all returns from his Gombolola Chiefs and queried any figures which he has reason to believe are inaccurate, submits the returns to the District Commissioner. The District Commissioner, after having dealt with the returns in the same way as the Saza Chiefs, forwards them through the Provincial Commissioner to the Director of Medical Services. Notification is made as convenient as possible to the natives; the task of the Gombolola Chiefs who, on an average, have to enter every month about two dozen events (births and deaths) in the register and in the quarterly returns is simple, and so is the task of the Saza Chiefs who have to check every quarter about half a dozen returns, knowing beforehand from which gombololas they may expect trustworthy returns and from which not. But all depends, it seems to me, on the competence and conscientiousness of the Saza Chiefs. That the

[1] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 24.

[2] Ibid. *1935*, p. 31. See also *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1934*, p. 8: 'Births and deaths are registered by the chiefs, and it is considered that these returns now attain a fair degree of accuracy.' The same opinion was expressed ibid. *1935*, p. 8; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 6.

[3] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 6.

[4] I am assuming here that the system introduced in Buganda for births is used throughout the Protectorate, with the exception of Karamoja, for both births and deaths.

further check by the District Commissioners is not effective can be inferred from the statement of the Medical Department quoted above: 'The accuracy could be greatly improved by regular scrutiny, gombolola by gombolola, of the quarterly forms in which fallacious returns are often readily noticeable, but it is beyond the capacity of this department at present to undertake this scrutiny.' This is certainly a most regrettable state of affairs. An experience of thirty years has shown that native birth and death records are obtainable in Uganda, and the available vital statistics suggest that the records are fairly complete in a number of sazas but quite inadequate in others. It is evident, therefore, that if each of the about 100 Saza Chiefs were to realize that the Administration is seriously interested in getting accurate and complete vital statistics the returns would greatly improve. As matters stand the Saza Chiefs cannot have this impression, as neither the District Commissioners nor the Medical Department challenge quarterly forms in which fallacious returns are readily noticeable, and as, furthermore, they can find it stated over and over again that the Administration does not consider native registration compulsory. To scrutinize regularly the quarterly forms, gombolola by gombolola, and to send back to the sazas, with queries, the forms in which fallacious returns are noticed, is a task which could be performed for the whole Protectorate by one competent native official. Such a scrutiny, it seems to me, should be started without delay.

VI. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration

Registration of births and deaths was regulated in the Uganda Protectorate by 'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904',[1] which was almost identical with the Ordinance issued four months earlier in the East Africa Protectorate. The Ordinance, which came into force on 1 January 1905,[2] made compulsory the registration of the birth of a child, 'if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent'. For all other births and for all deaths registration was to be optional, but the Commissioner was authorized to extend by Order published in the *Gazette* the provisions relating to compulsory registration to the births and deaths of all persons in the Protectorate of any particular race, class, tribe, or other group, or of all or some of the inhabitants of any particular town, district, or other area. In accordance with this provision an Order of 10 October 1906[3] made compulsory as from 1 January 1907 the registration of deaths of 'all persons of European, American or Asiatic origin or extraction within the Uganda Protectorate'. The Ordinance of 1904 was amended in 1915 by an Ordinance[4] which made compulsory the registration of births of all

[1] No. 13 of 1904 (10 Aug.), 'An Ordinance to make Provision for the Registration of Births and Deaths', reprinted in Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances, &c., 1904*, pp. 22–4, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1909*, pp. 676–81 (chapter 50).

[2] See Notice of 8 Dec. 1904, reprinted in *Ordinances, &c., 1904*, p. 73, and *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1909*, p. 688.

[3] Reprinted in ibid., p. 688, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1923*, vol. iii, p. 190.

[4] No. 8 of 1915 (27 Mar.), 'The Births and Deaths Registration (Amendment) Ordinance 1915' reprinted in Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances, &c., 1915*, p. 16.

persons of Asiatic race or origin. It was again amended in 1923[1] and in 1935.[2]

'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904' was supplemented by Rules issued on 8 December 1904,[3] which were amended in 1935,[4] and again in 1936.[5] The main Rules as they now stand are as follows:

2. The registration of births and deaths under this Ordinance shall be effected at the headquarters of each district in the office of the District Commissioner.

3. The hours for registration shall be the usual office hours of the District Commissioner of the district.

4. (*a*) Books shall be kept by District Commissioners for the registration of births and deaths. The register of births shall be in the Form A in the First Schedule hereto, and the register of deaths shall be in the Form B in the said Schedule, and registers shall contain the particulars therein set forth.

(*b*) The quarterly returns of births and deaths shall be sent in to the Registrar in the Forms C and D respectively in the First Schedule hereto.

5. (1) A person whose duty it is to register a birth or death shall send to the District Commissioner of the district in which the birth or death occurred a declaration—

In the case of a birth:

(*a*) which has occurred within three months of the date of the declaration, in the Form E in the First Schedule hereto;

(*b*) which has occurred more than three months prior to the date of the declaration, in the Form F in the First Schedule hereto.

In the case of a death:

(*c*) which has occurred or the body has been found within one month of the date of the declaration, in the Form G in the First Schedule hereto;

(*d*) which has occurred or the body has been found more than one month prior to the date of declaration, in the Form H in the First Schedule hereto.

(2) For the purpose of verifying the prescribed particulars and the amplification or correction thereof the District Commissioner may require, by notice in writing, the declarant or any other person whose duty it is to register the birth or death or, in default of such person, any credible person having knowledge of the truth of the case, to attend personally at his office within a reasonable time to be specified in the notice and to supply such other evidence or information as may be required by such District Commissioner. The declarant shall then certify to the correctness of all alterations or additions so made to the prescribed particulars by affixing his initials or mark thereto.

(3) The District Commissioner shall preserve the declaration and such other written evidence as may have been submitted to him in support thereof as he may deem advisable.

[1] Ordinance No. 3 of 1923 (6 Feb.), 'An Ordinance relating to the Revision of the Laws', reprinted in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1923*, vol. ii, pp. 1095–1109 (cap. 136).

[2] Ordinance No. 19 of 1935 (12 Oct.), 'An Ordinance to amend the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance', reprinted in Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances, &c., 1935*, pp. 439–40. The Ordinance as it stands to-day is reprinted in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate* (Revised Edition 1935), vol. i, pp. 185–8.

[3] 'Rules under The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904', reprinted in *Ordinances, &c., 1904*, pp. 74–9, and in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1909*, pp. 682–7.

[4] See Legal Notice No. 177 of 1935, reprinted in *Ordinances and Subsidiary Legislation 1935*, Part 2, pp. 238–48. The Rules as they stood after the enactment of this amendment are reprinted in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate* (Revised Edition 1935), vol. iv, pp. 56–64.

[5] See Legal Notice No. 173 of 1936, reprinted in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate Enacted 1936*, p. 74.

6. Where the name of a child is added or altered, under the provisions of Section 7 of the Ordinance, the registration thereof shall be effected as follows—

(1) Where the name is added, it shall be entered in the appropriate column in the register containing the entry of the birth and the District Commissioner shall affix his signature and the date of making the addition thereunder in the same column.

(2) Where the name is altered, the name originally given shall be deleted in the register by ruling one clear line through it, but so that the name shall remain legible, and the new name shall be written thereabove; the District Commissioner shall then affix his signature and the date of making the alteration thereunder in the same column and shall quote the number of this rule in the margin.

The District Commissioner shall thereupon send a certified exact copy of the entry, and, where the name has been altered, showing the original name and alteration, to the Registrar who shall file the same and amend any return in his custody of the entry thus amended.

If the register containing the entry of the birth is in the possession of the Registrar the addition or alteration shall be made and signed by him in manner aforesaid.

7. The fees to be levied and paid under the Ordinance shall be the fees set forth in the Second Schedule hereto.

8. Every person shall be entitled, upon giving 24 hours' notice to the Registrar, and upon payment of the fees set forth in the Second Schedule hereto, to search the index to and inspect any entry in any register or return in the custody of the Registrar and to have a certified copy under the hand of that officer of any such entry.

9. Every such certified copy or certificate shall be an exact copy of the entry in the register or return with a certificate at the foot in the Form I in the First Schedule and shall be signed by the Registrar.

11. Births and deaths occurring on board ships while within the territorial waters of the Protectorate shall be registered at the Registry Office which shall be nearest to the place where the birth or death took place, or at the nearest Registry Office to the port in the Protectorate at which the ship shall first touch after such birth or death has occurred.

Finally, Administrative Instructions[1] amplify some of the provisions contained in the Ordinances and Rules.

2. (3) All District Commissioners are Registrars of Births and Deaths.

(4) The Administrator-General is Registrar-General of Births and Deaths.

(8) Typewritten returns of births and deaths registered during each quarter should be forwarded by District Commissioners to the Registrar-General. When none has been registered a 'nil' return should be rendered.

(9) A District Commissioner should not register births or deaths occurring outside his own district.

(13) The quarterly returns should contain all the entries made during the quarter, whether supplementary returns have been made or not.

(14) Great care should be taken to see that all the columns of the register and the prescribed forms are duly filled in and that the particulars inserted in each column meet the requirements of the column-headings. Registrars should check all entries and ascertain that correct particulars are recorded before the returns are finally despatched to the Registrar-General. . . .

The main provisions ensuring registration of births and deaths, as they now stand, are as follows:

Birth and Death Registration

18. (1) The registration of the birth of a child shall be compulsory if either one or both parents are of European, American or Asiatic race or origin, or, in the case of an

[1] Uganda Protectorate, *Administrative Instructions* (1940), pp. 2–3.

illegitimate child not recognised by its father, if the mother is of European, American, or Asiatic race or origin.

(2) The registration of the death of any person of European, American or Asiatic race or origin shall be compulsory.

In case of a birth the registration of which is compulsory, (1) the father and mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred and each person present at the birth and the person having charge of the child shall register the birth within three months or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding Shs. 200 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month or to both.

In case of a death the registration of which is compulsory, (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) any inmate of the house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried shall register the death within one month or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding Shs. 200 or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding one month or to both.

Headings of Register

Birth (Form A): No.; Date of birth and time of birth; Place of birth; Name, if any; Sex; Name and surname, residence and occupation of father; Name and maiden surname, residence and occupation of mother; Nationality of parents; Full name, occupation and residence of declarant, and in what capacity he gives information; When registered; Signature of District Commissioner; Name, if added after registration of birth.

Death (Form B): No.; Date of death and time of death; Place of death; Name and surname; Sex; Age; Residence and occupation; Nationality; Cause of death; Full name, occupation and residence of declarant, and in what capacity he gives information; When registered; Signature of District Commissioner.

The Registrar-General[1] and the Registrars (District Commissioners) receive no remuneration for their services in this capacity. Registration of birth and death within six months after the event is free of charge. But a fee has to be paid for the registration of a birth or a death after six months from the event (for each year or part of a year from the date of birth or death Shs. 5); for the registration of the name or alteration in the name of any child whose birth has been previously registered, and for any other

[1] By Notice of 18 July 1913 (reprinted in *Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force 1923*, vol. iii, p. 190) 'the officer holding the substantive appointment of Assistant Chief Secretary was appointed to be Registrar-General of Births and Deaths, with effect from 8th July 1913'. This Notice was cancelled on 18 Dec. 1931 by Legal Notice No. 152 of 1931 (reprinted in *Ordinances 1931 and Subsidiary Legislation*, Part 2, p. 162), appointing the Officer discharging the duties of Deputy Chief Secretary to be Registrar-General of Births and Deaths. This Notice was again cancelled, on 1 Aug. 1934, by Legal Notice No. 118 of 1934 (reprinted ibid. *1934*, Part 2, p. 146), appointing the officer discharging the duties of Administrator-General to be Registrar-General of Births and Deaths. As regards the various other duties of the Administrator-General, see Thomas and Scott, p. 70.

alteration or any correction of an error of fact (Shs. 5); for the inspection of any register, return, or index in the custody of the Registrar-General (Shs. 4); and for a certified copy of any entry in any register or return in the custody of the Registrar-General (Shs. 5).

VII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. Fertility is low in the kingdom of Buganda and has apparently been so for very many years. In his report of 10 July 1901 to the Marquess of Lansdowne, Sir Harry Johnston stated:

> It is a subject of some surprise and disappointment that the Uganda people, still by far the most important entity in the Protectorate, should be slightly on the wane in numbers. I should think that they still reach the total of 1,000,000, but there is (according to the evidence of the missionaries who are acquainted with the country) a serious diminution in the birth-rate. This is attributed by Mgr. Streicher, the Roman Catholic Bishop in the western part of the Protectorate, to the following causes:—
>
> The Baganda women are said by the natives for the past 100 years to be showing signs of much diminished fertility. To counteract this tendency the Baganda men wished to import into their country down to a recent date wives from the adjoining countries of Busoga, Unyoro, Toro, and Ankole. To obtain these wives continual raids were undertaken in those directions, while a brisk Slave Trade was carried on. Raiding and Slave-trading have now come to an end completely since the establishment of European control. Therefore, the supply of extra-territorial wives has ceased, and in consequence thereof, the birth-rate has gone down.
>
> To this must be added the substitution of monogamy for polygamy, apparently a very real substitution. In many parts of West Africa where Christianity prevails, but where there is very little result other than pious utterances from the mouth, ostensible monogamy is corrected by the possession of recognized or unrecognized concubines and by a general promiscuousness in sexual matters. But in Uganda, Christianity seems to have taken such a real hold over the people that though by no means free from immorality—as no nation or community is free from the same tendency—they really seem to be striving at genuine monogamy and the exclusive possession of one wife for a partner. As the Baganda women are certainly very poor breeders, this means that the majority of couples have only one child. In fact, the fact of a second child on the part of the wife is such an unusual occurrence that the wife in consequence thereof is given a new and honorific title. The fortunate father announces the birth of a second child by beating a special drum in a special manner and singing a special song daily for a fortnight at his doorway.[1]

Since European control which checked the forced supply of extra-territorial wives had only just come into effect, it can hardly have been a cause of the 'serious diminution in the birth-rate'. As regards the statement that a second child was such an unusual occurrence that the wife in consequence thereof was given a new and honorific title, Johnston was the victim of a misunderstanding. The conferment of the honorific title and the other ceremonies took place at the birth of twins.[2] But while in this official report he attributed part of the decrease in the birth-rate to the spread of Christianity and the high standard of morals, he attributed it in his book published a year later to immorality, and expected a rise in the birth-rate from the spread of Christianity. After having stated that

[1] *Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda* (1901), pp. 15–16.

[2] See Roscoe, *The Baganda*, pp. 64–73; Mair, *An African People*, pp. 43–53.

one cause of the population decline was 'the exhaustion of men and women by premature debauchery',[1] he said:

If the Baganda are to be saved from dying out as a race—and I cannot but believe and hope they will—it will be entirely through the introduction of Christianity and the teaching of the missionaries, both Roman and Anglican. The introduction of monogamy as a universally recognised principle now amongst all people who desire to conform to mission teaching may be the salvation of Uganda, strange to say. The people, through this teaching, are now becoming ashamed of marrying girls who have led a bad life before marriage. The appreciation of female chastity is distinctly rising, while at the same time young men find debauchery no longer fashionable, and endeavour to marry early and become the fathers of families. If ever a race needed a Puritan revival to save it from extinction, it is the Baganda, and if ever Christian missions did positive and unqualified good among a Negro race, this good has been accomplished in Uganda, where their teaching has turned the current of the more intelligent people's thoughts towards the physical advantages of chastity.[2]

[1] He repeated also his statements regarding the rarity of a second child and the acquisition of women through raids and slave trade.

[2] Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 642. As usual, so in the case of the Baganda, opinions concerning the effect of polygamy and monogamy upon fertility vary. Lugard (*The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 30) says: 'This system of polygamy and early marriage tends to check the increase of population, since only the youngest and favourite wives become mothers.' The missionary Roscoe, on the other hand, claims that the introduction of monogamy led rather to a decrease in the number of births: 'There was a surplus of women, and when chiefs and wealthy men, on becoming Christians, cast off their many wives, these deposed wives were exposed to temptations greater than they were able to withstand. When the question was first considered, food and housing presented no difficulty. Chiefs became responsible for the cast-off women of their own clans, and the women themselves did not think their lot particularly hard as long as they were housed and provided with the means of obtaining food and clothing. The vexed questions of housing and food followed when the hut tax was imposed, and chiefs found that they could not afford to pay for the huts of those women of their clans who had been discarded as wives, and whom they had promised to befriend and care for. The huts were therefore destroyed and the women were turned adrift by their relatives. Numbers of them refused to settle down to earn an honest living, which they could have done by cultivating cotton and other products. Instead they gave way to the worst forms of vice and became prostitutes to traders, soldiers, and those of their own people who refused to marry lest they should have to build huts and pay the regular hut tax. It was a wise provision which altered the hut tax to the poll tax and removed this difficulty, but unfortunately untold harm had already been done before the discovery was made, and venereal disease had taken such a hold that up to the present time remedies have not been able to stay it and it threatens to extinguish the tribe.' (Roscoe, 'Uganda and some of its Problems', pp. 104–5.)

That the changes in the status of women have tended to reduce the number of births was emphasized also in a Dispatch of 30 Sept. 1930 by the Acting Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies: 'Native public opinion views with some alarm the tendency, under our administration, to regard the women as exempt from all tribal obligations. In Buganda the women are nowadays so emancipated that the younger men are evincing a very definite reluctance to contract regular unions with wives over whom neither they nor the chiefs nor the Protectorate Government have any control. During my recent tours in districts further afield it was represented to me by the chiefs at more than one place that the growth of motor transport and the existence of motor bus services on all the main roads is having a bad effect on the birth rate, inasmuch as a woman who is tired of life in a rural community and has three or four shillings at her disposal can easily abandon her home and disappear in one of the towns, where she adopts a life of prostitution. The chiefs asked me if Government could take steps to counteract this growing evil by controlling the acceptance of women as passengers, but I was obliged to inform them that any legislation which aimed at limiting the freedom of females as such would not be tolerated by public opinion at home. Your Lordship will realize, however, that the problem is not a simple one, and that complete emancipation of native women from all forms of tribal control will not necessarily promote the physical welfare of the people.' (*Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations*, pp. 35–6.)

Felkin, in 1886, gave as one cause for the low fertility among the Baganda women 'separation of husband and wife'.

Although in the poorer families the women are prolific, it being common enough to meet with mothers of six or seven children, yet on account of polygamy most of the women have only one or two. It is the custom, except in the lowest class of society, for a woman to separate from her husband from the time of her pregnancy until she has weaned her child, and this is not done until it is two years old. Even in the lowest class a few months separation is usual.

Chiefs who have very large harems have establishments in the country to which their women are banished during this period, and in them they are strictly watched.[1]

Dr. Felkin relates furthermore that 'miscarriages, said by the natives to be due to syphilis, are not infrequent',[2] and though many others of the early writers complained about the prevalence of syphilis,[3] Felkin seems to have been the only one to have recognized the connexion between this disease and the low fertility of the Baganda women. Twenty years later, however, this seemed to have become the prevailing opinion. The Colonial Report for 1906–7 said:

Sleeping sickness and syphilis are the two diseases that chiefly account for the low birth-rate.[4]

The report for the following year stated that sleeping-sickness was on the wane and that 'the terrible prevalence of venereal diseases' was the main cause of the low fertility.[5] The same opinion was expressed many times subsequently,[6] but Sir Albert Cook in his report on the work of the Lady Coryndon Maternity Training School for the year 1932 held a more cautious view:

In the Uganda Protectorate in dealing with the Baganda, the Banyoro, the Batoro, the Banyankole, the Basoga and the Teso, that is to say, with the great bulk of the 3½ million native inhabitants, we are dealing with a highly syphilized population. The influence of this on childbirth is obviously most important. First, as to the frequency of syphilis in pregnant women. In our Church Missionary Society Lady Coryndon Maternity Training School, the percentage of women whose husbands had suffered from syphilis or who had themselves suffered was as follows:—

1925 .	. 62%	1927 .	. 67%	1929 .	. 57%	1931 .	. 57%
1926 .	. 60%	1928 .	. 62%	1930 .	. 52%		

... With this large percentage of syphilis in the mothers, it is interesting to try and find out how often abortion or premature birth is due to the disease and how many children are born congenital syphilitics.

[1] Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 745. Lugard (*The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 30) and Roscoe (*The Baganda*, pp. 55–6) confirm that a polygamous wife lived apart from her husband during the long suckling period, but Mair (*An African People*, p. 55) says that 'no modern Muganda has any recollection of such a rule'.

[2] Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 745. He said, however: 'Still births are very rare.'

[3] See pp. 315–17 below.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1906–7*, p. 22.

[5] See ibid. *1907–8*, p. 30. See also Thomas and Scott, pp. 301–2: 'By 1906 the prevalence of syphilis among the Bantu tribes of the Protectorate had assumed so grave an aspect that the Commissioner (Bell) applied to the Secretary of State for an inquiry to be made into the subject. Colonel F. J. Lambkin, R.A.M.C., was accordingly appointed "to report upon the prevalence of venereal disease and to concert measures . . . for checking its ravages". He arrived at Kampala in 1907, and reported in the following year. It was apparent that the seriousness of the situation had not been exaggerated, the incidence of syphilis being as high as 90 per cent. of the population in certain areas.'

[6] See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1918–19*, p. 6; *Medical Report 1923*, pp. 6, 60.

Had I been asked this question ten years ago, I should have replied with the utmost confidence that two out of every three Baganda mothers have had syphilis at one time or another in their lives and that the percentage of abortions or premature births in women showing active signs of syphilis is in the neighbourhood of 65 per cent.[1]

Further experience has made one more cautious and especially the results of detailed observations elsewhere. To get at the exact results, clinical work must be checked by laboratory findings (serological tests, etc.) and it will be readily understood that with very limited staff and only partially trained assistants this may be difficult or impossible.[2]

Recent reports emphasize that the incidence of venereal diseases in the country as a whole is increasing. In his *Report on the Post-War Development of the Medical Services*, the Director of Medical Services said:

It is with gratitude that I accept the opportunity to submit recommendations for a more comprehensive campaign against the venereal diseases, Gonorrhoea and Syphilis, in the Protectorate for I am satisfied that the incidence of the diseases is increasing rapidly, that they are spreading to sections of the population previously almost untouched and that unless some action is taken to combat the diseases they will seriously affect the future of the State. It must be pointed out in considering venereal diseases that the population as a whole is poorly nourished and largely affected by other debilitating conditions.

While I believe that the special conditions brought about by the war have aggravated the speed of the spread of the diseases, there is little doubt that even before the war increases were occurring.[3]

As regards the number of live-births registered in the kingdom of Buganda, it oscillated in 1912–19 between 8,319 and 10,287, in 1920–2 between 12,265 and 13,050, rose gradually to 16,718 in 1926, oscillated in 1927–32 between 16,482 and 17,197, rose gradually to 20,483 in 1936, oscillated in 1937–41 between 19,627 and 20,862, and rose gradually to 26,624 in 1944. The official birth-rate varied in 1912–22 between 12·0[4] and 16·8,[5] and it is safe to say that throughout this period the birth records were incomplete. The rate rose to 18·3 in 1923, to 19·0 in 1924, varied in 1925–41 between 19·2 and 23·3, rose in 1942 to 26·8, and amounted in 1943–4 to 29. All rates prior to 1942 were very low and it is likely that for some years they lag behind the truth,[6] but there is no cogent reason to assume that the rates, on the whole, were far off the mark.

[1] See also Dr. Cook, *Uganda Memories (1897–1940)*, pp. 49, 244, 326–31, 338, 344.

[2] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 49. The history of syphilis in Buganda deserves a monograph to itself. 'It seems that the natives first contracted these diseases from the Arabs and that at the time of the arrival of the Europeans about twenty or thirty per cent of the native population had become infected' (Buell, vol. i, p. 606). By the end of the nineteenth century the vast majority of the population seems to have been syphilized. But the incidence for some time has apparently been declining. It may well be, therefore, that the Baganda will regain their fertility.

[3] *Report*, p. 80. See also *Joint Report of Finance Committee and Development and Welfare Committee on Post-War Development* (2nd ed.), p. 35: 'There can be no question of the gravity of the position in Uganda nor of the inadequacy of the normal resources and mechanism of the medical services adequately to deal with it. There is good reason to believe that the disease was spreading before the war and that war conditions have aggravated the speed of that spread.'

[4] It would probably have been lower still in 1915 but was not computed for that year.

[5] It should be noted, however, that according to Dr. Cook (*Uganda Memories*, p. 244) the return prepared by the Native Council for 1906, which covered nine months only, showed 8,572 births. This indicates a higher birth-rate.

[6] The rise in the numbers of live-births recorded in the Mengo District from 5,655 in 1931 to 7,734 in 1939 arouses the suspicion that registration was incomplete in 1931 (in fact in every year

Another area in which fertility has been low for a long time is the Bunyoro District. Here again venereal disease was given as the main cause.

1913. Native Legislation in Bunyoro.—A tour was undertaken in Bunyoro in July. The anxiety and interest in the subject of the native authorities there can only be described as remarkable. The ravages of venereal disease would appear to be more serious than in Buganda, and the Mukama and the leading Chiefs are evidently deeply concerned with regard to the future of their population. They seemed prepared to offer every inducement within their power to Government to commence an anti-venereal scheme. They were prepared to pass any native law, and to provide free buildings, and went so far as to discuss the offering of the half of all the Chiefs' land rents in order to provide a fund.[1]

1917. It is seen that in Bunyoro the Births have dropped from 5,527 in 1913 to 1,680 in 1917 (and including Still-Births from 7,559 to 2,486) and though a good deal of this may be put down to emigration yet this is not the only cause. The Banyoro are a very poor race physically and syphilis is probably the chief cause of the small number of births and the large number of still-births. It is reported that inoculation of infants with syphilis is still practised.[2]

1923. Bunyoro.—The vital statistics of this portion of the Northern Province have for some time past been disquieting and venereal disease prevalence is reported to be more extensive there than in any other part of the Protectorate, a 90% infection being reported by Dr. Cook and confirmed by Dr. Lee.[3]

The early birth records of Bunyoro are quite puzzling. The numbers of births reported in 1912–15 were 3,163, 5,527, 4,737, and 3,081 respectively. The number dropped to 1,763 in 1916 and declined further to 1,284 in 1919. It oscillated in 1920–7 between 1,422 and 1,747, and in 1928–42 between 1,770 and 2,323, but dropped in 1943 to 1,711 and in 1944 to 1,561. The official birth-rate was 24·1 in 1912, 45·1 in 1914, and oscillated in 1916–44 between 13·2 and 23·8. It averaged 15·2 in 1937–44. But the official rates are in part misleading, as the population estimates were quite erratic.[4] The estimate was evidently far too low in 1928–30, and if the birth returns were exact the actual birth-rate would have been under 21 in every year from 1916 on. But the figures do not seem trustworthy. That the birth-rate should actually have been about 45 in 1913, the very year in which the ravages of venereal disease caused the deepest concern to the Mukama and the leading Chiefs, does not seem plausible. It is likely, on the other hand, that birth registration in the last thirty years has been incomplete.

Bunyoro was the only district of the Northern Province which had a low fertility. The birth-rate oscillated in Lango District (1926–44) between 29·2 and 38·2, in Gulu District (1926–38) between 27·95[5] and 53·7, in Chua

from 1928 to 1934). The drop in the number of live-births recorded in the Mubende District from 3,397 in 1938 to 1,890 in 1939—the birth-rate falling from 21·5 to 12·0—seems incredible. (In 1940–4 the birth-rate averaged 11·7.)

[1] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 78.

[2] Ibid. *1917*, p. 9. See also ibid. *1922*, p. 8; *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1918–19*, p. 6.

[3] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 61. See also ibid., p. 6; *1924*, p. 63; *1926*, p. 14; *Report of the East Africa Commission*, pp. 54, 144, 185.

[4] Thus the population was put in 1912 at 130,922, in 1914 at 104,937, in 1918 at 113,771, in 1919 and 1920 at 92,660, in 1921 (count) at 98,758, in 1928 at 84,616, in 1930 at 86,111, in 1931 (count) at 114,220, and at about the same figure in all subsequent years.

[5] Only in 1926–9 was the birth-rate under 40.

District (1926–38) between 25·8[1] and 54·0,[2] in West Nile District (1926–44) between 18·7 and 44·3.[3] In the Northern Province as a whole the birth-rate oscillated in 1926–44 between 28·5 and 36·7.

In the Busoga District the number of reported births oscillated in 1912–18 between 9,470 and 12,093, dropped to 6,918 in 1919, oscillated in 1920–4 between 8,792 and 9,892, in 1925–34 between 10,598 and 12,906, declined gradually to 8,070 in 1939, averaged 8,371 in 1940–1, and declined gradually to 6,111 in 1944. The official birth-rate oscillated in 1912–30 between 35·5 and 48·25, with the exception of 1919 when it was 27·9, and dropped gradually thereafter to 21 in 1939–40 and to 16 in 1944. The Medical Reports do not explain the enormous fall in the birth-rate, and no other District of the Eastern Province shows a decline prior to 1941. The official birth-rate oscillated in Budama District (1926–39) between 20·9[4] and 36·2,[5] in Bugishu District (1926–38) between 30·5 and 45·4, in Bugwere District (1927–38) between 20·3 and 32·0,[6] in Teso District (1927–40) between 15·8 and 25·7,[7] and in the Eastern Province as a whole (1927–40) between 24·9 and 32·2. But the decline in 1941–4 was not confined to the Busoga District. The birth-rate dropped between 1940 and 1944 in the Central District from 29·1 to 18·9, in Teso from 24·9 to 19·0, and in the Eastern Province as a whole from 25·7 to 18·0.

In the Ankole District the number of reported births oscillated in 1913–20 between 5,518[8] and 6,615, in 1921–3 between 6,816 and 7,382, and rose to 10,479 in 1931. It dropped to 6,979 in 1932 and to 6,034 in 1933, oscillated in 1934–9 between 6,166 and 7,752, jumped to 9,932 in 1940, and oscillated in 1941–4 between 7,803 and 8,754. The official birth-rate oscillated in 1913–44 between 20·7 and 38·5. The sudden changes in the numbers of reported births indicate that at certain times registration was quite defective. The same is obviously true of the Toro District, where the number of births reported in 1912–44 oscillated between 3,029 and 7,218, and the official birth-rate between 20·0 and 55·2.[9] In the Kigezi District (1928–44) the birth-rate oscillated, likewise with wild changes from year to year, between 29·7 and 45·4. In the Western Province as a whole it

[1] Only in 1936 was the birth-rate under 35.

[2] The Gulu and Chua Districts were amalgamated on 1 Jan. 1937 into the Acholi District. In this District the birth-rate decreased from 45·9 in 1939 to 31·2 in 1944.

[3] The birth records of the West Nile District inspire little confidence. The numbers of births returned in 1937–44 were 4,887, 5,849, 9,633, 9,929, 12,257, 12,604, 10,063, and 9,702 respectively.

[4] Only in 1926–9 was the birth-rate under 27·8.

[5] The Medical Reports give for 1930 a birth-rate of 37·55, but they assume erroneously that the number of births was 5,314 instead of 4,314. From 1940 on the figures for the Budama District are included in those of the Central District.

[6] The Bugishu and Bugwere Districts were amalgamated on 1 Jan. 1937 into the Central District.

[7] In 1926 the official birth-rate was only 11·8. But the records were probably incomplete also in some later years. The number of births reported decreased gradually from 6,514 in 1932 to 4,454 in 1936 and rose thereafter gradually to 7,173 in 1939.

[8] The figure reported in 1912 (4,073) was evidently too low.

[9] The colossal changes in the birth-rates are due in part to wrong population estimates. The birth-rate dropped from 55·2 in 1925 to 24·3 in 1931, although the number of reported births declined only from 6,354 to 4,701, because in 1925 the population was estimated at only 115,118 while the 1931 count showed it to be 193,714.

TABLE 14. *Registered Births and Deaths in Buganda, Busoga, Bunyoro, Ankole, and Toro, 1912–44*[1]

	Buganda					*Busoga*					*Bunyoro*				
Year	*Live-born*	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Live-born*	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Live-born*	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1912	9,045	1,001	11,400	16·8	21·2	9,882	548	7,502	40·5	30·8	3,163	962	2,452	24·1	18·7
1913	8,971	925	11,989	12·87	17·20	10,992	611	7,870	44·6	..	5,527	2,032	6,019	..	..
1914	9,061	976	10,949	12·77	15·43	9,470	360	7,770	38·49	31·58	4,737	1,566	4,852	45·15	46·25
1915	8,319	978	12,231	..	..	9,634	480	7,228	..	..	3,081	1,217	3,043	..	..
1916	9,737	968	12,802	14·40	18·93	12,093	548	7,771	48·25	31·00	1,763	841	2,280	16·42	21·24
1917	8,818	971	13,203	13·29	19·69	11,132	726	8,892	43·54	34·78	1,680	806	3,126	15·83	29·46
1918	10,287	1,082	14,160	12·79	17·61	10,782	669	9,229	42·17	36·10	1,649	893	4,500	14·50	39·57
1919	9,512	1,009	15,221	12·02	19·22	6,918	319	10,053	27·93	40·59	1,284	638	3,345	13·85	36·09
1920	12,265	1,127	14,469	15·50	18·28	9,005	484	6,980	36·36	28·18	1,597	953	2,609	17·23	28·15
1921	13,050	1,169	13,761	16·77	17·68	9,829	487	11,312	44·15	50·81	1,602	993	2,599	16·21	26·31
1922	12,481	1,102	13,939	16·03	17·91	8,792	483	5,839	39·49	26·23	1,539	967	2,430	15·57	24·60
1923	14,479	1,120	15,103	18·34	19·13	9,892	545	7,698	45·06	35·06	1,626	907	2,482	18·81	25·67
1924	14,914	992	14,877	19·02	18·97	9,751	540	6,456	43·60	28·87	1,510	770	2,480	15·77	25·89
1925	15,514	1,187	14,455	19·43	18·11	10,810	498	5,084	45·87	21·57	1,422	675	2,240	14·24	22·44
1926	16,718	1,053	15,539	21·47	19·95	11,501	662	6,187	45·57	24·52	1,747	758	2,247	17·54	22·57
1927	17,037	957	13,562	21·58	17·18	11,671	593	5,968	40·45	20·68	1,516	640	1,958	15·50	20·03
1928	16,482	..	15,391	19·50	18·98	10,598	..	5,942	35·80	20·19	1,839	..	2,331	21·63	26·98
1929	17,162	..	15,805	19·78	18·47	11,861	..	6,289	35·48	18·91	2,019	..	2,348	23·77	28·76
1930	17,165	614	18,105	19·70	20·77	12,906	642	9,107	37·39	26·38	2,003	429	2,804	23·26	32·56
1931	17,197	771	16,984	19·70	19·46	12,049	782	8,965	31·84	23·69	2,060	552	2,466	18·03	21·59
1932	16,807	955	16,450	19·25	18·84	11,978	1,037	8,656	31·38	22·68	2,185	512	2,431	19·17	21·33
1933	17,757	714	16,283	20·23	18·62	12,218	1,003	8,034	31·66	20·82	2,323	443	2,347	20·38	20·59
1934	18,136	679	15,367	20·67	17·51	10,651	899	9,115	27·49	23·53	1,922	331	2,101	16·90	18·47
1935	19,118	874	16,117	21·71	18·29	10,270	851	9,457	26·45	24·36	2,005	271	1,662	17·57	14·56
1936	20,483	868	16,600	23·17	18·77	9,217	831	10,214	23·80	26·37	2,173	253	1,641	18·96	14·32
1937	20,073	694	16,004	22·60	18·02	8,567	707	10,397	22·23	26·98	1,819	202	1,657	15·84	14·43
1938	20,862	672	14,658	23·32	16·38	8,387	545	8,317	21·75	21·57	1,770	147	1,166	15·33	10·10
1939	20,295	618	14,045	22·53	15·59	8,070	548	6,571	20·85	16·98	1,915	139	1,299	16·50	11·20
1940	19,627	425	16,356	21·71	18·09	8,311	491	7,908	21·48	20·43	1,809	218	1,161	15·46	9·92
1941	20,664	384	16,190	22·75	17·82	8,431	537	8,316	21·76	21·46	1,815	129	1,308	15·49	11·16
1942	24,290	377	25,014	26·76	27·56	7,507	464	10,416	19·52	27·08	1,831	129	1,384	15·57	11·77
1943	26,570	316	19,415	29·04	21·22	6,937	338	8,926	18·13	23·33	1,711	129	1,364	14·50	11·56
1944	26,624	257	21,587	28·94	23·47	6,111	254	7,833	16·04	20·56	1,561	136	1,134	13·18	9·58

Year	Ankole					Toro					Total				
	Live-born	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Live-born*	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Live-born*	*Still-born*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1912	4,073	529	3,352	17·8	14·6	4,305	1,998	2,332	37·4	20·2	30,468	5,038	27,038	24·2	21·5
1913	5,638	681	4,241	..	..	5,156	2,056	2,397	..	..	36,284	6,305	32,516	24·93	22·41
1914	5,863	622	4,290	21·98	16·08	3,933	1,659	1,729	34·19	15·03	33,064	5,183	29,590	22·94	20·53
1915	5,577	711	5,434	..	..	3,739	1,391	1,474	..	..	30,350	4,777	29,410	..	..
1916	5,877	787	5,079	22·02	19·03	3,509	1,473	1,645	31·30	14·67	32,979	4,617	29,577	23·35	20·94
1917	6,214	763	5,357	23·22	20·02	3,029	1,211	1,446	27·11	12·94	30,873	4,477	32,024	21·87	22·69
1918	6,615	820	5,839	24·74	21·84	3,729	1,510	2,072	28·77	15·98	33,062	4,974	35,800	21·05	22·80
1919	5,518	750	7,388	20·69	27·71	3,731	1,767	3,907	29·58	30·98	26,963	4,483	39,914	17·69	26·19
1920	6,529	773	6,033	24·48	22·62	3,167	1,478	2,260	25·11	17·92	32,563	4,815	32,351	21·36	21·22
1921	7,095	780	6,206	28·24	24·70	3,872	1,504	1,976	32·95	16·81	35,448	4,933	35,854	24·14	24·42
1922	7,382	775	5,879	29·38	23·40	4,322	1,739	2,450	36·78	20·85	34,516	5,066	30,537	23·51	20·80
1923	6,816	748	5,205	26·98	20·60	3,863	1,498	2,193	32·82	18·63	36,676	4,818	32,681	24·86	22·15
1924	7,554	1,218	5,225	29·71	20·55	5,678	2,123	2,754	48·73	23·63	39,407	5,643	31,792	26·75	21·58
1925	7,956	922	4,229	31·01	16·48	6,354	2,256	3,101	55·20	26·94	42,056	5,538	29,109	27·94	19·34
1926	8,024	1,275	5,133	31·07	19·87	6,597	2,313	2,995	52·39	23·78	44,587	6,061	32,101	29·44	21·20
1927	9,533	1,718	5,087	36·65	19·55	6,902	2,232	2,947	48·60	20·75	46,659	6,140	29,522	29·58	18·72
1928	9,112	..	4,264	34·64	16·50	7,218	..	3,532	46·77	25·06	45,249	..	31,460	27·74	19·29
1929	9,311	..	5,073	34·22	17·76	6,687	..	3,182	42·92	20·30	47,040	..	32,697	27·43	19·06
1930	10,472	478	7,333	38·50	26·91	5,347	199	3,776	34·35	24·26	47,893	2,362	41,125	27·68	23·77
1931	10,479	527	7,534	37·51	26·97	4,701	285	4,204	24·26	21·70	46,486	2,917	40,153	25·29	21·84
1932	6,979	282	5,423	24·84	19·31	4,107	243	3,364	21·12	17·30	42,056	3,029	36,324	22·80	19·70
1933	6,034	291	4,867	21·39	17·25	4,089	162	3,127	20·92	16·00	42,421	2,613	34,658	22·91	18·71
1934	6,556	289	5,698	23·17	20·14	4,438	177	3,295	22·58	16·76	41,703	2,375	35,576	22·44	19·15
1935	6,166	280	5,672	21·75	20·01	3,941	134	3,301	19·98	16·73	41,500	2,410	36,209	22·27	19·43
1936	7,696	233	4,013	26·81	13·98	4,218	176	4,004	21·37	20·28	43,787	2,361	36,472	23·41	19·50
1937	6,967	230	4,594	24·07	15·87	3,976	149	3,538	20·09	17·88	41,402	1,982	36,190	22·07	19·29
1938	7,718	261	4,608	26·37	15·74	4,683	159	3,483	23·52	17·49	43,420	1,784	32,232	23·01	17·08
1939	7,752	257	4,611	26·21	15·59	5,360	195	3,052	26·61	15·16	43,392	1,757	29,578	22·83	15·56
1940	9,932	356	5,808	33·10	19·36	6,156	234	3,721	30·18	18·24	45,835	1,724	34,954	23·98	18·28
1941	8,754	365	7,438	29·07	24·70	5,544	252	3,791	26·97	18·44	45,208	1,667	37,043	23·55	19·29
1942	7,961	360	8,816	26·51	29·36	5,658	247	3,770	27·28	18·17	47,247	1,577	49,400	24·64	25·76
1943	8,693	318	5,972	28·69	19·71	6,174	291	3,416	29·37	16·25	50,085	1,392	39,093	25·97	20·27
1944	7,803	268	5,717	25·57	18·80	5,581	269	3,007	26·23	14·13	47,680	1,184	39,278	24·61	20·28

[1] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 18; *1913*, p. 20; *1914*, p. 18; *1917*, p. 11; *1922*, p. 11; *1927*, p. 17; *1928*, pp. 18–19; *1929*, pp. 17–18; *1930*, p. 21; *1931*, p. 21; *1932*, p. 35; *1933*, pp. 25, 27; *1934*, p. 27; *1935*, p. 30; *1936*, p. 36; *1937*, p. 29; *1938*, p. 32; *1939*, p. 28; *1940*, pp. 7–8; *1941*, p. 6; *1942*, p. 12; *1943*, p. 9; *1944*, p. 11. Birth- and death-rates have not been published for the total area for 1928–44; I have computed them from the birth and death figures reproduced in this table and from the population estimates of the various Districts given in the *Medical Reports* and the *Blue Books*.

dropped gradually from 41·0 in 1928 to 26·1 in 1933,[1] oscillated in 1934–7 between 25·1 and 27·6, rose thereafter to 36·7 in 1940, but dropped to 28·9 in 1944.

In the five administrative units for which birth records were available before the first World War, the number of births reported oscillated in 1912–23 between 30,350 and 36,676, with the exception of 1919 when it was only 26,963, rose to 39,407 in 1924, and oscillated in 1925–44 between 41,402 and 50,085. The birth-rate oscillated in 1912–44 between 21·1 (1918) and 29·6 (1927), except 1919, when it was only 17·7. It exceeded 24 in every year from 1923 to 1931 and from 1942 to 1944, but was below 24 in every year from 1932 to 1941.

In the whole Protectorate the number of births reported rose from 91,368 in 1928 to 109,828 in 1943, but dropped in 1944 to 99,520. The official birth-rate oscillated in 1926–44 between 25·4 (1937) and 29·9 (1927) without showing any definite trend.

In 1928–44 the number of male births was 866,220 and the number of female births 832,968. There were 104·0 male births to 100 female births.[2]

Still-births. Prior to 1930 (when a new form of return for vital statistics was introduced) the numbers of reported still-births were enormous. In the five administrative units which furnished such returns the proportion of still-births among all births amounted in 1912–27 to 12·8 per cent., in 1930–6 to 5·6 per cent., in 1937–41 to 3·9 per cent., and in 1942–4 to 3·2, 2·7, and 2·4 per cent. respectively. In the Protectorate as a whole the proportion was 4·2 per cent. in 1930–6, 3·4 per cent. in 1937–43, and 2·9 per cent. in 1944. While the proportion of still-births in 1912–27 had been 30·6 per cent. in Bunyoro and 28·2 per cent. in Toro, the highest rate reported from any district in any year between 1935 and 1944 was 11·9 (and excluding Bunyoro 8·3).

Until 1930 the still-birth rates were accepted as representing the true conditions, and syphilis was stated to be the chief cause of the particularly

[1] When the birth-rate dropped from 34·0 in 1931 to 27·9 in 1932 the Medical Department attributed the decrease to faulty registration, but the birth-rate was lower still in each year from 1933 to 1937.

[2] As regards Buganda, Wilson said in 1879: 'Careful observation has established the fact that there are a good many more female births than male . . .' (Wilson and Felkin, vol. i, p. 150), and Felkin, in a communication read at the Royal Society of Edinburgh on 3 May 1886, added: 'I have made some observations with regard to the excess of female births which may be of interest, namely, that the very great proportion of children born of newly-caught female slaves are girls. This point is all the more noticeable, because I found that it is only in the first births that girls predominate so largely over boys. To make this clear, I may give the following figures:—Of 300 Waganda women observed 9, or 3 per cent., appeared to be sterile; 291 had children. The male first births were 144, the female first births were 147. Of 500 women who had been captured, 18 only, or 3·6 per cent., appeared to be sterile; and the number of male first births was 79, of female 403. In the subsequent births, however, male and female children born were nearly equal in number, the females being only slightly in excess' (Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', pp. 744–5). The newly caught female slaves evidently knew that 'only girls matter'. The strange belief that female births very much exceeded male births among the Baganda was shared by several later writers. Roscoe, for example, related in 1921: 'According to the most reliable information obtainable, the females outnumbered the males; the birth-rate is said to have been two females to one male. . . . [But] the proportion of males and females among the infants, we are assured, is becoming equalised' (*Twenty-Five Years in East Africa*, p. 169).

large number of still-births in Bunyoro and Toro.[1] When the number of still-births decreased in a district it was usually attributed to the splendid work of the maternity centres;[2] when it increased no comment was made, or the rise was said to be unfortunate.[3] When the introduction of a new form in 1930 resulted in an enormous drop in the number of still-births reported from some districts, the Medical Department declared that 'it remains for future investigation and reports to determine whether the old or the new rates are the more correct'.[4] From 1933 on, the Medical Reports all state that the new rates are incorrect.

1933. It seems probable that not all the still-births which occurred can have been recorded, since otherwise there can be no explanation for a still-birth rate of 1·52 in Entebbe District and 6·44 in the adjacent district of Mubende, or 7·59 in Busoga compared with 1·18 in the adjoining district of Budama and 4·52 in Mengo. Further, the rates of 0·17 for Teso and 0·97 for Kigezi are unbelievably low.[5]

1934. Fewer still-births were registered in 1934 than in the previous years. It is likely that they are not all recorded. The rates vary from 14·69 per thousand births in Bunyoro to 0·58 per thousand in the Entebbe district.[6]

1935. There was an increase in the number of still-births registered. Little reliance can, however, be placed on the rate based thereon as it is certain that a large number of such births is not reported. The rate for the whole Protectorate was 4·19.[7]

1936. 3,932 as compared with 4,144 in 1935 were registered. This figure is probably

[1] See, for example, *Medical Report 1918*, p. 9. The East Africa Commission reported (1925) that in Bunyoro 'practically the whole population is syphilitic', and that 'a large proportion of still-births can be attributed to venereal disease' (*Report*, p. 54).

[2] See, for example, *Medical Report 1922*, p. 8; *1924*, p. 8.

[3] It should be noted, furthermore, that some statements in the Medical Reports are wrong because the rates were either wrongly computed or wrongly interpreted. The rates are given throughout as representing the proportion of still-births among total births, but the rates for the early years actually showed the ratio of still-births to 100 live-births (and, therefore, were too high). *Medical Report 1922*, p. 8, says that the still-birth figures for Bunyoro 'have shown a small but steady improvement for the last three years', but the number of still-births was actually higher in 1922 than in every year from 1916 to 1920 and the still-birth rate in 1922 (38·6) was the highest on record (see ibid., p. 11, and Table 14 above). *Medical Report 1926*, p. 14, says concerning Buganda: 'The number of still-births recorded, 1,053, is lower than that for any previous year, except 1924', but the number of still-births recorded was lower than in 1926 in each year from 1912 to 1917, and in 1919. *Medical Report 1927*, p. 15, says concerning Ankole: 'The still-birth rate has shown a fairly steady increase for the last seven or eight years.' Yet the rates for 1919–27 were 12·0, 10·6, 9·9, 9·5, 9·9, 13·9, 10·4, 13·7, and 15·3 respectively. The rate jumped in 1924 and again in 1926 and 1927, and there was not 'a fairly steady increase for the last seven or eight years'.

No still-birth figures have been published for 1928 and 1929.

[4] See p. 269 above. According to ibid. *1930*, p. 19, the still-birth rates in 1928–30 were as follows:

Year	*Buganda*	*Busoga*	*Toro*	*Ankole*	*Bunyoro*
1928	4·82	5·27	23·32	13·11	29·53
1929	6·65	4·51	24·03	17·82	20·44
1930	3·45	4·73	3·58	4·36	17·63

[5] Ibid. *1933*, p. 24.

[6] Ibid. *1934*, p. 24. Actually still-births had decreased from 1933 to 1934 in the same proportion as live-births, and the official still-birth rates were 4·09 and 4·08 respectively. The rate was lower in Teso (0·32) than in Entebbe (0·58).

[7] Ibid. *1935*, p. 31. See also *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1935*, p. 8: 'During 1935, 4,144 still-births were registered compared with 3,949 in 1934. This figure is of little value, however, as it is certain that only a proportion of still-births are reported to the chiefs.' The still-birth rates varied from 0·31 in Teso to 11·90 in Bunyoro.

TABLE 15. *Registered Births and Deaths, Uganda, 1926–44*[1]

Year	Live-born			Still-born	Deaths	Deaths under 1 year	Birth-rate	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate
	Male	Female	Total		Total				
BUGANDA PROVINCE									
1926	..	..	16,195	1,053	15,539	2,427	20·52	19·35	150
1927	..	..	17,608	957	13,562	2,293	21·73	17·18	130
1928	8,415	8,067	16,482	..	15,391	2,560	19·50	18·98	155
1929	8,689	8,473	17,162	..	15,805	1,937	19·78	18·47	113
1930	8,651	8,514	17,165	614	18,105	2,200	19·70	20·77	128
1931	8,728	8,469	17,197	771	16,984	2,033	19·70	19·46	118
1932	8,416	8,391	16,807	955	16,450	1,674	19·25	18·84	100
1933	9,034	8,723	17,757	714	16,283	1,875	20·23	18·62	106
1934	9,231	8,905	18,136	679	15,367	1,649	20·67	17·51	91
1935	9,642	9,476	19,118	874	16,117	1,609	21·71	18·29	84
1936	10,387	10,096	20,483	868	16,600	1,818	23·17	18·77	89
1937	10,402	9,671	20,073	694	16,004	1,593	22·60	18·02	79
1938	10,700	10,162	20,862	672	14,658	1,449	23·32	16·38	69
1939	10,338	9,957	20,295	618	14,045	1,401	22·53	15·59	69
1940	10,007	9,620	19,627	425	16,356	1,803	21·71	18·09	92
1941	10,518	10,146	20,664	384	16,190	1,615	22·75	17·82	78
1942	12,279	12,011	24,290	377	25,014	2,471	26·76	27·56	102
1943	13,626	12,944	26,570	316	19,415	1,677	29·04	21·22	63
1944	13,728	12,896	26,624	257	21,587	2,330	28·94	23·47	70
EASTERN PROVINCE[2]									
1926[3]	..	..	21,131	..	..	6,631	22·61	..	314
1927	..	..	28,566	..	..	8,167	26·52	..	286
1928	14,290	13,796	28,086	..	..	8,659	25·11	..	308
1929	15,874	15,113	30,987	..	..	8,203	26·44	..	265
1930	17,515	17,456	34,971	1,551	28,025	7,818	30·28	24·26	224
1931	18,010	17,844	35,854	1,797	27,173	7,104	31·17	23·62	198
1932	17,851	17,812	35,663	1,862	22,421	5,669	30·66	19·27	159
1933	19,133	18,783	37,916	1,896	23,807	6,193	32·20	20·22	163
1934	16,005	15,267	31,272	1,582	27,102	5,990	26·47	22·94	192
1935	15,696	15,228	30,924	1,568	28,974	5,745	26·13	24·48	186
1936	15,847	15,663	31,510	1,557	29,689	6,298	26·58	25·05	200
1937	15,123	14,854	29,977	1,411	26,141	5,188	25·21	21·99	173
1938	15,035	14,787	29,822	1,163	21,382	4,054	24·90	17·85	136
1939	17,528	17,215	34,743	1,052	21,207	4,258	28·68	17·51	123
1940	15,862	15,440	31,302	981	23,234	5,279	25·68	19·06	169
1941	15,664	15,022	30,686	1,033	23,882	4,412	25·03	19·48	144
1942	14,457	13,362	27,819	940	26,303	4,395	22·66	21·43	158
1943	13,563	12,457	26,020	750	23,802	3,363	21·16	19·35	129
1944	11,283	10,883	22,166	510	22,178	2,781	18·02	18·03	125
WESTERN PROVINCE									
1926[4]	..	..	12,962	..	..	4,590	37·29	..	354
1927[5]	..	..	16,689	..	8,034	5,313	41·97	..	319
1928	12,311	11,780	24,091	..	..	6,533	40·97	..	271
1929	11,888	11,693	23,581	..	..	6,852	38·28	..	291
1930	11,425	10,978	22,403	782	14,086	5,748	34·55	21·69	257
1931	12,036	11,704	23,740	947	15,296	5,771	33·95	21·87	243
1932	10,224	9,502	19,726	600	12,301	3,843	27·92	17·41	195
1933	9,516	9,152	18,668	537	10,849	2,686	26·13	15·18	144
1934	9,817	9,159	18,976	523	12,804	3,226	26·33	17·77	170
1935	9,230	8,940	18,170	548	13,587	3,287	25·05	18·73	181
1936	10,542	9,691	20,233	488	11,191	2,451	27·56	15·24	121
1937	9,761	9,249	19,010	456	11,921	2,494	25·64	16·08	131
1938	11,614	11,184	22,798	629	11,492	2,139	30·29	15·26	94
1939	12,067	11,624	23,691	736	11,506	2,238	30·98	15·05	94
1940	14,603	14,019	28,622	988	14,164	2,674	36·73	18·18	93
1941	13,347	12,788	26,135	1,155	16,451	2,376	33·13	20·85	91
1942	13,012	12,385	25,397	1,212	17,110	2,076	31·86	21·46	82
1943	14,354	14,008	28,362	1,283	14,411	1,945	34·97	17·77	69
1944	11,955	11,716	23,671	1,044	14,803	1,680	28·87	18·05	71

Year	Live-born			Still-born	Deaths Total	Deaths under 1 year	Birth-rate	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate
	Male	Female	Total						
Northern Province									
1926	..	..	21,199	..	..	6,108	32·15	..	288
1927	..	..	23,140	..	..	6,570	34·60	..	284
1928	11,519	11,190	22,709	..	..	5,487	32·64	..	242
1929	12,090	11,702	23,792	..	..	5,241	32·12	..	220
1930	13,117	12,340	25,457	1,294	15,361	6,599	33·97	20·49	259
1931	12,690	11,816	24,506	1,302	16,046	6,336	32·73	21·37	259
1932	13,486	12,802	26,288	1,181	14,693	5,871	34·58	19·32	223
1933	13,524	12,599	26,123	1,143	14,276	5,385	33·83	18·49	206
1934	12,470	11,856	24,326	1,165	17,981	6,614	31·25	23·10	272
1935	13,416	12,959	26,375	1,154	15,255	5,046	33·40	19·31	191
1936	11,783	11,185	22,968	1,019	13,123	4,535	28·73	16·41	197
1937	11,869	11,140	23,009	1,070	14,669	5,057	28·48	18·16	220
1938	12,415	11,860	24,275	1,048	16,554	6,746	29·76	20·29	278
1939	14,541	13,749	28,290	1,148	16,301	6,105	34·19	19·70	216
1940	14,252	13,448	27,700	1,189	14,077	4,661	32·93	16·74	168
1941	15,091	14,098	29,189	1,262	14,348	4,823	34·10	16·76	165
1942	16,124	15,818	31,942	1,359	17,288	6,043	36·69	19·86	189
1943	14,630	14,246	28,878	1,198	19,474	6,281	32·81	22·13	218
1944	13,974	13,085	27,059	1,159	15,864	4,790	30·36	17·80	177
Uganda Protectorate									
1926	..	..	71,487	..	..	19,756	27·40	..	276
1927	..	..	86,003	..	..	22,343	29·94	..	260
1928	46,535	44,833	91,368	..	..	23,239	28·14	..	254
1929	48,541	46,981	95,522	..	..	22,233	28·13	..	233
1930	50,708	49,288	99,996	4,241	75,577	22,365	29·19	22·06	224
1931	51,464	49,833	101,297	4,817	75,499	21,244	29·18	21·75	210
1932	49,977	48,507	98,484	4,598	65,865	17,057	28·11	18·30	173
1933	51,207	49,257	100,464	4,290	65,215	16,139	28·39	18·43	161
1934	47,523	45,187	92,710	3,949	73,254	17,479	26·05	20·58	189
1935	47,984	46,603	94,587	4,144	73,933	15,687	26·43	20·66	166
1936	48,559	46,635	95,194	3,932	70,603	15,102	26·42	19·60	159
1937	47,155	44,914	92,069	3,631	68,735	14,332	25·38	18·95	156
1938	49,764	47,993	97,757	3,512	64,086	14,388	26·70	17·50	147
1939	54,474	52,545	107,019	3,554	63,059	14,002	28·89	17·02	131
1940	54,724	52,527	107,251	3,583	67,831	14,417	28·65	18·12	134
1941	54,620	52,054	106,674	3,834	70,871	13,226	28·23	18·75	124
1942	55,872	53,576	109,448	3,888	85,715	14,985	28·78	22·54	137
1943	56,173	53,655	109,828	3,547	77,102	13,266	28·63	20·10	121
1944	50,940	48,580	99,520	2,970	74,432	11,581	25·78	19·28	116

[1] See *Medical Report 1926*, p. 14; *1927*, pp. 15, 17; *1928*, p. 19; *1929*, p. 18; *1930*, p. 21; *1931*, p. 21; *1932*, pp. 32–3, 35; *1933*, p. 27; *1934*, p. 27; *1935*, p. 30; *1936*, p. 36; *1937*, p. 29; *1938*, pp. 31–2; *1939*, p. 28; *1940*, pp. 7–8; *1941*, p. 6; *1942*, p. 12; *1943*, p. 9; *1944*, p. 11. Lango District was transferred in 1932 from the Eastern to the Northern Province; in order to render the figures comparable I have re-computed those for 1926–31. The Western and Northern Provinces were amalgamated at the beginning of 1939 under the name 'Western Province'; I show the results separately also for 1939–44. (The 1926 and 1927 figures for live-born in the Buganda and Western Provinces do not agree with those given in Table 14, because the above figures were derived from the new returns introduced in 1926.)

[2] All figures excluding Karamoja District.

[3] Bugwere District, no returns received; Soroti District, December quarter not received.

[4] Ankole District, June quarter not received; Kigezi District, no returns received.

[5] Kigezi District, no returns received.

valueless, the percentage rate of still-births to births plus still-births ranging from 0·94 in Kigezi to 10·43 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·97.[1]

1937. The number of still-births reported was 3,631 compared with 3,932 in 1936. The figures are probably not accurate. The percentage rate of still-births to the total of live births and still-births ranges from 0·93 in Kigezi to 9·99 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·79.[2]

1938. The number of still births recorded was 3,512 compared with 3,631 in 1937. The figures are probably not accurate. The percentage of still-births to the total of live births and still-births ranges from 0·90 in Entebbe to 7·66 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·46.[3]

1939. The number of still-births recorded was 3,554 compared with 3,512 in 1938, but these figures are probably not accurate. The percentage of still-births to the total of live births and still-births ranges from 0·25 in Teso to 6·77 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·21.[4]

1940. The number of still-births recorded was 3,583 compared with 3,554 in 1939 but these figures are probably not accurate. The percentage of still-births to the total of live births and still-births ranges from 0·85 in Teso to 10·75 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·23.[5]

1941. The number of still-births recorded was 3,834 compared with 3,583 in 1940 but these figures are probably not accurate. The percentage of still-births to the total of live births and still-births ranges from 0·75[6] in Teso to 6·64 in Bunyoro. The rate for the Protectorate was 3·47.[7]

1942. The number of still-births recorded was 3,888 compared with 3,834 in 1941. The accuracy of the figures reported cannot be vouched for. The still-birth rate for the Protectorate was 3·43, the highest rate being reported from Bunyoro where the rate was 6·58 and the lowest from Teso where it was 0·77. The Bunyoro rate is more likely to be accurate than that from Teso.[8]

1943. Still-births recorded were 3,547. The still-birth rate for the whole country was 3·13 while Bunyoro District maintained its high rate at more than double.[9]

1944. Recorded still-births numbered 2,970. The still-birth rate for the Protectorate was 2·90.[10]

The Medical Reports have given no explanation of the enormous drop in the still-birth rate except for saying that it was due to the introduction of new forms. I do not know the text of the old forms, but the new forms[11] contained the instruction 'Abortions and miscarriages should not be included'. It may well be, therefore, that the high still-birth figures for the earlier years were due to the fact that numerous abortions and miscarriages were considered to be still-births. On the other hand, the exceedingly low figures for some districts in recent years may be due to mistakes in the opposite direction.

General Mortality. Commissioner Sir Harry Johnston, in his reports made in 1900 and 1901, said that civil wars and famines had reduced the population,[12] and that smallpox was 'endemic all over Equatorial

[1] *Medical Report 1936*, p. 34. The still-birth rate was lower in Teso (0·18) and in Budama (0·58) than in Kigezi.
[2] Ibid. *1937*, p. 27. The rate in Teso was only 0·14.
[3] Ibid. *1938*, p. 33. The rate in Teso was 0·31. [4] Ibid. *1939*, p. 25. [5] Ibid. *1940*, p. 9.
[6] Should read 0·73. [7] Ibid. *1941*, p. 4. [8] Ibid. *1942*, p. 7.
[9] Ibid. *1943*, p. 6. The percentage ranged from 0·63 in Teso to 7·01 in Bunyoro.
[10] Ibid. *1944*, p. 7. The percentage ranged from 0·20 in Teso to 8·01 in Bunyoro.
[11] See p. 267 above.
[12] See *Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 5; *Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 15.

Africa'.[1] He did not mention sleeping-sickness, although this disease had already claimed many victims in 1900.[2] The Governor, Sir Hesketh Bell, reported in November 1908:[3]

> In 1900 there were 8,430 deaths; in 1901, 10,384; in 1902, 24,035; in 1903, 30,441; in 1904, 11,251; and during 1905, 8,003.[4] This total of 92,544, however, only represents the loss of life during six years in the Kingdom of Buganda alone. The mortality in Busoga, where statistics have not been available, has probably been quite as great if not greater,[5] and if we also include the deaths that have occurred from sleeping sickness in Unyoro and the Nile District, it may be taken that the total mortality from this scourge in the Uganda Protectorate up to the end of 1906 considerably exceeded 200,000.[6]

During this whole period the epidemic practically ran its course.

> By the end of 1903, the deaths numbered over 90,000, and the Lake shores were fast becoming depopulated. Whole villages were completely exterminated . . . .[7]
>
> No cure has . . . been found and no measures suggested which could usefully be taken by the Administration beyond attempts to prevent the introduction of natives into the fly district. Researches are still being pursued by experts on the spot.[8]
>
> We have now been confronted with this appalling epidemic for two and a-half years, and the pity of it is that we are still unable to devise any means to arrest its progress or mitigate its ravages. All who are seized with the fell disease are doomed to die; all we can do is to hope to keep it within what are now fairly defined limits, and to discourage as far as possible communication with the infected areas. The former depends a great deal more on the fly than on us, and the latter is a precaution, and nothing more, which is likely to have but little practical result.[9]
>
> Unless the laborious researches of the Commission appointed by the Royal Society to investigate the disease result in the discovery of a remedy, I fear there is no course but to let the epidemic run its course and work itself out—practically what is now being done with the plague in India.[10]
>
> In my reports for the last two years . . . I gave full accounts of the appearance and spread of this dread epidemic in the Protectorate, and discussed the question as to whether any remedial measures were possible. The conclusions arrived at were not hopeful; no remedy has been found; and such measures as segregation and attempting to confine the population of the affected and non-affected districts within their areas were not found to be practicable.[11]

[1] See ibid., p. 21. The ravages of smallpox in Uganda had been noticed by the first Europeans who went there. See, for example, Wilson and Felkin, vol. i, p. 183; vol. ii, pp. 48, 97.

[2] Dr. Cook was evidently mistaken when he wrote: 'That disease was not known to exist in Uganda previous to 1901' (*Uganda Memories*, p. 161).

[3] *Report on the Measures Adopted for the Suppression of Sleeping Sickness in Uganda*, p. 8.

[4] In 1906 the recorded deaths numbered 5,304; see *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1909–10*, p. 24.

[5] See also *Report on Measures*, p. 26: '. . . the terrible disease which during the past ten years has wiped out more than two-thirds of the population of the Lake shore. . . . It is estimated that between 1898 and 1906 more than 200,000 souls died from sleeping sickness in Buganda and Busoga.'

[6] See also Churchill, *My African Journey*, p. 98: 'By the end of 1905 considerably more than two hundred thousand persons had perished in the plague-stricken regions out of a population in those regions which could not have exceeded three hundred thousands.' The estimates of the number of deaths vary. See, for example, *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 56: '. . . there is always present the fear of another outbreak such as that of the years 1901 to 1905, when it is said that more than 300,000 people died in the islands of Lake Victoria and the low-lying countries surrounding the lake.'

[7] *Report on Measures*, p. 5.

[8] *Memorandum on the State of the African Protectorates administered under the Foreign Office* (1904), p. 5.

[9] Report by Principal Medical Officer, *General Report on the Uganda Protectorate* 1903–4, p. 14.

[10] Ibid., p. 15.

[11] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1904–5*, p. 23.

The decrease in the number of deaths in the Kingdom of Buganda in 1904 and 1905 is not believed to have been due to any diminution in the virulence of the disease. In my report to the Earl of Elgin, dated 23rd November, 1906, I wrote: 'The natives have been almost completely wiped out everywhere along the Lake shore, and in the islands the mortality has been even more appalling . . . .'[1]

Finally, after the death of something like a quarter of a million natives, measures were taken to prevent a further spread of the disease.

The end of the year [1906] was marked by the inauguration of the measure for the complete evacuation by the inhabitants of the fly-infested shores of the Lake, thus removing at one swoop the main source of infection.[2]

It was estimated that, at the end of 1906, over 100,000 souls were still living within constant reach of the tsetse flies. Of these about 30,000 inhabited the islands in the Victoria Nyanza, while the remainder were occupying homesteads and villages either on the immediate Lake shore, or on the banks of the Nile and of other fly-infested rivers.[3]

. . . nearly 100,000 persons were induced to abandon their homes and plantations at the simple bidding of the British administration.[4]

From 1906 on, more or less complete records of deaths from sleeping-sickness have been available for the whole Protectorate. The total numbers in 1906–12 were 6,522, 4,175, 3,662, 1,782, 1,546, 1,487, and 932 respectively.[5] But the Medical Report for 1912 contained still a note of warning:

Sleeping sickness, though its prevalence has enormously diminished, is, in the absence of a cure, and with the continued presence of the carrier in the infected areas, only held at bay by our present measures, and the strictest precaution should therefore be used in relaxing existing regulations in regard to it.[6]

However, the number of recorded deaths continued to decrease and dropped to 69 in 1920.[7] By that time it was considered safe to start the repopulation of the evacuated areas, but it was done on a small scale only. The Sesse Islands, which in 1900 carried at least 20,000 inhabitants, 'now have a population of about 4,000'.[8] Large areas of the south of Busoga District, 'formerly well cultivated are now, owing to sleeping sickness, almost uninhabited and have reverted to heavy bush or secondary forest'.[9] In some areas the disease still to-day causes great concern.

1937. Trypanosomiasis, though its incidence has declined, still remains a major problem in the West Nile district. The area, however, which is now most affected is not the same as last year, indeed the Koich valley which in 1936 was a serious source of worry, has been largely depopulated owing to the gradual voluntary movement of people southward. This has introduced a new difficulty because, around the large clearings made on the Koich river for the protection of those crossing it, there is at the present time so small a number of inhabitants as to be insufficient to maintain the clearings, and it seems probable that some concentration of the population will be necessary to protect it from the tsetse fly. Again, the movement of people into new areas has increased the incidence of trypanosomiasis in these parts, either

[1] *Report on Measures*, p. 8.
[2] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1906–7*, p. 22. This measure had been proposed by Sir Hesketh Bell in a Dispatch to Lord Elgin of 23 Nov. 1906; see *Report on Measures*, pp. 10–11.
[3] Ibid., p. 13.
[4] Ibid., p. 19.
[5] See *Medical Report 1920*, p. 12.
[6] Ibid. *1912*, p. 8.
[7] Ibid. *1920*, p. 12.
[8] Thomas and Scott, *Uganda* (1935), p. 430.
[9] Ibid., p. 434.

from infections acquired on the Koich river but undetected until arrival in the new area, or from infections acquired on the rivers in the newly-settled country.[1]

The Medical Report for 1939 took a more optimistic view.

In the West Nile District, which is still the chief focus of this disease in the Protectorate, it is pleasing to record that the progressive diminution in the number of new cases shown in the previous two years has been continued this year and only 475 new cases were found.[2]

This progressive decrease is all the more significant when it is remembered that during the past three years the periodical examinations of the population have been increasing in thoroughness, until now it may confidently be asserted that few cases can escape detection.[3]

But later reports were more realistic.

1941. The third event, which has not only taken up the full-time services of one Medical Officer (which has thereby deprived a district of one) but which will also require extra staff, probably for some years, is the recrudescence of sleeping sickness in Busoga. This is attributable primarily to the clandestine visits of Kavirondo fishermen, and though these have now all been repatriated, the damage has been done and the number of cases of the disease which systematic search has produced to date is 295, including 34 deaths.[4]

514 cases were reported from Busoga district. These occurred at first on the shore of Lake Victoria and were clinically of the type caused by *T. gambiense*. Towards the end of the year cases were discovered at some distance from the lake and presented the clinical picture of the Rhodesian type of the disease. The diagnosis of *T. rhodesiense* was confirmed by animal inoculation and at the end of the year the epidemic showed no signs of abating. In the West Nile district the incidence continues to decrease, 304 cases being reported as compared with 355 in 1940.[5]

1942. Sleeping Sickness which re-appeared in the Busoga District of the Eastern Province towards the end of 1941 continued to give cause for alarm. The number of new infections reported remained high during the first quarter of the year, the peak being reached in March. The infection extended from the Busoga District to the Central District and across the Kenya border. In all 1,838 cases were reported from the Eastern Province, 1,112 of which occurred before the end of March. . . .

209 deaths due to sleeping sickness were recorded in the Eastern Province.

The incidence of the disease in the West Nile District continues to diminish. 246 cases were reported compared with 304 in 1941. . . .

In Toro there were 106 cases compared with 62 in the previous year. The area affected remains small. The increase in cases recorded is considered to be due to a more careful examination of the population in the infected area. A few cases have been reported from Mengo and Masaka Districts, in the Buganda Province and from Bunyoro and Acholi in the Western Province but the position gives no cause for alarm.[6]

The recent epidemic is not altogether similar to that we had some years ago for *T. rhodesiense* is the trypanosome responsible on this occasion. The trypanosome in the last epidemic was the *T. gambiense*. So far as I am aware this is the first time that a serious epidemic has been caused in this country by the *T. rhodesiense*. This trypanosome is responsible for the sleeping sickness epidemics that have occurred in Tanganyika, the Rhodesias and Nyasaland and in these countries it was spread by *G. morsitans*. In Uganda the infection is being transmitted by *G. palpalis*, the

[1] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 10.

[2] The numbers of new cases found in the West Nile District in 1935–8 were 568, 1,867, 700, and 656 respectively; see ibid. *1939*, p. 17.

[3] Ibid., p. 32.

[4] Acting Director Medical Services, 12 Dec. 1941, *Legislative Council, 21st Session, 1st, 2nd and 3rd Meetings*, p. 44.

[5] *Medical Report 1941*, pp. 1–2.

[6] Ibid. *1942*, pp. 4–5.

tsetse fly so far associated in the minds of scientists with the spread of *T. gambiense*. That *G. palpalis* could transmit *T. rhodesiense* was indicated to us by Dr. Duke from work done in our Trypanosomiasis Research Laboratory in Entebbe. It will be difficult to prove now how *T. rhodesiense* entered the Busoga District but it must have come here in a labourer with the parasite in his blood entering this district from across our borders. Now that we have the infection in this country we must take every possible step to ensure that it is not passed to other parts of the country infested with *G. palpalis* and to areas infested with *G. morsitans*. We have areas infested with *G. morsitans*. The possibility that *G. pallidipes* was a factor in the spread of sleeping sickness in Busoga has been mentioned by our observers but proof is not available yet. This tsetse fly is associated with diseases of cattle and is not uncommon through parts of the territory. Should this tsetse prove to be a transmitter of *T. rhodesiense* our dangers will be increased. We cannot therefore 'let up' in any way on our control measures.[1]

1943. Eastern Province.—In the Busoga epidemic area there has been a general downward trend of new cases. An upward course in the period June–August rapidly corrected itself and the figures of diagnosed cases for the first and last months of the year—January 68, December 19 (including relapses)—are probably a true representation of the course of this particular epidemic. Control measures have not yet been relaxed.

Dr. Jackson of the Tanganyika Territory, Tsetse Research Unit, visited the area in April and under his direction experiments were instituted from which two definite facts emerged (*a*) *G. pallidipes* is a natural transmitter of *T. rhodesiense* and (*b*) that the earlier supposition that *G. palpalis* is also a vector has not been confirmed. The work in connection with the breeding range of *G. palpalis* is being continued: latest observations show that in Busoga at least breeding can take place 12 miles from the nearest water.

Buganda Province.—Buvuma Island which lies south of Jinja and is readily accessible to the Busoga coast by canoe, became infected probably late in 1942 and the first case was diagnosed in February, 1943. Intensive measures were immediately instituted and the outbreak was limited to 36 cases. Here the vector was undoubtedly *G. pallidipes* which has a foothold on the northern part of the island but so far has not penetrated through the dense forest belt which crosses the northern part from coast to coast.[2]

Other Areas.—The position in the other endemic areas shows no material change.[3]

1944. The sustained reduction in the incidence of cases of human trypanosomiasis gives cause for satisfaction, but the infection persists in certain areas. *T. rhodesiense* infections continued to occur in Busoga and Mbale districts and on Buvuma Island in the Mengo district. In all these areas 150 new cases were reported, 37 proving fatal. *T. gambiense* infections continued in the following districts; West Nile, Acholi, Bunyoro, Ankole and Toro. In the West Nile 148 new cases occurred but no deaths were reported. In the other districts there were 69 cases in all with 5 deaths.

The finding reported previously that *G. pallidipes* was responsible for the spread of *T. rhodesiense* in Busoga and elsewhere, has led to a more careful study by medical entomologists of this species of tsetse. More attention has also been given to *G. morsitans*. While the entomological staff has not been increased and therefore surveys made have been limited in extent, considerable evidence has accumulated that both these species of tsetse fly have spread in recent years and that during the

[1] Director Medical Services, 14 Dec. 1942, *Legislative Council, 22nd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 39. See also ibid., p. 6.

[2] See also Director Medical Services, 20 Dec. 1943, *Legislative Council, 23rd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 42: 'Turning to epidemic diseases sleeping sickness appeared on Buvuma Island at the beginning of the year and caused very considerable anxiety to the Medical Department and the Administration of Buganda, as it was feared that it would extend on to the Buganda coast where there is to-day a considerable population living in contact with tsetse fly.'

[3] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 4. For further details see *Report on a Visit to Uganda and Kenya* by S. Napier Bax, pp. 2–45.

past year their advance has been even faster than was considered likely. *G. morsitans* is deploying from the north and west and invading ever increasing areas of Acholi, Lango, Karamoja and the county of Buruli in Buganda, while *G. Pallidipes* has in recent times occupied the two counties of Buruli and Bugerere in Buganda and is suspected to be in the counties of Kyagwe and Bulemezi, also in Buganda. While this expansion of tsetse is a menace to the health of the human population, it has already decimated the cattle in the areas infested.[1]

Certain questions asked me in Finance Committee indicated that members of this Council, and possibly the public, have for long been unaware how large a part of this territory is still affected by human trypanosomiasis, and how great a menace this infection continues to be to our human population. The districts from which cases of human trypanosomiasis were reported over this year alone are: Mengo, Busoga, Mbale, Acholi, West Nile, Madi, Bunyoro, Ankole and Toro. Although the infection from these areas is not a new occurrence it is widespread, and I am pleased to be able to say that the number of cases reported in all districts I have mentioned show a considerable reduction on past figures due, I firmly believe, to the maintenance of the control measures which we introduced some years ago and have persisted with.

The infections in all districts other than Mengo, Busoga, and Mbale are of *t. gambiense* spread by *g. palpalis*, a tsetse fly that seldom wanders far away from water in our lakes and rivers. In Mengo, Mbale and Busoga we now have to deal with *t. rhodesiense*, an infection we are satisfied is transmitted by *g. pallidipes*, a tsetse capable of wandering freely and now proved to be extending its area of occupation through large parts of the territory. Honourable members may like to know that it was only last year that we were satisfied that *g. pallidipes* was carrying *t. rhodesiense*, and it is less than four years ago since the first person infected with *t. rhodesiense* was found in this territory. The measures we have been able to take against *g. palpalis* are not altogether suitable for the control of *g. pallidipes* and I must admit that we live to-day in constant fear that infected tsetse fly of the last mentioned species may pass into areas now not affected with the *rhodesiense* form of trypanosome.[2]

[1] *Medical Report 1944*, p. 6.

[2] Director Medical Services, 18 Dec. 1944, *Legislative Council, 24th Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 66. He said, furthermore, as regards trypanosomiasis in cattle and the spread of the tsetse fly in areas known to be not infested previously: 'Within recent months tsetse fly has spread, we believe, from Busoga into the Bugerere Saza of Buganda and has caused a considerable epidemic of trypanosomiasis in the cattle population of the district. The epidemic has been so severe that we fear that the whole cattle population of the area will be decimated. There have also been reports of spread of tsetse fly from the Buruli Saza into the Saza of Bulemezi, and more recent information indicates that there has been a spread of *g. pallidipes* across the Nile from Busoga into the Saza of Kyagwe. We have long known that tsetse fly, this time *g. morsitans*, is spreading in Karamoja, Lango and Acholi, but recent surveys we have made, some in co-operation with the Tsetse Research Department of Tanganyika, indicates that the spread in these areas is becoming more rapid and that to-day there is considerable danger that very large parts of these districts now unaffected will become unsuitable for cattle and that there is a grave risk that the infection will spread into Teso.' (Ibid., pp. 66–7.) A Nominated Member said at the same meeting: 'I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the tsetse menace is a bigger menace to East Africa to-day than was the Italian army in Abyssinia in 1940!' (Ibid., p. 52.)

The spread of the tsetse fly was also discussed at great length by the Veterinary Officer in his *Report on Livestock Production in Uganda*. He said, for example (p. 29): 'The annually increasing menace of tsetse and trypanosomiasis to the cattle population in Uganda, together with its effects upon economic and sociological problems, cannot be stressed too strongly. Today Teso District is the one remaining area in Uganda which is not infested to a greater or lesser degree by this scourge, and even this district is now menaced by tsetse expansion towards its northern boundaries. It is estimated that at least half of the total area of the Protectorate is now uninhabitable to cattle, and the whole livestock industry is threatened by tsetse encroachment upon the remaining cattle producing areas. It should be appreciated that the indirect effects of a tsetse belt extend far beyond the limits of tsetse infestation, in that trypanosomiasis will occur amongst herds of cattle considerable distances from the original source of infection.' See also *Joint Report of Finance Committee and Development and Welfare Committee on Post-War Development*,

Another disease which has caused many deaths in this century is plague. 'There appears to have been no case of the disease recorded in the Protectorate in the years 1900 to 1905 inclusive, and the present endemic had its origin in Mbale in 1906.'[1] The actual number of deaths is, of course, unknown. The reported numbers were as follows:[2]

Year	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*
1910	3,623	1917	4,031	1924	810	1931	2,299	1938	376
1911	3,734	1918	2,493	1925	869	1932	990	1939	308
1912	3,100	1919	1,022	1926	1,589	1933	833	1940	268
1913	3,292	1920	1,732	1927	1,863	1934	937	1941	213
1914	3,725	1921	5,871	1928	1,174	1935	1,871	1942	338
1915	4,028	1922	1,305	1929	5,118	1936	929	1943	..
1916	4,384	1923	914	1930	2,370	1937	478	1944	7

The Medical Report for 1935 stated:[3]

Once again plague has shown a marked rise in incidence. It had been hoped that the control measures suggested by Sir Edward Thornton when he visited the country in 1930[4] had been successful in reducing the plague menace to a relatively minor problem, but it is now evident that the decline in the number of cases of plague was not associated with these control measures but was merely due to the fall in an epidemic wave. We have now apparently reached the ascending portion of the next wave, and the most alarming feature of the outbreak has been the large area over which sporadic cases have been found. There has been no suggestion of a central focus with a spread centrifugally. Cases have occurred first in one place, then perhaps twelve miles away, then perhaps three miles away, and a month later perhaps close to the original focus.

The Report for 1937 said:

It seems probable that Plague is undergoing its periodic fall in incidence and that the decrease in the number of cases this year is attributable to this and not to any real improvement in its control, for as has again and again been pointed out in these reports, that will only become effective when the African builds for himself a house which contains no real harbourage for rats, and adopts habits of food storage and refuse disposal which deprive the rodent of any food. The elimination of plague in the absence of some, at present unforeseen, epoch-making discovery is not therefore likely to be effected for many years.[5]

The number of cases has decreased considerably since 1942.

1943. The decrease in the incidence of plague in 1943 has been dramatic. In 1943 only 19 cases have been reported, all from the Mengo district. The figures for that

2nd ed., p. 95: 'Until recently rinderpest was considered to be the greatest enemy of livestock but, with the introduction of goat virus as a means of immunization, the control of this disease has been simplified, and it no longer sweeps over the countryside taking its toll in thousands every year. Its place, as a bar to progress, has been taken by trypanosomiasis, and this disease now exists in either acute or chronic form in every District of the Protectorate, except one, this being due to the widespread movement of trade stock and the steady expansion of fly belts.' It should be noted, however, that the Acting Governor, on 5 Dec. 1944, said that 'Rinderpest, due chiefly to the movement of infected game and to a lesser extent the movement of stock, continued to spread . . .' (*Legislative Council, 24th Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 2).

[1] Thomas and Scott, p. 309.

[2] See *Medical Report 1925*, p. 16; *1938*, p. 22; *1940*, p. 5; *1941*, p. 2; *1942*, p. 5; *1944*, p. 6.

[3] Ibid. *1935*, p. 9.

[4] 'Acting on the recommendation of Sir E. Thornton the practice of burning or dethatching huts for the purposes of disinfection has been replaced by the use of cyanogas' (ibid. *1931*, p. 28).

[5] Ibid. *1937*, p. 11.

district in 1941 and 1942 were 215 and 315. We should like to interpret the sudden drop as proof that years of departmental propaganda, education and supervision have at last borne fruit but it would be wiser, while recording the figures, to postpone any attempt at final conclusions until the normal cycles in endemic areas have had time to operate.[1]

1944. The steady decrease in the number of cases of plague has continued and only seven cases were reported, all from Mengo district. The mortality rate was 100%. While it is true to say that improved housing conditions are tending to reduce the rat population in living quarters, progress made up to date in this direction cannot be held as wholly accountable for the steady decline in the incidence of the disease.[2]

As in other colonies, the first World War and its aftermath proved fatal to many natives. 'In all, some 191,600 of the people of Uganda served in the war, of whom 11,000 were combatants and 117,819 were employed in the essential transport services of the various Columns.'[3]

1917. Syphilis is responsible for the greatest number of deaths. The special work in connection with venereal diseases was, unfortunately, unavoidably stopped at the beginning of the war by the removal of the greater part of the Medical Staff for military service . . . .[4]

Epidemics of Cerebro Spinal Meningitis and Smallpox have been very widely spread during the latter part of the year especially in the Northern and Eastern Provinces and it is impossible to estimate accurately the number of deaths in the outlying districts. The Medical Officer, Gulu, estimates that at least 5,000 natives have died of Cerebro Spinal Meningitis alone in the area under his charge, *i.e.*, West Nile, Gulu and Kitgum during 1917, while the District Commissioner, West Nile, estimates 3,000 in the West Nile alone.[5] The large increase in epidemic diseases is undoubtedly chiefly due to the war owing firstly to the large increase in the movements of the native population, *e.g.*, recruiting for King's African Rifles, secondly to the shortage of Medical Staff. Even in pre-war times (with 23 Medical Officers) our staff has never been sufficiently numerous to attempt to cope with diseases in the more distant parts of any district,[6] for a Medical Officer becomes each year more and more tied by his routine duties to his station, but during 1917 the staff has been reduced to such a very small number both as regards Medical Officers (7 only) and Indian Assistants, that it has been impossible to do all that should have been done.

Another factor in the spread of smallpox has been the inefficiency of the vaccine lymph.[7]

1919. Influenza . . . which visited the Protectorate towards the end of 1918, spread over the whole country and caused thousands of deaths. It is difficult to estimate accurately what the number was, but, judging from reports received, it must have reached 25,000.[8]

Dr. Cook, in a pamphlet published in December 1918, said:

Those of us who have lived in Uganda for the last twenty years or more, have keenly realized the forces making for depopulation. It is even doubtful whether the

[1] Ibid. *1943*, p. 3.
[2] Ibid. *1944*, p. 6.
[3] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1929*, p. 5.
[4] *Medical Report 1917*, p. 9.
[5] But see also *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1917–18*, p. 7: 'It is estimated that not less than 5,000 deaths took place from this disease in the districts of Gulu and Kitgum, whilst in the Arua District of the West Nile it is considered that 3,000 natives have died from this cause.'
[6] See also *Medical Report 1912*, p. 8: 'In outlying districts of immense area, where, owing to limited staff, a Medical Officer can rarely be present, it is extremely difficult to control the prevalence of disease and to prevent the existence of permanent foci for the spread of diseases which are of an endemic or infectious nature.'
[7] Ibid. *1917*, p. 11.
[8] Ibid. *1919*, p. 11; see also ibid., p. 30. The epidemic persisted into 1920 (see ibid. *1920*, p. 10). The reported numbers of deaths from smallpox in 1916–20 were 2,118, 4,178, 8,270, 1,840, and 578 respectively; see ibid., p. 13.

dreadful ravages of the slave trade in Central African countries like Uganda, have accomplished more destruction than the epidemics of recent years. Since 1900, sleeping sickness, plague, cerebro-spinal fever, dysentery, smallpox, and recently influenza, have added their quota of destruction to the loss of life caused by the war.[1]

The Colonial Reports say repeatedly that 'the year 1919 was marked by a famine of unusual severity, causing many deaths from starvation',[2] but I found no estimate of the total deaths.[3]

During the second World War health conditions deteriorated likewise. One cause was the depletion of the medical and sanitary staff.

Every endeavour has been made to maintain district medical activities at pre-war standards but there is little doubt that while work at hospitals has been kept efficient, rural areas have suffered consequent upon an enforced reduction in touring by European personnel due as much to the difficulty of maintaining effective transport as to pressure of other duties.[4]

The spread of venereal diseases and sleeping-sickness has been discussed above.[5] Regarding other diseases a few statements may be reproduced here.

Malaria. 1944. . . . during the first half of this year we had what must be described as a severe epidemic, mainly in the Buganda Kingdom and in the Busoga District. Over this period we had a rapid rise of infections causing serious symptoms, both in rural areas and in townships which ordinarily have been kept comparatively free of such infections.[6]

Malaria appeared in epidemic form and even township areas protected by permanent drainage schemes and routine oiling, were affected. The epidemic was fostered by unusual rains. . . .

In Kigezi, which is a highland area, malaria was reported in areas previously considered free of the disease. Investigations proved that cases were occurring in the vicinity of swamps, which were being partly drained and cultivated to produce increased crops of sweet potatoes. Dissections of *anopheles* caught in huts in the affected area incriminated as the vector *Anopheles christyi*, a species not previously considered dangerous.[7]

Malaria is almost certainly our most serious disease for it occurs throughout the country, and directly and indirectly takes a greater toll of life from both indigenous and non-indigenous sections of the population than any other disease or infection. It must be the subject of very careful research by a team of workers for we have little knowledge of how the disease should be attacked in rural areas. Much has been done in the past, but there still remains much to do to remove the infection from in and around our towns.[8]

Relapsing Fever. 1943. The control of relapsing fever has become one of our major problems and there has been a pronounced increase of cases microscopically diagnosed over previous years. Indications of a spread to Busoga are particularly alarming.[9]

[1] Cook, *Uganda Memories*, pp. 325–6.

[2] See *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1920*, p. 5, to *1926*, p. 5; *1927*, p. 4; *1928*, p. 5.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1918–19*, p. 5, says that '4,419 deaths are estimated to have occurred before the close of the year in the Busoga, Bukedi and Teso districts as the result of starvation'.

[4] *Medical Report 1944*, p. 1. See also ibid. *1941*, p. 1; *1942*, p. 1; *1943*, p. 1.

[5] See pp. 279, 291–3.

[6] Director Medical Services, 18 Dec. 1944, *Legislative Council, 24th Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 65.

[7] *Medical Report 1944*, p. 5.

[8] *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services* (1944), p. 60.

[9] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1942*, p. 5.

1944. The spread of relapsing fever to areas not previously infested with *Ornithodorus moubata* continues to present a serious problem.[1]

Dysentery. 1943. Dysenteries show an increased incidence.[2]

1944. During the last few months we have had to face an acute epidemic of dysentery in the Kigezi District: in the month of October alone the disease was reported as being responsible for over 900 deaths. Laboratory investigations have proved that the infective organism is the *shiga* bacillus, a comparatively rare infection in our territory. . . .[3]

Cerebro-spinal Meningitis. 1942. 606 cases with 204 deaths were reported as compared with 112 cases with 38 deaths during 1941. The number of deaths recorded is high in view of the availability of effective drugs for the treatment of this disease but this can be explained by the fact that a number of cases were reported either in a dying state or actually dead. The majority of the cases occurred in the Teso and Busoga Districts of the Eastern Province from which 179 and 189 cases were notified respectively. A large number of the cases reported from Busoga occurred in the large military camp maintained there, where in spite of preventive measures sporadic cases continued to occur with small epidemics interspersed.[4]

1943. A fulminance of endemic conditions in regard to this disease among certain of the backward tribes occurred in the middle of the year. The number of cases returned was 1,191 with 227 deaths.[5]

1944. 1,850 cases with 217 deaths were laid to the account of this disease. The area most affected was Teso district where 783 cases and 65 deaths occurred. Acholi had 334 cases with 51 deaths and the West Nile 387 cases and 79 deaths. Most of the cases that ended fatally were either reported after death had occurred or at a late stage of the disease.[6]

Trachoma.—Trachoma has always been appreciated as an important cause of invaliding and blindness in Uganda but this year, as a result of direct observation while examining recruits for H.M. Forces, the Assistant Medical Officer in Karamoja has drawn attention to the very great prevalence of the disease there. He estimates that in some areas as many as 70 % of the population are suffering from the disease in one of its forms and he has, of his own initiative, instituted a campaign of personal prophylaxis. This is given special emphasis as it is an example of the potentiality of the right type of our young African doctors observing independently and using his influence among his own people.[7]

Tuberculosis. There is a general opinion that tuberculosis is spreading in the country, for the number of cases treated in our hospitals has increased in recent years.[8]

Digestive Diseases. 1943. The prevalence of famine conditions in some districts contributed to an increase in the incidence of digestive troubles.[9]

1944. The continuance of famine conditions for a period with dietary imbalance were, in some measure, responsible for the maintenance at a high level of digestive disorders.[10]

As in other countries in East Africa ankylostomiasis is most common in Uganda, but opinion regarding its effects on the population seems to have changed of late.

1933. The observations made in recent years were borne out during 1933 by the

[1] Ibid. *1944*, p. 5. See also Director of Medical Services, 18 Dec. 1944, *Legislative Council, 24th Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 65.

[2] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 5.

[3] Director of Medical Services, 18 Dec. 1944, *Legislative Council, 24th Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 66.

[4] *Medical Report 1942*, pp. 5–6.

[5] Ibid. *1943*, p. 5.

[6] Ibid. *1944*, p. 6.

[7] Ibid. *1943*, p. 5.

[8] *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services*, p. 36.

[9] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 3.

[10] Ibid. *1944*, p. 4.

investigations of medical officers working in different parts of Uganda, who confirmed the fact that helminthic disease was widespread, particularly ancylostomiasis. In certain districts, notably Busoga, it is thought that the incidence must approximate to 100 per cent. Medical officers expressed the opinion that although it did not often appear in the medical returns ancylostomiasis was probably the most important factor contributing to the general debility which is common in Uganda.[1]

1934. As a cause of inefficiency, it is probably second only to malaria.[2]

1935. Ancylostomiasis causes a considerable amount of debility among the peoples of Uganda.[3]

1936. The District Medical Officer, Kigezi, considers ancylostomiasis uncommon in his district, but in most other districts the infection is reported to be wide-spread, but to cause little disability. It is probable, however, that infestation is responsible for some degree of ill-health.[4]

1937–1941. Although the infection appears to be wide-spread, medical officers report that as a rule it causes little disability.[5]

1942. Helminthic infections are common throughout the Protectorate, no district can be considered to be free of hook-worm and round worm infections. Schistosomiasis is reported to be increasing. Tape worm is common in Ankole and the parts of the country occupied by Nilotics. Guinea worm occurs in Nilotic areas in the north and west. Onchocerciasis is being found to be far more common than we had believed in the past. It is specially common amongst the people living along the River Nile in the Busoga District.[6]

The question of adequate nutrition has apparently caused concern only in recent years. The Medical Report for 1932 could still contain the following passage:

In Sir Albert Cook's report upon the work of the Lady Coryndon Maternity Training Centre, he included some valuable observations upon problems connected with child-birth and conditions affecting birth, death and maternal and infantile mortality rates. These are printed below:—

'Thanks to the tropical sunshine, so rich in ultra-violet rays, to the universal habit of breast feeding and to the national diet, so opulent in vitamins, rickets is excessively rare. . . .'[7]

But the Report for the following year said:

The chief relation food appeared to bear to disease in Uganda was that the lack of suitable food was undoubtedly a contributory factor in the under-nourishment, debility and anæmia so often seen. The diet of the natives of Uganda consists mainly of carbohydrates and is deficient in fats and protein since few of them get meat and fewer still drink milk.[8]

The Nutrition Sub-Committee of the Uganda Agricultural Survey Committee stated:

Our knowledge of the nutrition of the African is limited and what work has been done indicates that there is a very considerable amount of ill-health due to lack of vitamins and possibly minerals in the diets now consumed.[9]

[1] *Medical Report 1933*, p. 33.
[2] Ibid. *1934*, p. 24.
[3] Ibid. *1935*, p. 27.
[4] Ibid. *1936*, p. 33.
[5] Ibid. *1937*, p. 26; *1938*, p. 30; *1939*, p. 25; *1940*, p. 6; *1941*, p. 4.
[6] Ibid. *1942*, p. 7. See also ibid. *1943*, p. 5.
[7] Ibid. *1932*, p. 48.
[8] Ibid. *1933*, p. 36. See also ibid. *1934*, p. 36, *1935*, p. 42, the statements regarding scurvy in children.
[9] *Report*, pp. 9–10. See also ibid., pp. 3, 5, 16, and *An Investigation into Health and Agriculture in Teso*, pp. 3, 13–14, 21, 23.

The Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire said (1939):[1]

The native dietary is primarily vegetarian and consists chiefly of bulky carbohydrate foods. . . .

The published investigations of Loewenthal, Mitchell, Owen, Hennessey, and others[2] indicate that there exists a very considerable amount of ill-health due to lack of first-class protein, fat, vitamins and possibly of minerals in the diets now consumed.[3]

The Medical Report for 1939 said:

Of all the problems which confront the Department none is of greater importance than the removal of the condition of sub-nutrition which is so prevalent among the local African tribes. It is safe to say that if the general level of nutrition among the people could be raised the incidence and severity of the common African diseases would be greatly diminished.[4]

A *Review of Nutrition in Uganda*, recently prepared by the Nutrition Committee, said among other things:

The Initial Stages.—It is both the privilege and the penalty of nutritional research in Uganda, as in other parts of the tropics, that it has grown up under the influence of the knowledge of mal-nutrition as seen in the more temperate parts of the world. Thus doctors came to the tropics with adequate knowledge of the mal-nutritional diseases of the temperate regions and as they did not find signs of rickets, pellagra, scurvy, and even no beri-beri, which is a disease of the rice-eaters of the East, the conclusion was formed in certain quarters that there existed little malnutritional disease in the natives of the tropics. At the same time there was much ill-health, but this was ascribed to the presence of tropical parasitic complaints. Tropical medicine grew up under the influence of the knowledge of parasitology and almost all our efforts were directed towards the reduction of parasitic complaints such as malaria, helminthic disorders and so on. Public health has therefore largely been dominated by the desire to decrease infectious and parasitic disorders and has taken but little note of the need of an improved diet.

The Prisons.—The first section of the community in which nutritional disease was detected was in the inmates of the prisons. This was probably due to the fact that these people were more closely supervised than persons in the general population, and at the same time it was probable that from time to time the diet of the prisoners suffered seriously by reason of a shortage of supply and also because it was not always appreciated that it was necessary to provide a balanced diet in the case of Africans, who were thought to be quite healthy on a diet of one or two staple carbohydrates. . . .

Anaemia.—The problem that lay in front of much of this study of malnutrition was that very little was known of the normal African standards in health, so that it became impossible to state when a state of slight malnutrition was present. . . .

It soon became apparent that the problem of anaemia could not be studied in isolation and that it was necessary to consider whether cases of anaemia did not present other signs of deficiency.

A Common Malnutritional Syndrome found in Tropical Africa.—In most countries the advance in the study of malnutrition has usually followed the recognition of one prevalent type when it has been slowly recognised that large sections of the population suffer from a milder state of the same deficiency. In the tropics of Africa reports have come in during recent years that a new type of malnutrition should be recognised in these parts and that it is very common. Reports have come from

[1] *First Report*, Part II, p. 19.

[2] A brief abstract of these investigations is given in Uganda Protectorate, Agricultural Survey Committee, *Report of the Nutrition Sub-Committee*, pp. 6–8.

[3] See also *Medical Report 1936*, p. 50; *1937*, p. 39; *1938*, p. 42.

[4] Ibid. *1939*, p. 4. For malnutrition, particularly among schoolchildren, see ibid. *1942*, p. 8.

Kenya where observations were first made in East Africa; they have been confirmed in West Africa and in the Belgian Congo and in Tanganyika; and at last reports have come in from South Africa. They all report the same clinical picture; and there is a general agreement that this is a new clinical entity. . . .[1]

This aspect of malnutrition must be regarded as only at its inception and must await further confirmation. Nevertheless the syndrome occurs very frequently in babies of one or two years of age, and in them it is shown as a brownness of the hair and a pallor of the skin. These babies if weighed are found to be from 30–60 % under the anticipated weight for babies of the same age and it appears probable that the cause of the high infant mortality among African children lies in the elucidation of this syndrome. The majority of children in Buganda show signs of this disease in the second year.

Agricultural. It is axiomatic that malnutrition in any part of the world may be due to defects in quality, quantity or both and, as far as Uganda is concerned, the greater divergence of conditions which exist makes it impossible to generalise as to which factor, or factors, must predominantly operate.

It may be said, broadly speaking, that in the elephant grass, plantain areas any malnutrition would tend to be due to quality; whereas, in the short grass areas of poorer soil and less dependable rainfall, large numbers of people are underfed in every way. Apart from less favourable conditions for growing crops in the short grass areas the dry season is longer and more pronounced than in the plantain areas; this entails longer storage and if the harvest has not been too good the seed reserve for the following season is encroached upon. The result of this is less crops sown (and if these fail in any way a resowing may not be possible) hence another small crop and a vicious circle which is difficult to break through and which may become accepted as a normal state of affairs. . . .[2]

Recent reports have discussed at great length the generally low state of health of the Africans. Some quotations may serve as an illustration.

How bad the general physical condition of the African in Uganda really is has been suspected by all who have close contact with him but experience in recruiting during this war—as indeed in the last—has proved beyond dispute that a thoroughly fit native of Uganda is rare.[3] The greater part of the population shows signs of defective nutrition which is hardly surprising as from birth they are ordinarily sustained on a deficient diet. While nutrition might be considered a major problem it is not the whole picture, for besides lacking good food the population is almost universally infected with intestinal and blood parasites and lives in unventilated and insanitary huts unprovided with most, if not all, that would be considered essentials for living even in the poorest of European houses.[4]

The effect of tuberculosis on the well-being of the African population of Uganda as a whole is not fully known nor are the areas of maximum density of infected persons clearly depicted. There is no doubt, however, that the incidence of the disease is very much greater than would appear from a scrutiny of medical returns and there is good reason to fear that with changing conditions and the tendency to urban settlement the menace to public health will become progressively greater.[5]

[1] See also Trowell and Muwazi, 'A Contribution to the Study of Malnutrition in Central Africa' (1945).

[2] *Review* (1945), pp. 3–6.

[3] Governor Dundas, on 15 Dec. 1943, spoke of 'a deplorably low state of general health as revealed by the incidence of physical unfitness among the many thousands called up for military service' (*Legislative Council, 23rd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 2). See also *Medical Report 1944*, p. 2: 'The standard of physical fitness for recruits of other than combatant forces was lowered to meet the demands on a depleted reserve of manpower in areas from which recruits have been steadily drawn in recent years.'

[4] *Joint Report of Finance Committee and Development and Welfare Committee on Post-War Development* (2nd ed.), p. 30. See also ibid., p. 127.

[5] See also ibid., p. 30.

. . . A great deal of the ill-health can be accounted for by the presence of a definite illness, but in many cases lassitude, debility or frank disease can be proved to be due to a deficiency in diet and throughout the population as a whole there is the background of malnutrition which lowers resistance to infective agents, induces sickness and retards recovery.[1]

There is little or no truth in the general belief that the African woman ordinarily has easy labours; disease, malnutrition and bad living conditions have, over countless generations, affected the development of African women and hence complicated labours are not rare.[2]

Leprosy is by no means a rare disease throughout the Protectorate, and in certain parts of the country is common. Much more needs to be done to treat persons affected than has been possible in the past.[3]

Recent reports have also emphasized the urgent need for more medical staff and more hospitals.

While advancement has been made in the last fifty years in bringing medical and health services to our people, it cannot yet be said that we have been able to touch more than the fringe of our problems, and that only in circumscribed areas. All we have attempted has made it increasingly evident that the field we have to cover is an immense one, that we shall need a much larger European staff, supported by a great increase on our present trained African staff, considerably more than our present training centres can produce, and that we shall require almost unlimited funds.[4]

To attempt to give the African population the benefits of modern medicine with trained staff imported into the country would be beyond the present and future resources of the country, and there is no question but that this would be undesirable and contrary to Government's stated policy, which visualises the education of the local people to govern and care for themselves.

. . . how far these [the present medical services provided and maintained by Government] fall short of our actual requirements . . . will be visualised when it is appreciated that we have one doctor to about 80,000 people, and that under the term doctor is included the African Assistants we have trained at our Mulago School.[5] It is generally estimated in Great Britain that to give effective service there should be one doctor to no more than 1,000 people. To provide a service to our people such as is thought necessary for Great Britain we shall need nearly 4,000 doctors, and for most of our districts find 250 doctors to do the work we are now trying to do with no more than two to four. . . .

The number of general hospital beds maintained in this country, including those

[1] Ibid., p. 36.

[2] *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services* (1944), p. 22.

[3] Ibid., p. 36.

[4] Ibid., p. 2. See also *Joint Report of Finance Committee and Development and Welfare Committee* (2nd ed.), p. 30:

'The aim of the Government Medical Services in Uganda is to bring the benefits of modern curative and preventive medicine within the reach of every one of the population of nearly 4,000,000 souls who live in the Protectorate, and in so doing to arrange that by a closely correlated system of medical education it will be possible ultimately to leave the care of the African in the hands of his own countrymen, trained in accordance with the best traditions of the medical art.

'Great progress has been made towards that goal since the days in the last century when the Government Medical Services had its beginnings with the engagement of medical personnel to care for the health of the staff maintained by the Imperial Government to administer the country, but tangible as the results may seem on superficial observation it takes no deep probing to display the canker of indigenous and imported disease whose many roots are sapping the vitality of the people and which if not eradicated will seriously retard, if not actually bring to a standstill, any further social and economic development.'

[5] See also ibid., p. 127: '. . . there are large sections of the population resident 30 or more miles from a medical unit where treatment of any sort is available.'

provided at Mission Hospitals and Rural Government Dispensaries, is around 4,000; the number we should maintain to give our population a reasonable hospital service is 40,000. This number does not make any allowance for special accommodation for such conditions as mental diseases, leprosy, venereal diseases, etc.[1]

I shall now briefly discuss total mortality on the basis of the death returns.

In the kingdom of Buganda the number of deaths registered oscillated in 1912–17 between 10,949 and 13,203, and in 1918–41 between 13,562 and 18,105; it rose in 1942 to 25,014[2] and amounted in 1943 to 19,415 and in 1944 to 21,587. The official death-rate varied in 1913–41 between 15·4 and 20·8,[3] but was in 1942–4 27·6, 21·2, and 23·5 respectively. The rates, on the whole, are very low, and for some years, no doubt, lag behind the truth,[4] but in view of the apparently very low number of births and the apparently very low infant mortality it is possible that the actual death-rates did not differ essentially from the official rates.

In Busoga District the number of deaths registered oscillated in 1912–44 between 5,084 and 11,312 without showing any definite trend. The official death-rate oscillated in 1912–24 between 26·2 and 50·8,[5] and in 1925–44 between 17·0 and 27·1. As regards the other districts of the Eastern Province, for which returns are available only from 1930 on, the death-rate oscillated in Budama District (1930–9) between 15·0 and 24·9, in Bugishu District (1930–8) between 16·0 and 24·9, in Bugwere District (1930–8) between 18·7 and 37·3, in Teso District (1930–44) between 13·7[6] and 23·7, and in the Eastern Province as a whole (1930–44) between 17·5 and 25·0.

[1] *Report on Post-War Development of Medical Services*, pp. 17–18.

[2] Mortality was excessive in 1942 in various areas of the Protectorate but the cause seems to be unknown. The Medical Report for 1942 says (p. 7): 'This year deaths reported exceed the number of live births in the Mengo District of the Buganda Province, the Busoga District of the Eastern Province and the Ankole District of the Western Province. No definite reasons for this can be offered but it is possible that the departure of young men with the military forces may have been a contributive factor.' Actually the number of births reported in the three Districts rose from 29,236 in 1941 to 32,603 in 1942, and the number of reported deaths jumped from 26,928 to 37,527. It is obvious that the departure of young men with the military forces cannot have contributed to the large rise in the number of births or to the enormous rise in the number of deaths.

[3] For 1912 the death-rate is given as 21·2, but this is due to the fact that in computing the rate the population was assumed to be only 536,303 although the 1911 count had shown it to be 705,615.

[4] In 1939–44 the official rates in Mubende District were 10·2, 11·0, 9·5, 10·1, 7·3, and 10·1 respectively.

[5] The high rate of 50·8 was reached in 1921 owing to a severe plague epidemic; see *Medical Report 1921*, pp. 9, 14; *1922*, p. 36.

[6] The rates in 1937 and 1938 were 14·5 and 13·7 respectively. Yet the Acting Commissioner of the Eastern Province said in his report for 1937 as regards Teso that 'it is feared that the general standard of housing and hygiene . . . has hardly risen at all', and that 'the steady and continuous erection of permanent buildings to replace the existing mud and grass houses, huts, lukiko halls, etc., is a matter of importance' (*Reports of the Provincial Commissioners, Eastern, Northern and Western Provinces 1937*, pp. 10, 12), while in his report for 1938 the Commissioner of the Eastern Province stated that it was 'a year which approached dangerously near to famine', that in Teso over 7,000 people were fed from communal granaries, and that the problem of soil erosion is there 'most serious' (ibid. *1938*, p. 6; see also Hailey, p. 1100). Moreover, plague was apparently endemic in Teso, causing in 1938 144 deaths (see *Medical Report 1938*, p. 22). See, furthermore, *An Investigation into Health and Agriculture in Teso*, p. 22.

In Bunyoro District the death returns are as puzzling as the birth returns. The number of deaths registered oscillated in 1912–19 between 2,280 and 6,019, in 1920–34 between 1,958 and 2,804, in 1935–7 between 1,641 and 1,662, and in 1938–44 between 1,134 and 1,384. The official death-rate exceeded 20 in every year from 1913 to 1933, but fell thereafter and was in every year from 1938 to 1944 below 12. It is possible that death registration was adequate in former years, but it must have deteriorated since and has been certainly quite defective since 1937. As regards the districts of the Northern Province for which returns are available only from 1930 on, the death-rate oscillated in Lango District (1930–44) between 12·8 and 30·1, in Gulu District (1930–8) between 23·7 and 40·6, in Chua District (1930–8) between 11·9 and 34·6, in West Nile District (1930–44) between 9·1 and 26·2,[1] and in the Northern Province as a whole (1930–44) between 16·4 and 23·1.

In Ankole District the number of deaths registered was 3,352 in 1912 and oscillated in 1913–44 between 4,013 and 8,816. The official death-rate oscillated between 14·0 and 29·4. In Toro District the number of deaths registered oscillated in 1912–27 between 1,446 and 3,907, and in 1928–44 between 3,007 and 4,204. The official death-rate oscillated between 12·9 and 31·0. In Kigezi District (1930–44) the death-rate oscillated between 12·1 and 20·1,[2] and in the Western Province as a whole (1930–44) between 15·0 and 21·9.

In the five administrative units for which death records were available already before the first World War, the number of deaths reported was 27,038 in 1912 and oscillated in 1913–44 between 29,109 and 49,400.[3] The death-rate oscillated in 1912–44 between 15·6 (1939) and 26·2 (1919).

In the whole Protectorate the number of deaths reported oscillated in 1930–44 between 63,059 and 85,715.[4] The official death-rate oscillated in 1930–44 between 17·0 and 22·5. But as registration has obviously been incomplete in many districts the actual rates may have been considerably higher than the official rates.

The official death-rates in Uganda suggest that mortality has been lower in the last 15 years than in earlier times, and this may be due to the fact that famines and severe epidemics have become much rarer occurrences. But the rates have been so low in some districts in recent years that improvement in mortality was probably not as great as the official rates indicate.[5]

[1] The death-rate oscillated in 1930–8 between 9·1 and 12·7, and in 1939–44 between 18·1 and 26·2. As regards the incompleteness of the records, see p. 269 above.

[2] As regards the incompleteness of the records, see p. 269 above.

[3] Leaving out of consideration the year 1942, the maximum was 41,125 (1930).

[4] Excluding 1942 the maximum was 77,102 (1943).

[5] When the official death-rate dropped from 1931 to 1932 in the Western Province from 21·87 to 17·41, in the Eastern Province from 23·62 to 19·27, and in the Northern Province from 21·37 to 19·32, the *Medical Report* (*1932*, p. 30) stated for the Western Province that 'this decrease is considered to be the result of faulty registration' and for the Eastern and Northern Provinces that it was probably due, 'in part at least, to neglect of registration'. But such considerable declines in the death-rates to even much lower levels occurred also in later years (see Table 15).

Infant Mortality. As long as no figures were available it was generally believed that infant mortality was very high.[1] The Medical Report for 1922 said:

> Infantile mortality rates throughout the Protectorate are supposed to be, and undoubtedly are, very high. Figures for the returns have never yet been available, partly owing to the difficulties in ascertaining the age of death.[2]

When the first returns did not show an excessive mortality their accuracy was doubted.

> Infantile Mortality Returns have been received for Buganda Kingdom and are now recorded for the first time. . . . The rate for Buganda Kingdom (population 789,124) works out at 226·9 per thousand births. This rate is considerably lower than was expected. The records can hardly be regarded as accurate, being a first effort at Infantile Mortality Returns from native records . . . .[3]
>
> Infantile Mortality Rates for Baganda . . . . It was found impossible to get these rendered by the chiefs with any degree of accuracy this year, but some returns were made by the more highly educated chiefs and the rates given work out at 222 per thousand, which is thought to be inaccurate and rather an under-estimation, but it is a great beginning and more accurate results may be hoped for in the future.[4]

However, when the rate for Buganda had dropped to 179 in 1924, 157 in 1925, and 150 in 1926, the Medical Report said that the figures 'may be regarded as fairly accurate, because the natives of this province have become accustomed to rendering these returns'.[5]

From 1926 on, returns were received from nearly all districts. In the Protectorate as a whole the infant mortality rate dropped from 276 in 1926 to 116 in 1944. In some districts the changes were most spectacular. In Bunyoro the rate dropped between 1926 and 1938 from 535 to 62[6] while it rose in Chua from 120 to 564. The comments in the Medical Reports are not very helpful. When infant mortality declined it was usually attributed to maternity and child-welfare work; but when the

[1] Johnston, in 1902, said of the Baganda: 'There is, of course, an enormous death-rate among the children, who are very badly looked after by their mothers' (*The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 646); of the Basoga: 'Among the peasants infant mortality is terrible, it is rare that a peasant woman succeeds in rearing more than one child' (ibid., p. 721); and of the Nilotic negroes (Bari, Latuka, Acholi): '. . . infant mortality is considerable, large numbers of children dying from malarial fever' (ibid., p. 778). Dr. Cook wrote in Nov. 1905 in his Journal: 'The paucity of children [at Hoima] was amazing when compared with Buganda, and I had little difficulty in accepting what the ladies [at the mission dispensary] claimed as true, *viz.*, that some 90% of Banyoro children died in infancy' (*Uganda Memories*, p. 209). In 1909 he noted: 'Infant mortality is high in Uganda, something like sixty per cent. of the children dying at, or soon after birth' (ibid., p. 268). Roscoe said in 1911 concerning the Baganda: 'Prior to the coming of the Arabs in King Suna's reign the death-rate among infants was not so high as in later years, when specific disease had become rife, and had begun to tell upon the children' (*The Baganda*, p. 97; it is interesting to note that Felkin, in 1886, had stated that 'infant mortality is very slight', 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', p. 745) *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1911–12*, p. 14, said with regard to the Protectorate: 'The rate of infant mortality among natives is alarmingly high . . . .'

[2] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 8. A few years earlier the infant mortality rate in Uganda was put at 330; see Lugard, Foreword to Cook, *Uganda Memories*, and also ibid., p. 330.

[3] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 6. See also the statement quoted p. 269 above.

[4] Ibid., p. 56. See also ibid., p. 61: 'So far they [infantile mortality returns] show distinct alteration for the better in those parts where active anti-venereal disease measures have been introduced.' It is difficult to see how the *first* returns could show distinct alteration for the better.

[5] Ibid. *1926*, p. 14.

[6] In 1943 and 1944 it was only 54.

TABLE 16. *Infant Mortality Rates, Uganda, 1926-44*[1]

Districts	*1926*	*1927*	*1928*	*1929*	*1930*	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*
Buganda Province:																			
Mengo	115	104	130	101	125	149	108	125	93	84	92	90	76	69	98	87	99	66	86
Entebbe	182	148	163	112	129	100	85	88	72	62	74	60	59	60					
Masaka	139	127	146	109	106	97	90	96	83	77	77	61	58	61	84	66	124	59	95
Mubende	205	169	208	145	168	114	114	104	123	120	121	114	88	79	90	67	59	51	59
Eastern Province:																			
Busoga	331	276	289	293	267	235	206	203	230	228	277	248	211	178	255	215	279	200	183
Budama	352	448	422	373	264	211	145	123	142	147	174	146	126	108	162	137	131	124	123
Bugishu	305	313	377	210	265	232	173	197	273	207	218	200	144	122					
Bugwere	..	310	306	364	197	182	135	143	156	189	158	150	106						
Teso	175	120	139	121	85	88	88	94	103	98	92	56	54	72	82	69	76	62	67
Western Province:																			
Toro	340	342	325	322	361	378	279	208	190	223	202	140	111	112	137	118	96	98	77
Ankole	370	300	304	338	286	267	208	163	178	169	103	124	116	110	116	142	135	87	91
Kigezi	..	..	182	204	125	139	144	100	152	169	96	133	70	74	59	41	39	43	52
Northern Province:																			
Lango	381	349	337	211	198	189	132	123	182	134	130	140	153	116	110	123	143	158	151
Bunyoro	535	433	417	382	324	244	172	167	137	105	93	107	62	68	87	67	85	54	54
Gulu	386	344	266	227	311	366	252	238	326	144	175	196	260	255	196	195	216	256	245
Chua	120	248	219	346	334	327	342	305	357	283	312	365	564						
West Nile	220	185	106	105	229	234	259	244	330	280	316	314	362	282	201	186	187	264	171

[1] See *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 32-33; *1939*, p. 27; *1942*, p. 11; *1943*, p. 9; *1944*, p. 11.

rate for the Protectorate rose from 161 in 1933 to 189 in 1934 the comment was: 'It is probable that a number of deaths in children over one year are included in the returns.'[1] When in 1930 the rate for Teso was 85 it was said to be obviously inaccurate, but when it dropped in 1938 to 54 it was claimed that 'the figure compares quite favourably with some European countries'.[2] In view of the bad hygienic and sanitary conditions (which prevail still to-day in Teso) the Medical Department was certainly right in rejecting as obviously too low the rate of 85 for 1930, but this rate came probably nearer the truth than the rates of 56 and 54 for 1937 and 1938. As regards Bunyoro, the Report of the Lady Coryndon Maternity Training School for 1928 stated:

> Masindi centre we have had regretfully to close down. This is the third of our centres in Bunyoro we have had to close. Bunyoro is an unlucky country. It has by far the highest infantile mortality and the lowest birth-rate in the Protectorate and yet even when facilities are provided the people are too apathetic to avail themselves of them. The immediate cause of closing the centre was the need for building a new one owing to dilapidation of the old temporary centre but the figures for the last few years speak eloquently of the refusal of the Bunyoro to be helped.[3]

It is inconceivable that ten years later the infant mortality rate should have been something like 62. But leaving out of consideration the Eastern and Northern Provinces where the sudden changes in the rates (in both directions) arouse particular distrust, and taking into account only the Buganda and Western Provinces, the returns seem still far from corresponding to the truth. It has been shown that when the first returns for Buganda (1923) yielded an infant mortality rate of 227 the Medical Department said that this rate was considerably lower than was expected, and suggested that when the returns would become more complete the rate would rise. But even assuming that the first returns did not understate but overstated infant mortality, it seems incredible that the rate should actually have oscillated in 1934–44 between 63 and 102. The progress allegedly achieved in the Western Province is still more fantastic. The infant mortality rate was reported here as exceeding 250 in every year from 1926 to 1930. For 1938–44 it is given as 94, 94, 93, 91, 82, 69, and 71 respectively.[4]

All that can be said is that the official figures of Uganda indicate an enormous improvement and a very low infant mortality for recent years, but that these figures undoubtedly overstate the improvement and very likely understate present mortality.

Adult Mortality. No attempt, apparently, has ever been made to classify deaths over 1 year according to age. The scanty available data concern-

[1] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 24.

[2] Ibid. *1938*, p. 33. It was, in fact, lower than in every European country except England, Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland; including still-births it was even lower than in any other country in the world.

[3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 98.

[4] In England and Wales the infant mortality rate oscillated in 1838–1904 between 130 and 164 and dropped in 1916 for the first time below 95. The decrease in England was due in part to a decrease of the birth-rate. In Buganda the average official birth-rate in 1938–44 was much higher than in any year from 1911 to 1937.

ing deaths of labourers employed on public works still showed 15 years ago a high mortality, in fact, a much higher mortality than the Administration realized.[1] Health conditions have been particularly bad among immigrant labourers. One cause which was emphasized particularly in the Medical Report for 1927 was the poor state in which they arrived.

Unfortunately, the areas from where the West Nile and especially the Banyalwanda labour come, are badly infected with Dysentery and intestinal parasitic diseases which probably account for their poor physique and poor disease resisting powers.[2] Added to this, practically all the Banyalwanda labour has to pass through a district absolutely infested with Spirillum Tick. It is obvious therefore that they are a very real danger not only to the districts through which they pass, but also to the townships and districts where they finally decide to remain. . . .[3]

By this time conditions within Uganda had already improved. The Medical Report for 1925 said:

The health conditions of alien labour housed in camps were bad. The number of camps for which Mulago[4] was responsible was 15, housing on an average 4,194 porters mainly belonging to the Banyaruanda tribe recruited from Belgian Ruanda. During the year these porters accounted for 10,947 new cases with 55,947 re-attendances for various diseases. There were 1,281 cases of Dysentery amongst them with 222 deaths, 159 of which occurred in hospital and 63 in camps. The total deaths during the year from all causes were 285.[5]

The Medical Report for 1926 said with regard to railway labourers who had come from the West Nile District and were in a camp at Luzira:

. . . when this labour was first installed the conditions under which the labourers were housed was bad and the sick rate and death rate correspondingly high. As soon as it could reasonably be done, conditions were improved, and now the whole of the labour is on the way to being housed in permanent brick buildings under good conditions. In this one camp, as the result of these improvements, a comparison between the last three months of 1925 and the same period for 1926 shows a drop in the dysentery rate from 1,100 per 1,000 per annum to 100 per 1,000 per annum and in the death rate from 150 per 1,000 per annum to 0 per annum. . . .[6]

Health conditions among the Banyaruanda were still very bad.

The conditions under which they lived were not good. In consequence, there was a considerable amount of sickness amongst them. Dysentery, tick fever and malaria were the principal diseases which afflicted them. Of these, the most fatal was

[1] To quote only one example. The *Report of the Labour Department* for 1930 states (pp. 4, 9) that for the construction of the Mwirasandu–Nsongezi–Kagera Port Road 10,435 labourers were recruited in 1929–30 of whom 157 died from sickness. The Report says (pp. 5–6) that the death-rate was 'slightly lower than the normal death rate of the district of Ankole.

Death rate per 1,000 on construction		15
,, ,, ,, ,,	Ankole District, 1928	16·50
,, ,, ,, ,,	,, ,, 1929	17·76.'

But these labourers were engaged on a four months' contract, and the average labour strength (computed from ibid., pp. 7–8) was 2,928 so that the actual death-rate (excluding deaths from accidents) was 54 and not 15.

[2] See also *Labour Department Report 1925*, p. 2.

[3] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 68.

[4] 'Mulago consists of a number of medical interests and activities centred round Mulago Hospital' (ibid. *1926*, p. 72).

[5] Ibid. *1925*, p. 82. See also *Rapport par le Gouvernement belge au sujet de l'Administration du Ruanda–Urundi 1925*, p. 85.

[6] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 78.

dysentery, accounting for 995 cases with 139 deaths amongst all Government labour in the camps concerned. During the year we were luckily free from *epidemics* of dysentery such as occurred in 1925 amongst the labour and the disease shewed no marked seasonal variation. As in the case of other diseases, particularly tick fever, the highest rate was usually amongst new arrivals who had not adapted themselves to strange conditions.[1]

It seems actually that in the Government Labour Camps under the care of Mulago from which, apparently alone, figures are available mortality had not improved in 1926 but improved in 1927, while morbidity was not lower in 1927 than in 1926 or 1925. The data for 1925–7 may be summarized as follows:[2]

	Number			*Rate per 1,000*		
	1925	*1926*	*1927*	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*
Average daily strength in camps . . .	4,194	3,693	1,888	..	..	..
Cases of diseases . .	10,947	15,456	8,113	2,610	4,185	4,297
Deaths from dysentery .	222	139	14	53	37	7
Deaths from other causes	63	162	43	15	44	23
Total deaths. . .	285	301	57	68	81	30

The Medical Reports made the following comments:

1925. In placing under camp conditions natives who have been used all their lives to village conditions, an increase in sickness of all descriptions is to be expected. But that it should have reached and maintained the proportions it did, must be ascribed to the conditions under which they lived.[3]

1926. A sick rate of 4,185 per 1,000 per annum and a death rate of 81 per 1,000 per annum amongst a body of picked adults is extremely high. Ignorance and fear of seeking medical relief largely explains this state of affairs. The presence of these people, diseased, ignorant and unclean in their habits, amongst the indigenous tribes, constitutes a real danger to the health of the local inhabitants.[4]

1927. Table . . . shows the sickness and death rates in the camps under the care of Mulago. The figures disclose a very marked improvement on 1926,[5] the most noteworthy change being the reduction of the dysentery death rate from 37 per 1,000 to 7 per 1,000. . . .

The improvement is to be attributed to three factors. (*a*) That all labour is concentrated in two camps where careful and competent supervision is possible. (*b*) That there being less demand for immigrant labour, the camp population is less shifting than before. (*c*) The unfit have been repatriated and the fittest remain.[6]

When immigration again increased in the second half of the 1930s the health conditions of the alien labourers were viewed with ever-increasing concern. At first it was apparently the question of nutrition which attracted particular interest. The Medical Report for 1936 described the position as follows:

It is a common practice to offer a labourer Shs. 10 a month with rations or Shs. 12 a month without rations. As a large proportion of the labour employed in the country is from Ruanda, and these men only come to earn enough to pay their taxes and to do this in the shortest possible time, it is natural that they should prefer to take

[1] *Medical Report 1926*, pp. 78–9.
[2] See ibid. *1925*, p. 82; *1926*, p. 86; *1927*, p. 150.
[3] Ibid. *1925*, p. 82.
[4] Ibid. *1926*, p. 79.
[5] This does not apply to the sickness rate.
[6] Ibid. *1927*, p. 127.

Shs. 12 a month without rations, hoping to live, or rather half-starve, on Sh. 1 a month. One of the criticisms of the new Rules [under the Masters and Servants Ordinance] is that the suggested diet costs Shs. 6 to Shs. 7 a month. This diet only contains some 3,400 calories, and is only just adequate under the standards set out in a pamphlet issued by the Health Organisation of the League of Nations entitled 'Report on the Physiological Bases of Nutrition', for a man doing moderately hard work. It is, therefore, obvious that if Shs. 2 really represents the sum which the employer spends on food, it is inadequate to provide a reasonable diet, while if it represents only part, the employee who accepts Shs. 12 a month without rations must find the balance from his small wage or be inadequately fed.[1]

The Committee of Inquiry into the Labour Situation in the Uganda Protectorate said with regard to the Banyaruanda:

These 100,000 annual migrants constitute perhaps the most intractable feature of the present problem. Purposeful, silent, not readily to be deflected, they may be seen in groups on almost any day in the year on the south-western roads pressing on relentlessly towards Buganda, reminiscent of nothing so much as of a stream of ants. Both on humanitarian grounds and on the practical one of safeguarding the health of Uganda's indigenous population some steps should be taken to mitigate the hardships of the journey for these people once they have entered Uganda territory.[2]

Before the great majority of these immigrants obtain work they have to reach Buganda, which represents to them what the United States did to the Irishman of the nineteenth century. The route they follow is a long and trying one with expanses of empty and largely waterless country. Although they leave their homes in Ruanda in good physical condition many, having already travelled a long stretch of difficult country, are suffering from fatigue and under-nourishment when they reach the Uganda frontier for the most part at the bridge over the Kakitumba River at Merama Hill. Once over the Kakitumba a small proportion can obtain immediate employment at the tin mines which are close at hand. The great majority, however, makes for Buganda, and proceeds by cross-country routes to Mbarara, a distance of say 30–40 miles, travelling a sufficiently well-watered country with a number of centres of population. From Mbarara the route to Buganda follows the Mbarara–Masaka road; the greater part of the 92 miles of this road is uninhabited and waterless and many reach the neighbourhood of Masaka in an exhausted and sometimes starving condition. Masaka hospital as a result receives a steady flow of these immigrants suffering from malaria, semi-starvation and other diseases brought on by the rigours of the journey. Apart from the hardships which they themselves undergo, their poor health is a source of danger to the population among whom they settle. Tuberculosis is being introduced, spirillum fever is re-appearing along the routes by which they travel, and their insanitary habits are spreading intestinal parasites and similar infections around the camping places at which they congregate.[3]

The Director of Medical Services, at the meeting of the Legislative Council on 14 December 1942, emphasized particularly the influence of immigrant labour on the health condition of the indigenous population.

Before I conclude I should like to make reference to our labour problems for these have an important bearing on the health of our people. It is unfortunately true to say that some employers in this country find it easier and cheaper to take on new arrivals for work on their estates rather than to maintain what labour they have in a fit state of health. Uganda is very fortunate in having immigrant Banyaruanda labour in numbers for work at low wages but I am satisfied that the availability of

[1] Ibid. *1936*, p. 11. See also, for example, *Report on an Investigation into Conditions affecting Unskilled Labour* (1937), p. 11; *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee* (1943), pp. 26–8.

[2] *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Labour Situation in the Uganda Protectorate*, 1938, pp. 48–9.

[3] Ibid., pp. 22–3.

this cheap labour has hampered improvement in the conditions under which labour is worked, cared for and generally maintained.[1]

The Labour Advisory Committee in their *Report on the Organization of the South-Western Labour Migration Routes* said:

It has long been recognised that the conditions under which the Banyaruanda[2] and other labourers travel along these routes leave a great deal to be desired. The hardship which they endure from the lack of any adequate provision for safeguarding them against exposure, highway robbery, disease, wild animals and the shortage of food is a matter of common observation. . . .

Although the existence of this problem has long been recognised, in 1942 it presented itself in a particularly acute form. The decrease in the planting of cotton in Buganda during that year caused the supply of immigrant labour to exceed the demand and in consequence there was a considerable amount of unemployment among the immigrants. Although for many years Banyaruanda suffering from malnutrition have been treated in the hospitals at Mulago and Masaka, in 1942 the numbers were much larger than usual and the problem of destitute Banyaruanda made itself felt as far east as the township of Jinja. The numbers of emaciated and half-starving labourers calling at dispensaries in the areas of employment, mainly in search of food, was also exceptionally high. The Medical Officer of the Mengo District, among others, drew attention to the appalling state of health of the majority of these itinerant labourers, most of whom were in his view living below subsistence level and many at starvation level. This view was reinforced by representations from the Resident of Buganda and other Administrative Officers. In short, the conditions were such as to call imperatively for remedial measures, both short- and long-term.[3]

The Committee had at its disposal a most instructive Memorandum on 'The Health of Temporary Immigrant Banyaruanda and Allied Tribes' by the District Medical Officer, Mengo, dated 3 June 1942.[4] It is based on 'a detailed enquiry into the health aspects of immigrant labouring conditions amongst the Banyaruanda, mainly on the estates of the Uganda Sugar and Tea Factories'. I must here confine myself to quoting the Conclusions.

1. The uncontrolled entry of thousands of Banyaruanda into this District every year in search of work is constituting not only a very grave social problem but one of profound medical importance. They arrive from Ruanda–Urundi in an exhausted devitalised state; the vast majority are grossly under-nourished; many are suffering from specific nutritional disease and from infective disease, much of which is directly attributable to malnutrition.

[1] *Legislative Council, 22nd Session, 1st and 2nd Meetings*, p. 40.

[2] 'This term is used in this report as a convenient expression to cover all the immigrants from the south-west, though all may not be natives of Ruanda–Urundi.' See also in this connexion *Report of Enquiry 1938*, p. 22: 'Volunteer labour coming in from the West Nile District travels by steamer to Butiaba and thence finds its way into Buganda usually by road, often obtaining temporary work on the way and supporting itself without difficulty. It presents no special problem.' Conditions at the Tanganyika frontier, on the other hand, are not very satisfactory. 'At the present time there is a slight degree of control at Kyaka by the Tanganyika Authorities, consisting merely of a superficial examination by a native medical orderly and the issue of road passes to those who are regarded as fit to travel. Those rejected are, theoretically, not permitted to cross by the Government ferry and are detained in some huts in the *Gombolola*; actually, it is highly probable that they cross the river elsewhere by canoe ferry, as many seriously unfit are seen on Uganda roads.' ('Report of the Sub-Committee appointed by the Labour Advisory Committee on 21st December 1942', *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee*, p. 35.)

[3] *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee*, p. 2.

[4] Ibid., pp. 23–34.

2. To what extent the nutritional state of Banyaruanda before they leave their tribal lands contributes to exhaustion, physical breakdown and disease *en route* or soon after arrival is problematical. Some knowledge of this would be of value in assessing all the causes involved.

3. On the journey down they are subject to the rigours of physical hardship, insufficient food, and recurring untreated malaria—a disease to which they are not intensively exposed in their own country, to which in consequence they have little or no tolerance, and which must contribute materially to their lack of resistance to other diseases.

4. Mortality is far in excess of that of the indigenous population, but to what extent we have no reliable information. There is evidence, not yet fully confirmed, that mortality rates among Ruanda employees of the Uganda Sugar Factory are staggeringly high. Further inquiry into the mortality experienced by these people is urgently called for.

5. There is evidence that the incidence of tuberculosis among Banyaruanda is rapidly increasing in this District—to the danger of the resident population.[1] Here again it is urgently necessary that the question be investigated as early as possible.

6. The inexorable necessity of earning as much money as possible during their short stay in Uganda and of earning their sustenance compels these people to work immediately they arrive, thus precluding a period of rest and recuperation which they so urgently need. If they are too ill to work, they starve; if they overtax their strength in work they expose themselves to the risk of physical breakdown and intercurrent disease.

7. There are grounds for believing that in general the conditions of employment on Baganda *shambas* are less onerous than are those on non-native owned estates that do not provide food in lieu of part pay without option. Circumstances dictate that where possible Banyaruanda prefer to work additionally for their food rather than pay for it or accept it in lieu of part pay Such preferment operates to the detriment of their health in the period before they have recovered from the effects of their journey.

8. The food that is worked for on *shambas* is usually monotonous and deficient in certain essential food factors, particularly in good class protein and fat. The standard contract ration issued by employers is not a whole diet and by itself cannot maintain health, being notably deficient in vitamins A, B and C. There can be no certainty that employees accepting the ration will work for or purchase the additional supplements necessary to convert it into a whole diet. Many Banyaruanda in fact do not, where there are no *shambas* in the vicinity.

9. Agricultural labour on estates is not excessive for fit men, even on the Uganda Sugar Estate, but it is excessive, for undernourished debilitated men such as many of those who have recently arrived from Ruanda and who have not fully recovered from the effects of their journey. Under such conditions the standard task, even of only 4 hours duration, may well precipitate these men over the threshold of physical breakdown. There is evidence that work on the Uganda Sugar Estate is unreasonably excessive to any but physically fit men with the result that some 10 per cent of Banyaruanda porters are unable to finish their task for the day.

10. Continuous manual labour of more than 4½ hours duration without a rest pause is detrimental to physical efficiency and therefore to work output and health. Similarly, the beneficial effect on labour efficiency (and therefore on health) of issuing a mid-task ration of maize gruel or a similar stimulant is well recognized and is in fact practised by some employers in this district to certain classes of labour.

11. The practice of cutting the entire pay for a task in cases of non-completion by reason of illness or debility is reprehensible—a stronger word could be used—and should not be tolerated by Government.

[1] The increase in the incidence of relapsing fever has likewise been attributed to the spread of the tick by the migrations of labourers from Ruanda-Urundi and the Belgian Congo. See *Medical Report 1943*, p. 3; *1944*, p. 5.

12. The standard of housing of African labour on agricultural estates in this district is in general deplorably low; there are, however, a few exceptions. The Uganda Sugar Factory and Tea Estates provide good but limited housing facilities, but circumstances are such that the majority of employees prefer to live in the vicinity of the *shambas* off the estate. Housing conditions at many estates are no better than those on Baganda *shambas* employing immigrant labour.[1]

13. There is wide diversity in the completeness of medical facilities on estates. At most a supply of simple remedies and dressings are available. Only a few provide ward accommodation and only two qualified medical practitioners, in one case on a part time basis only. The chief criticism here is the lack of trained medical attendants. The Uganda Sugar Factory has incomparably better medical arrangements than any other estate in the district, despite its deficiencies.[2]

The Committee fully endorsed the 'Earl-Hett Report' of 8 October 1942 which it had received from the Acting Assistant Director of Medical Services and the Inspector of Labour. This report contains in particular the results of a visit to a tin mine at Rutongo in Ruanda–Urundi, which employs 3,700 porters. It appears that working and living conditions, in many respects, are more favourable there to the labourers than in Uganda.

New recruits are not given a full task until, as a result of a balanced diet and any necessary medical attention they are able to complete it. . . . The labourers were seen at work and it was hard to believe that they belonged to the same tribe as the porters who are now a familiar sight on the roads in Uganda. Their physique was excellent and a group of drillers using twenty-pound hammers was particularly impressive. These men, although observed for a period of at least 15 minutes, continued to swing their hammers without rest and without distress, a feat quite beyond the strength of the average Munyaruanda. They were contract labourers in their second and third years of service. . . . The work of the *Chef de Main d'Œuvre Indigène*, who is in charge of the welfare of the labour, was of great interest. His office is, designedly, placed at a short distance from the general offices of the company and is screened by trees so that labourers with complaints or requests can feel that they are dealing with him and not with the management. The functions of this service are to ensure the healthy and contented labour . . . . The death rate per thousand is ten . . . .[3]

Visits were paid to the sugar factories at Lugazi and Kakira when the cause of the high death rates among Banyaruanda labour was being investigated. The difference in outlook between the managements at these factories and at Rutongo was very apparent. There is a large supply of casual labour usually available at Lugazi and the management prefer to use this labour, only using contract labour when forced to do so. Although anyone who wishes may receive rations the management do not appear interested in whether these are drawn or not and fail to appreciate the

[1] See also *Labour Department Report 1944*, p. 4: 'The housing of labour remained at a general unsatisfactory level though efforts to obtain improvements, particularly with the larger employing concerns, have not been relaxed and some progress has been achieved. The provision of proper housing and other facilities for employees was still regarded in some quarters as the last item of capital expenditure to be undertaken, the extent and standard of such facilities being dependent on the ability of any particular enterprise to meet the cost, after all other charges have been met. The implication is that where enterprises can only pay at the expense of human material then the position should be accepted. It is satisfactory to be able to state that one of the larger employing concerns displayed great interest in the problem of feeding and housing labour and effected considerable improvements in providing new labour lines of a more satisfactory and suitable type, together with kitchen arrangements for communal cooking and feeding, thus setting an example which others might well follow. There was, however, a clear indication that general improvements towards accepted minimum standards can only be achieved by the enforcement of regulations designed to cover all requirements.'

[2] *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee*, pp. 32–4.

[3] Ibid., pp. 14–15.

advantage of ensuring that they get the return in energy for the money they give in lieu of rations.[1]

It must not be assumed that the provision of camps with food and medical facilities will, by itself, achieve Government's object with regard to the inflow and outflow of labour nor that the attainment of this object will remove the causes of the malnutrition and starvation and the morbid conditions associated with them which are found today among immigrant labour in Uganda . . . . There is little use in providing food and shelter for immigrants on their way to and from work if the conditions under which they work are not satisfactory and lead to sickness and death and, except on grounds of humanity, in making hospital accommodation available if the people treated in hospital, after they are discharged, again fall victims to under-nourishment and lack of shelter.[2]

There is no statistical yard-stick by which to judge the effect of immigrant labour on the health of the local population. There is no disease found amongst the Banyaruanda which did not exist in Uganda before they began to immigrate and returns from hospitals and dispensaries constitute only a record of the number of persons diagnosed as suffering from certain illnesses who have sought medical advice and do not represent the incidence of these diseases amongst the local population. It can, nevertheless, definitely be said that hospital beds which should be occupied by the local population are being used for the Banyaruanda and the presence of so many ill-housed and unhealthy individuals with intestinal parasites and with tuberculosis has an adverse effect on the health of the population among which they live. The effect of the maintenance of a low wage rate caused by large supplies of cheap labour must not be neglected.[3]

The Report on the Post-War Development of the Medical Services complained in 1944 that the conditions under which the labourers from Ruanda–Urundi 'travel and those under which they live and work are still far from satisfactory'.[4]

The newly formed Labour Department has not yet on its staff a Medical Officer to advise on the care of labourers from a medical point of view. The fitness of labour is so much dependent on their living and feeding conditions that the provision of a medical officer to care for labour should be considered a measure of economy. Present conditions under which labourers are housed, fed and cared for when sick are deplorable, and must not be allowed to continue. It is recommended that the Medical Officer appointed to the Labour Department should be of the grade of a Senior Medical Officer.[5]

Population Growth. There is a consensus of opinion that the population of Buganda declined enormously in the decades preceding the proclamation of the British Protectorate (1894). Lugard, who accepted Wilson's estimate of 5,000,000 natives for 1879, wrote in 1893 that the population had in the meantime 'decreased probably by more than half'.[6] In a more recent book he demonstrated the decline by saying that Stanley in 1875 found the King of Buganda fighting the Wavuma with an army of 250,000 while Ashe in 1889 estimated the fighting strength of the Baganda at only 40,000.[7] Johnston reports:

The Kingdom of Uganda in the time of Mutesa, though then of smaller extent politically than at the present day, probably numbered 4,000,000 people. In 1901 I was not able to estimate the population at much over 1,000,000.[8]

[1] Ibid., p. 15. [2] Ibid., pp. 18–19. [3] Ibid., p. 20. [4] *Report*, p. 13. [5] Ibid., p. 37.
[6] Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. i, pp. 432–3.
[7] See Lugard, *The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 53, 82.
[8] Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. ii, p. 640.

Roscoe relates:

> In the early days of Mutesa's reign the Baganda were said to have numbered three millions; civil war, which broke out after the death of the famous king [1884], and famine, which followed the war, reduced the number of the people to about a million and a half . . . .[1]

Major Macdonald said that 'in the days of Mtesa, the population of Uganda had been estimated to amount to 1,000,000', but that 'it is doubtful if 600,000 souls remained in the country, and even these were to be still further reduced by famine and pestilence'.[2]

We are thus told that within about the same period the population of Buganda decreased from 5,000,000 to less than 2,500,000, or from 4,000,000 to about 1,000,000, or from 3,000,000 to 1,500,000, or from 1,000,000 to less than 600,000. All these numerical expressions of the amount of population decline are ill founded, and the same is true of the figures relating to the fighting strength. Stanley, who in 1878 estimated the population of Buganda at 750,000, did not say that he found the King of Buganda with an army of 250,000; he said he found in the emperor's camp at Nakaranga about 250,000 people—125,000 Waganda warriors, 'nearly 50,000 women, and about as many children and slaves of both sexes', and 25,000 warriors from other countries.[3] Ashe, who in 1889 put the population of Buganda rather higher than Stanley in 1878, did not estimate their fighting strength at 40,000; he thought it impossible that Stanley found 150,000 warriors *in one camp*, and doubted 'if by the mightiest effort more than forty thousand warriors could be massed at any given point'.[4] But the fact that the arbitrary juxtaposition of various estimates shows an enormous population decline and that it would be easy to assemble other figures indicating a considerable population increase[5] does not, of course, mean that the population did not actually decline, and it is interesting to study the causes which are said to have led to such a decrease.

The missionary Wilson said in 1879:

> The Waganda are constantly at war with one or other of the nations round them, and their battles, being hand-to-hand encounters, are fearfully destructive. In one engagement which came under my immediate notice, fifty per cent. of the Waganda warriors were killed, and, as they gained the day, the loss of their opponents must have been even greater.
>
> The rule with the Waganda, when they have taken a town or district, is to put all the full-grown men to death, and to take the children and women prisoners . . . .[6]

[1] Roscoe, *The Baganda*, p. 6.

[2] Macdonald, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa 1891–1894*, pp. 194–5.

[3] See Stanley, *Through the Dark Continent*, vol. i, pp. 304–6. 'This large total [250,000] may seem startling, but not more so to those acquainted with the customs and population of Uganda and the nature and extent of Mtesa's authority than the five and a quarter millions said to have started with Xerxes in his invasion of Greece.'

[4] Ashe, p. 296.

[5] Stanley in 1878 estimated the population density of Buganda at only about 25 per square mile, Portal in 1893 at about 30, and Johnston in 1901 at about 50 (see pp. 236–7 above).

[6] Wilson and Felkin, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*, vol. i, p. 151. See also Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', pp. 735–7: 'The Waganda . . . are constantly at war, making continual raids on the surrounding countries for cattle and slaves. . . . Their fights are often very sanguinary, and they frequently lose 30 to 40 per cent. of their men.'

He emphasized furthermore the importance of diseases:

> The diseases to which the Waganda are subject make a formidable list . . . . Small-pox is one of the most fatal, coming at intervals in epidemics, and carrying off thousands of victims . . . . Syphilis is extremely common, especially among the men, in all its forms, and is a frequent complication in other diseases.[1]

Felkin listed moreover as 'Causes that Limit Population' in Uganda proper: (1) Conditions of Marriage (owing to the frequency of polygamy a large number of the poorer men are unable to marry); (2) Separation of Husband and Wife (from the time of her pregnancy until she has weaned her child); (3) Miscarriages.[2]

Lugard said in 1893 that the population of Buganda had been reduced by half 'owing to continual war and to Mwanga's persecutions'.[3] He mentioned also the famine caused among pastoral tribes by the 1890 cattle plague in Buganda, Ankoli, and Bunyoro,[4] and said that smallpox was 'a terrible scourge to the natives'.[5] In his book published in 1901 he dealt more fully with diseases.

> Confluent small-pox is the most fatal disease of Uganda. . . . The next most terrible disease is the bubonic plague . . . . Malarial fever is not uncommon . . . . The very prevalent skin diseases may be attributed to the change of diet consequent on the death of the cattle from rinderpest.[6]
>
> Syphilis is common.[7]

He stated furthermore that polygamy and early marriage tend to check the increase of population.[8]

Portal in 1893 explained the depopulation of Buganda as follows:

> The almost incredible misgovernment, the barbarous enactments of its kings, the cold-blooded massacres, the wars of extermination, the raids, the murders, and the internecine conflicts under which the country has groaned for the last thirty years, have in many districts more than decimated the population, and have driven thousands into voluntary exile to the south of the Lake.[9]

Macdonald said that by February 1890 the population of Buganda had been 'greatly reduced, not only by actual losses in war and by the secession of the Mohammedan faction, but also because great numbers of the peasants had fled from the country and transferred their allegiance to chiefs where life and property were more secure'. Immediately thereafter the population was 'still further reduced by famine and pestilence'.

> . . . for food was very scarce, and before the new crops could be reaped large numbers of the people had died of starvation or been reduced to living on roots and the wild

[1] Wilson and Felkin, vol. i, p. 183; see also Felkin 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', pp. 704–5. As regards Unyoro, Felkin says that 'small-pox makes great ravages at times . . . and venereal disease is widely spread' (Wilson and Felkin, vol. ii, p. 48), and concerning Bari that 'small-pox is often very prevalent in these parts, and venereal diseases also' (ibid., p. 97). The *Handbook of British East Africa 1893* stated concerning Uganda: 'As regards health there is little information available. Small-pox epidemics are frequent and fatal, and are much dreaded by the natives, and syphilis is very common' (p. 51).

[2] See Felkin, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe', pp. 744–5.

[3] Lugard, *The Rise of our East African Empire*, vol. ii, p. 98; see also Lugard, *The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 29, 53.

[4] See *The Rise*, vol. i, p. 526, vol. ii, p. 159; see also *The Story*, p. 104.

[5] *The Rise*, vol. i, p. 394.

[6] *The Story*, p. 68.

[7] Ibid., p. 69.

[8] See ibid., p. 30.

[9] Portal, *British Mission to Uganda*, p. 187.

products of the jungle. Then, as so often happens, pestilence followed in the footsteps of famine, and counted its victims by thousands. A virulent form of bubonic plague decimated the country, and threatened to reduce Uganda to little more than an empty name.[1]

Johnston, who assumed that by 1901 the population density of Buganda had been reduced to less than one-quarter, said:

This decrease is partly due to the appalling bloodshed and massacres which went on between 1860 and 1898 and were caused by the wars, raids, and civil wars which took place under the kings Mutesa, Kiwewa, Karema, and Mwanga, and which resulted from the counter-raids of Unyoro. But another cause seems to have been the exhaustion of men and women by premature debauchery. From some cause or another the women of Uganda have become very poor breeders.[2]

If one reads the works of Speke, of Stanley, of the Rev. W. P. [R. P.] Ashe, of Lugard, and Colvile, one realises what a bloody country was the Kingdom of Uganda before it came under British control.... Speke gives a pathetic account of Mutesa's wives being hurried off to a cruel execution for most trivial reasons .... The worship of the spirits in Uganda and Busoga involved constant human sacrifice.... In the countries speaking the speech of Unyoro native custom positively required the suicides of wives on their husbands' graves. But the warfare that took place!—the constant loss of life that was due to civil wars or the aggressions on or by other states; raids from Uganda into Unyoro to obtain extra wives for the chiefs, raids from Unyoro into Toro and Ankole to snatch cattle and seize women;[3] then again, further east, whole tribes wiped out of existence. This has occurred again and again.... Famines, epidemics of smallpox or of bubonic plague,[4] attacks of a virulent dysentery caused by bad water and semi-starvation, would slay here 6,000, here 10,000, elsewhere wipe out a whole nation. The cattle plague would come down from the north, and since there was no central Government to check it or to segregate infected herds, disease would wipe off all the cattle from a country as large as Wales, reducing its inhabitants, who had hitherto depended solely on the produce of their cattle, sheep, and goats, to starvation or a disastrous emigration.[5]

Johnston discusses also other diseases, in particular syphilis.

It would almost seem as though the Baganda had lost much of their original vigour as a race through the effects of former debauchery and the appalling ravages

[1] Macdonald, pp. 194–5. [2] Johnston, *The Protectorate of Uganda*, vol. ii, pp. 640–2.

[3] As regards Unyoro he said in particular that the aristocracy 'were perpetually fighting one with the other' and thereby 'must have destroyed during the last fifty years a quarter of a million people according to native accounts'; that 'their ex-king, Kabarega, had the doubtful honour of exterminating a larger number of his own subjects by his own massacres than was accomplished by any of his foreign foes or allies' (ibid., p. 592); that there had been an 'appalling depopulation of the country consequent on civil wars and foreign invasions' (ibid., p. 588) which had the result that 'the population of the District of Unyoro is estimated at the present day as not exceeding 110,000'; and that the race seems 'to have spent its vigour and exhausted its energy in the continual fighting which has gone on in that unhappy land for the last forty or fifty years' (ibid., p. 591).

[4] For Unyoro see ibid., p. 593: 'The bubonic plague which is always simmering in these countries near the Victoria Nyanza has visited Unyoro repeatedly, having largely brought about the depopulation of the Buruli sub-division.'

[5] Ibid., vol. i, pp. 279–80. With regard to the Bahima in Ankole, whose number he thinks has been reduced to 20,000 (ibid., vol. ii, p. 615), he says (ibid., p. 626): 'Thirteen years ago [1890] the cattle plague, which devastated so much of East Central Africa, swept through Ankole and carried off three-fourths of the cattle. The Bahima, who then depended almost exclusively on their cattle for food, perished from starvation in great numbers, and the following year still more of them died from a visitation of smallpox, which proved fatal to them in their weakened condition. Lieutenant Mundy states that from the information given to him by intelligent Bahima, he believes the Hima population and their stock of cattle at the present day to be not more than a third of what they were fourteen years ago.'

caused among them by syphilis. It is difficult to overestimate the damage done by this last disease. . . . Dr. Cook, of the Church Missionary Society, in one of his reports to the Bishop of Uganda in 1901, remarked, 'In Uganda syphilis is universal.' So far as can be ascertained, this plague did not exist in the country until communications were opened up with the Zanzibar coast-lands and with the Sudan provinces of Egypt between 1850 and 1860.[1]

According to these and other early writers the main causes of the population decline in Uganda in the decades preceding the British administration were (1) intertribal wars, (2) civil wars. (3) massacres by the kings, (4) offerings of human victims to the gods, (5) famines, (6) epidemics, (7) syphilis, (8) debauchery, (9) low fertility of women, (10) flight from the country. The numerical importance of some of these factors—violent deaths and famines—has probably been exaggerated.[2] It is possible even that mortality, while being very high, was not excessive. But since fertility in Buganda was low there is not the least doubt that deaths here considerably exceeded births and that there actually was a notable decline in population. But Buganda comprised only something like one-quarter of the total population of the Uganda Protectorate (as constituted in 1896), and as fertility apparently was not low in the rest of the country there seems no reason to assume that in the decades preceding the British administration there was a notable population decline in the country as a whole.

As regards the first period of British administration Commissioner Johnston stated in 1900 with regard to the Protectorate as a whole: 'Civil wars, invasions, and, in some districts, famines, have of late years caused an evident decrease in the population.'[3] Lugard, in 1901, said concerning the Baganda: '. . . it is probable that to-day not more than fifteen to twenty thousand could take the field. Ten years ago Ashe

[1] Ibid., vol. ii, p. 640. He says also that syphilis 'is rife throughout Unyoro' (ibid., p. 593).

[2] L. P. Mair points out that 'if the term "human sacrifices" . . . is taken to imply a belief in deities who required human lives of their worshippers, it is quite inaccurate' (p. 179), and that 'the arbitrary cruelties of the king only affected persons in or near the capital' (p. 182). As regards intertribal wars, she says: '. . . warfare . . . was regarded by the people not as a burdensome duty but as a profitable occupation entered upon with eager interest' (p. 191). 'Every able-bodied man was expected to turn out, but though the penalty for cowardice in the field was instant death by burning, people who simply stayed at home were merely fined on their chief's return' (p. 193). 'The main object of the expedition was plunder; fighting was merely an incidental which became necessary if the enemy defended their property' (p. 194). See also Colonel Colvile (*The Land of the Nile Springs*, pp. 95–6): 'Except in peculiar cases, such as the religious conflicts of Uganda [between Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Mohammedans], native wars are little more than cattle-raiding expeditions, in which the loss of life is comparatively slight. The combatants seem to have a very good idea of their relative strengths, and the side which knows itself to be the weaker, after a certain amount of shouting, spear-brandishing, and firing in the air, generally wisely retires before it has placed itself in any serious jeopardy; while, even if it does make a stand, the long grass and inaccuracy of the markmen's aim prevents even improved modern rifles from being very deadly.' Sometimes there were also specific reasons checking would-be aggressors. 'That Kabarega had not retaliated for raids made into his country, is accounted for by the fact that he was dependent upon Mtesa for all trade, since coast goods could only reach him through Uganda' (Lugard, *The Story of Uganda*, p. 84).

The only famine of importance was apparently that of 1890 caused by the great cattle plague, but the staple food of the Baganda was plantains, and while pastoral tribes such as the Bahima in Ankoli seem to have suffered terribly, deaths from starvation in Buganda were probably not very numerous.

[3] *Preliminary Report on the Protectorate of Uganda* (Apr. 1900), p. 5.

estimated the fighting strength at forty thousand.'[1] The Intelligence Division of the War Office stated in September 1902: 'Ten years ago it was estimated that the Baganda could place a force of about 40,000 men in the field. Owing to a constant succession of internecine wars, it is, however, considered by Lugard that 20,000 to 25,000 would probably represent the total available fighting strength at the present day.'[2]

In the period under consideration (1893–1900) the natives had certainly been involved in a great deal of warfare. Intertribal wars, it is true, i.e. wars in which both parties were exclusively natives, had lost in importance, but there were the expeditions of British forces, mainly composed of Baganda levies,[3] against the Unyoro and other tribes and later against the Sudanese mutineers, and the Baganda fought those battles in probably at least as large numbers[4] and with certainly as much gusto[5] as the earlier intertribal wars. Yet, all the available evidence shows that the number of Baganda who lost their lives in these campaigns was very small,[6] and

[1] Lugard, *The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*, p. 53. (As stated above, Ashe had not estimated the fighting strength at 40,000 but had doubted if by the mightiest effort more than 40,000 warriors could be massed *at any given point*.)

[2] *Précis of Information*, p. 72. It should be noted that Colonel Colvile as far back as 1893 evidently estimated the total fighting strength at less than 20,000. After having stated that he advanced into Unyoro with 'about fifteen thousand' Baganda he said: 'I practically had with me the whole able-bodied male population of Uganda, only old men, boys, and women being left behind' (Colvile, pp. 99–100). But it goes without saying that it would have meant an almost inconceivable effort—which, incidentally, was not at all justified by the circumstances—if the Baganda would have sent him as auxiliaries one-half of their able-bodied men.

[3] Sir Harry Johnston, in his report dated 10 July 1901, speaking of 'the enemies with which the Uganda Protectorate had to deal during the first three years of its existence', says that 'the only force by which these enemies might be controlled or vanquished was the . . . Sudanese—about 1,600 in number—and the native levies of the Baganda' (*Report on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 4). After the extension of the Protectorate over the Eastern Province, the Masai were used for similar purposes. 'Of late years they have frequently been employed by the Uganda Administration as auxiliaries in punitive expeditions, and on each occasion are reported to have rendered valuable service' (*Précis of Information*, p. 9).

[4] In Jan. 1894 Colonel Colvile advanced into Unyoro with a force composed of 8 Europeans, 15,150 Waganda, and 977 Sudanese, Swahili, &c. (see *Papers relating to Uganda*, 1895, p. 20). The British forces marching in Apr. 1895 into Unyoro consisted of six companies of Sudanese and about 21,000 Waganda (see *Report on Military Operations against Kabarega*, p. 2).

[5] Major Cunningham, in his report of 7 June 1895 to Commissioner Jackson, said: 'The spirit shown by the entire Waganda nation in so promptly coming forward to avenge a raid made upon some of their fellow-countrymen is very commendable' (ibid., p. 4). Commissioner Jackson himself, in his report of 1 July 1895 to the Earl of Kimberley, emphasized how 'desirous were the Waganda of striking an effective blow against their long-standing enemy' (ibid., p. 2). See also Sir Harry Johnston's report of 10 July 1901 to the Marquess of Lansdowne: '. . . soon after the establishment of this Protectorate he [Kabarega] commenced to harry the northern frontiers of Uganda. When his raids had been repulsed, the feeling of the Baganda was so strong that it may be said to have overcome the reluctance of the British Administrators to extend the area of the Protectorate. Urged on by the Baganda, war was made on Kabarega resolutely, and nearly half his territories were incorporated in the Kingdom of Uganda and placed under Uganda Chiefs' (*Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda*, p. 4). See furthermore Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. i, p. 235: 'When the British Protectorate was declared over Uganda, it is to be feared that the Baganda chiefs, greedy for territory and spoil, rather threw difficulties in the way of Kabarega coming to terms with the British authorities.'

[6] The losses of the Baganda in the campaigns against the Unyoro seem to have been negligible (see, for example, *Report on Military Operations against Kabarega*, pp. 3–4; Colvile, *The Land of the Nile Springs*, p. 277). The losses were apparently heavier in the expedition against the Sudanese mutineers, who had gained the support of a number of Unyoro and Baganda while the British forces included Baganda and Busoga irregulars. During the main campaign which lasted from

though the Unyoro and the other enemy tribes doubtless suffered more there is no reason to assume that their losses were very great.

As regards famines, Commissioner Johnston said himself:

> Famine has affected a relatively small area in the Protectorate—the district of Busoga. This was formerly a densely populated country. The scarcity of food seems to have arisen in the interior of that province from an unusual drought during 1898–99 . . . .[1]

But during that famine in the district of Busoga only '5,000 or 6,000 people are said to have lost their lives from starvation'.[2]

It is impossible, of course, to estimate the number of natives whose deaths in 1893–1900 were caused by invasions, civil wars, and famines, but a reasoned guess would probably not put it at much more than 100,000.[3] It is unlikely, on the other hand, that the deaths from other causes were less than 100,000 *per year*. It therefore seems hardly justified to attribute a population decrease, if such there was, to invasions, civil wars, and famines.

While Sir H. Johnston believed that the population had hitherto been falling, he thought that it would increase very much in the future.

> The lands of the Protectorate—exceptionally fertile as they are, and well watered by innumerable streams, lakes, and lakelets—should easily support a native population of 20,000,000. The increase in times of peace and plenty goes on so rapidly that, unless any rude check occurs to the prosperity of Uganda, we may look to see, I believe, an extraordinary development of the native population under British rule.[4]

A year later he was more sceptical.

> It is doubtful whether the native population is on the increase at the present time, but on the whole I should say it was decidedly on the increase in the Eastern and Nile Provinces.

19 Oct. 1897 to 26 Apr. 1898 the losses of irregulars on the British side were 185 killed and 341 wounded Waganda, and 39 killed and 90 wounded 'Wasoga and others'. The losses of the enemy were 230 killed and 235 wounded Sudanese mutineers, and 340 killed and 314 wounded 'Waganda and others' (see *Papers relating to Recent Events in the Uganda Protectorate*, 1899, pp. 31–2). In the campaign from 24 Oct. to 27 Nov. 1898 the casualties cannot have been great since it seems that the 'enemy's force consisted of 300 mutineers, 500 Waganda rebels, and 300 Wanyoro rebels' (ibid., p. 24). In estimating that the fighting strength of the Baganda at the beginning of this century was only about one-half of what it had been ten years earlier, General Lugard may have overlooked that in every year a new group of boys reaches military age so that in the course of a decade even heavy losses in the field are easily replaced. But it is possible also that he actually over-estimated the losses. Speaking of the 1897–8 campaign against the Sudanese mutineers, he says: 'Meanwhile, a considerable Waganda army had proceeded to the assistance of Macdonald. From October 19th to January 9th, the siege of the mutineers in Luba's continued, with constant skirmishes, in which . . . a very large number of the Waganda were killed, more especially in an attack by Woodward on November 24th, 1897' (*The Story*, p. 159). Actually 102 Waganda were killed in the attack of 24 Nov., and altogether 137 from 19 Oct. to 9 Jan. (see *Papers relating to Recent Events in the Uganda Protectorate*, pp. 31–2).

[1] *Preliminary Report on the Protectorate of Uganda* (Apr. 1900), p. 5.

[2] *Précis of Information*, p. 99. According to Dr. Cook, 'it was reckoned that some forty thousand had died in Busoga' (*Uganda Memories*, p. 245); but this was undoubtedly an exaggeration.

[3] This figure would include the losses incurred through invasions from the north. See in this connexion *Précis of Information*, p. 48: 'The eastern half of the district [Bari] is comparatively densely populated, but along the banks of the Nile the country, in 1898, was found to have been devastated and depopulated to a great extent by the Dervishes.'

[4] *Preliminary Report on the Protectorate of Uganda* (Apr. 1900), p. 7.

Famines and wars have brought about an actual decrease in the Rudolf and Central Provinces. In the countries of Uganda, Unyoro, Toro, and Ankole, the population is, on the whole, stationary, increasing slightly in the three districts last named, and diminishing slightly in the Kingdom of Uganda.[1]

I sincerely hope that an increase may return to them [the Uganda people] as in my opinion, there is no race like to them amongst the negro tribes of Africa. They are the Japanese of the Dark Continent, the most naturally civilized, charming, kindly, tactful, and courteous of black peoples.[2]

By that time sleeping-sickness had invaded the country. It killed in 1900–6 approximately one-tenth of the population of the Protectorate. The proportion of deaths was higher in the kingdom of Buganda and higher still in Busoga. As regards Buganda, the Colonial Report for 1907–8 stated:

In spite of the fact that the mortality from sleeping sickness has been enormously decreased during the last two years, the death-rate among the natives is still distressingly in excess of the birth-rate. The population of the Kingdom of Buganda appears to be dwindling at the rate of nearly 20,000 a year, and it is considered that this unfortunate state of affairs is mainly due to the terrible prevalence of venereal diseases among the people generally, and to infant mortality.[3]

From 1912 on, official opinion on population increase and decrease was based on the returns of births and deaths.[4] These showed an excess of deaths over births in Buganda for every year from 1912 to 1923 and for 1930 and 1942; in Busoga for 1919, 1921, 1936, 1937, 1942, 1943, and 1944; in Bunyoro for 1913, 1914, and for every year from 1916 to 1934; in Ankole for 1919 and 1942; in Toro only for 1919. In the whole of these five administrative units there was in the decade 1912–21 an excess of deaths over births amounting to 2,020, and in 1922–44 an excess of births over deaths aggregating 198,121 and averaging 8,614 per year, a rather small natural increase considering that the population of these units, according to the 1931 count, numbered 1,838,428.

In Buganda the population may be smaller now than it was 45 years ago. Commissioner Johnston (1901) thought that the natives of Buganda, though they had diminished, still numbered 1,000,000. The count of 1921 showed 774,753. Since the number of births was very low, since in 1900–11 more than 100,000 natives died from sleeping-sickness, and since the returns of births and deaths show for 1912–20 an excess of deaths of over 30,000, it is quite possible that the population decreased in 1900–20 by something like 200,000. For 31 December 1944 the population has been estimated at 919,911.[5]

[1] *Report on the Protectorate of Uganda* (July 1901), p. 15. He attributed the decrease in the kingdom of Uganda to a decrease in the birth-rate, see p. 316 above.

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1907–8*, p. 30. See also Dr. Cook, *Uganda Memories*, p. 244: 'The return of births and deaths prepared by the Uganda Native Council for 1906, incomplete and quite possibly inaccurate, as they probably were, yet showed indubitably that there was something gravely wrong. For the Kingdom of Buganda, the figures, which cover nine months only, show 8,572 births and 15,011 deaths. In this last total deaths from sleeping sickness approximated 3,998.' These figures certainly do not suggest that the population was 'dwindling at the rate of nearly 20,000 a year'.

[4] It should be kept in mind, however, that the Medical Department considers the birth records more complete than the death records; see p. 270 above.

[5] It may, however, have been under-estimated.

For Busoga the population estimates prior to 1911 are mere guesses,[1] but there is not the least doubt that the population decreased enormously during the first decade of this century. Sleeping-sickness probably killed off over 100,000 people out of a population which certainly did not reach 500,000 and may have been much smaller, and a severe famine in 1908 claimed over 10,000 victims.[2] The population has since increased but it is impossible to say by how much. According to the decennial counts, it decreased from 243,403 in 1911 to 221,108 in 1921, but leaped to 378,394 in 1931[3] although registered births exceeded registered deaths in 1921–30 by only 37,729 and although 'no abnormal immigration had been noted'.[4] The total excess of births over deaths in 1912–44 is given as 59,921. It is safe to say that, unless immigration considerably exceeded emigration, the population now is smaller than it was 45 years ago.

Lugard, in 1893, had stated that 'Unyoro is probably more populous than Uganda'. The East Africa Commission reported in 1925:

> Accurate statistics [for the Uganda Protectorate] are not available, but it is clear that until quite recently the population has been decreasing rather than increasing. This is particularly the case in the Bunyoro district, which was formerly almost as populous as the Kingdom of Buganda, and to-day contains little more than one-fifth of the population of Buganda. There can be no doubt whatever that the principal cause of this decline has been venereal disease.[5]

Actually the principal cause of this decline had been the handing over in the 1890s of large portions of the Kingdom of Bunyoro to the newly created Kingdom of Toro and to the Kingdom of Buganda 'as a reward for its loyalty and assistance'.[6] As far back as 1898, when the boundaries

[1] The *Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey* (1893), p. 87, stated: 'The numbers of the Wasoga may be estimated at 300,000.' *Précis of Information*, issued by the War Office in Sept. 1902, said (p. 40) that 'the number of inhabitants, according to a recent estimate made by Mr. W. Grant, C.M.G., the civilian officer in charge of the district, does not now exceed about 100,000'. In *Statistical Tables, Colonial Possessions 1903*, p. 830, the population was given as 300,000. See also p. 239 above.

[2] Deputy Commissioner George Wilson reported: 'From all the information I could gather it appeared that from 50 to 75 per cent. of the population of about 300,000 were in imminent danger of starvation' (*Correspondence relating to Famine in the Busoga District*, p. 8). Governor Bell himself, in a Dispatch of 19 Sept. 1908 to the Secretary of State, said: 'It is estimated that over 10,000 perished, and it is believed that, in the absence of the prompt measures taken by the administration [importation of about 800 tons of food], the mortality would have been ten times greater' (ibid., p. 5). But it is possible that the estimate 'over 10,000' covered only those who died of hunger. 'Unfortunately, the natives, being accustomed to live almost entirely on bananas, find much difficulty in assimilating the imported food, and many succumb to stomach troubles. Small-pox also is prevalent among them.' (Governor's Dispatch of 4 Apr. 1908, ibid., p. 3.)

See also Thomas and Scott, p. 438: 'When, in 1890, caravans from Mombasa first made use of the northern route to Uganda they found S. Busoga a well populated country able to provide vast quantities of food. . . . Busoga received a setback from famine in 1899–1900. Sleeping sickness decimated the lake-shore population within a few years from 1902, and a further famine early in 1908 completed the almost total depopulation of the S. of the district.'

Dr. Cook, *Uganda Memories*, pp. 245–7, gives a detailed description of the 1908 famine. He says that 'well over six thousand perished of actual starvation'.

[3] For 31 Dec. 1944 the native population is given as 380,889.

[4] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 29.

[5] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 144.

[6] *Enquiry into Land Tenure in Bunyoro*, p. 6. See also ibid., p. 5: 'The present Bunyoro [4,735 square miles] is all that remains of the once far-spread Kingdom of Kitara, the sway of whose

of Bunyoro were definitely fixed, the population of Bunyoro was probably less than one-fifth of the population of Buganda. Since sleeping-sickness also affected Bunyoro (though much less than Busoga and Buganda) it may be assumed that the population did not increase in the first decade of this century, and it is now probably smaller than 45 years ago as registered deaths exceeded registered births in 1912–44 by 14,519. According to the decennial counts, the population decreased in fact from 130,922 in 1911 to 114,220 in 1931.[1]

In Ankole the population increased according to the counts from 228,700 in 1911 to 279,354 in 1931,[2] and the number of registered births exceeded the number of registered deaths in 1912–44 by 63,231. Since there seems no reason to assume that mortality in the first decade of this century was excessive it is most likely that the population in this District is now larger than 45 years ago.

For Toro the returns of the counts must be considered with as much distrust as those for Busoga. They show for 1911–21 a negligible increase from 115,041 to 117,397 but a leap to 193,714 in 1931,[3] although registered births exceeded registered deaths in 1921–30 by only 27,934 and although 'no abnormal immigration had been noted'.[4] The total excess of registered births over registered deaths in 1912–44 was 62,521, and it is most likely that in this District as in Ankole the population is now larger than 45 years ago.

For the whole of the five administrative units which have provided vital statistics for over three decades and which comprise about one-half of the Protectorate the population is now apparently not greater than 45 years ago. Since for the rest of the country death records are not available prior to 1930 all that can be said is that in 1930–44 the excess of registered births over registered deaths was much greater than in the five administrative units discussed above.

VIII. Non-Native Births and Deaths Statistics

Birth registration became compulsory in 1905 for Europeans and in 1915 for Asiatics; death registration became compulsory in 1907 for all non-natives. European birth figures have been published for 1904–13, 1932, and 1936–8, Asiatic birth figures for 1932 and 1936–8, European death figures for 1904–13, 1919–23, and 1929–39, Asiatic death figures for 1910–13 and 1929–39.[5] The annual Blue Books show, moreover, for 1928–44 the total and the native births and for 1930–44 the total and the native

rulers stretched . . . [over] an area of hardly less than 30,000 square miles.' For details of the reduction of the area see Thomas and Scott, pp. 426, 430, 432–3.

[1] For 31 Dec. 1944 the population is given as 118,403.

[2] For 31 Dec. 1944 the population is given as 305,127.

[3] For 31 Dec. 1944 the population is given as 212,774.

[4] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 29.

[5] See *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1904–5*, p. 22; *1906–7*, p. 18; *1911–12*, p. 13; *1912–13*, p. 16; *1913–14*, p. 20; *1932*, p. 9; *1933*, pp. 9–10; *1934*, p. 9; *1935*, p. 8; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 7; *Medical Reports 1920*, pp. 14, 16; *1921*, pp. 16–17; *1922*, pp. 15–16; *1923*, p. 6; *1930*, pp. 22–4; *1931*, pp. 22–4; *1935*, pp. 33–4; *1939*, pp. 29–31.

deaths;[1] from these data figures of the non-native births and deaths can be derived.

The numbers of registered European births in 1904–13 were 7, 12, 5, 1, 8, 15, 10, 18, 27, and 25 respectively. The numbers of recorded European deaths in 1904–13[2] were 3, 4, 4, 3, 7, 14, 11, 11, 8, and 9 respectively, and in 1919–23 12, 8, 15, 24, and 9 respectively.[3] The numbers of registered Asiatic deaths in 1910–13 were 27, 9, 37, and 39 respectively. For 1928–44 the returns were as follows:

	Births			*Deaths*		
Year	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Non-Native*	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Non-Native*
1928	..	..	810	..	..	..
1929	..	..	392	10	152	..
1930	..	..	223	13	87	141
1931	..	..	496	28	111	202
1932	39	405	444	9	147	156
1933	..	..	467	7	113	137

	Births			*Deaths*				*Births*	*Deaths*
Year	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Non-Native*	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*	*Non-Native*	*Year*	*Non-Native*	*Non-Native*
1934	..	..	804	17	136	164	1940	1,251	246
1935	..	..	774	9	215	224	1941	1,222	231
1936	45	738	958	11	225	245	1942	1,323	241
1937	43	937	980	14	246	257	1943	1,550	240
1938	33	1,012	1,063	25	211	236	1944	1,652	258
1939	..	..	1,163	14	70	197			

Only for the births of 1932 and 1937 and the deaths of 1932, 1935, and 1938 do the figures for non-natives tally with those of Europeans and Asiatics.

Europeans. The scanty birth figures available for Europeans indicate a low fertility. Mortality is not low, and blackwater fever still claims more victims than in some other East African Dependencies.[4]

[1] See *Blue Book 1928*, pp. 85–6; *1929*, pp. 91–2; *1930*, pp. 103–4; *1931*, pp. 103–4; *1932*, pp. 109–10; *1933*, pp. 119–20; *1934*, pp. 127–8; *1935*, pp. 130–1; *1936*, pp. 123–4; *1937*, pp. 124–5; *1938*, pp. 122–3; *1939*, pp. 16–17; *1940*, pp. 16–17; *1941*, pp. 14–15, to *1944*, pp. 14–15.

[2] For 1902–3 the number of deaths is given as 8; see *General Report on the Uganda Protectorate 1902–3*, p. 7.

[3] It is doubtful whether these figures include all deaths that occurred.

[4] In his report for 1900 the Principal Medical Officer stated that 'prior to 1900 blackwater fever was almost unknown in Uganda proper' (*Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda* 1901, p. 20). For later years see, for example, *Medical Report 1912*, pp. 7, 10; *1915*, p. 9; *1933*, p. 18; *1938*, p. 26; Governor's Address to the Legislative Council, 4 Dec. 1931, *Uganda Official Gazette*, 15 Dec. 1931, p. 428.

During the war health conditions deteriorated. *Medical Report 1943* said (p. 1): 'There is accumulated evidence that the health of our European officials and that of the European members of the public generally is not as good as in normal times. Provisional figures show that over the year we have had a 20% increase in the number of officers on the sick list compared with 1938 and a like increase in working days lost through ill-health.' See also ibid. *1944*, p. 2: 'The deterioration in the health of the European population, official and unofficial, resulting from the strain imposed by sustained war conditions, continues to be cumulative.'

TABLE 17. *Deaths of European Officials, Uganda, 1912–39*[1]

Year	Number		Deaths	Year	Number		Deaths
	Total	Average			Total	Average	
1912	349	144	2	1926	512	374	1
1913	569	168	—	1927	525	338	2
1914	694	169	3	1928	542	388	4
1915[2]	481	154	—	1929	573	394	2
1916[2]	484	147	2	1930	590	396	2
1917[2]	378	120	2	1931	607	501	2
1918[2]	377	122	—	1932	542	442	1
1919[2]	444	124	2	1933	508	397	—
1920	350	280	2	1934	523	434	1
1921	390	244	1	1935	551	442	1
1922	413	266	6	1936	570	462	—
1923	383	313	2	1937	595	499	4
1924	434	361	3	1938	652	522	2
1925	488	366	3	1939	667	563	—

[1] See *Medical Report 1912*, p. 15; *1913*, p. 17; *1914*, p. 16; *1915*, p. 13; *1916*, p. 11; *1917*, p. 17; *1918*, p. 16; *1919*, p. 16; *1922*, p. 15; *1925*, p. 18; *1927*, p. 18; *1930*, p. 22; *1933*, p. 28; *1936*, p. 37; *1939*, p. 29.

[2] 'Records incomplete.'

Asiatics. Prior to the enactment of the Births and Deaths Registration (Amendment) Ordinance, 1935, registration of births and deaths among Asiatics was probably incomplete,[1] and the increase in the numbers of births and deaths in recent years may be due only to more adequate registration. Fertility seems to be very high among Asiatics and mortality not particularly unfavourable.

[1] See also in this connexion *Colonial Reports, Uganda 1935*, p. 49.

CHAPTER X

TANGANYIKA TERRITORY[1]

I. CENSUS-TAKING

1. *Native Counts*

A COUNT of the native population has been attempted three times under British administration, in 1921, 1928, and 1931. In no case was it considered necessary to enact an Ordinance for this purpose.[2]

The Report on the 1921 count merely states that the 'tables have been drawn up from the census returns submitted by the District Political Officers'.[3] Opinions about the completeness of the 1921 returns have varied considerably in the course of time. Immediately before the count the Administration had stated that 'the total native population in Tanganyika is now estimated at about 4,000,000'[4] or 'approximately the same' as in 1913.[5] Since at that time the Administration was of the opinion that, according to the German figures, the population of the Territory now under British Mandate had been 4,145,000 in 1913,[6] it did not challenge the completeness of the 1921 returns which yielded a total

[1] The Tanganyika Territory consists of that portion of the former Colony of German East Africa which, under Article 23 of the Treaty of Versailles, the Principal Allied and Associated Powers agreed should be administered under a mandate by His Britannic Majesty.

[2] At the Second Reading of the 1931 Bill entitled 'An Ordinance to provide for the taking of a Census of Non-natives in the Tanganyika Territory' the Chief Secretary stated: 'It is, of course, intended to take a census of the native population of the country, but we do not require legislation to do that. We have all the powers that we require under the Hut and Poll Tax Ordinance and under the Native Authority Ordinance.' (*Proceedings of the Legislative Council 1931*, Part I, p. 159.)

[3] *Report on the Native Census, 1921*, p. 1. That not all the 'census returns' were the results of actual counting may be inferred from the returns of the most populous district, the Mwanza District (ibid., p. 8):

Tribe	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Totals*
Sukuma . . .	106,700	119,300	106,700	119,200	451,900
Ruri. . . .	12,500	13,500	12,500	13,500	52,000
Kerewe . . .	7,000	8,000	7,000	8,000	30,000
Suba . . .	7,000	8,000	7,000	8,000	30,000
Shashi . . .	7,000	8,000	7,000	8,000	30,000
Gaya . . .	7,000	8,000	7,000	8,000	30,000
Zinza . . .	5,500	6,100	5,500	6,100	23,200
Sanaki . . .	4,500	5,500	4,500	5,500	20,000
Nyamwezi . .	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	12,000
Sumbwa . . .	2,800	3,200	2,800	3,200	12,000
Misc. small tribes .	2,700	2,900	2,700	2,900	11,200
Totals . . .	165,700	186,500	165,700	186,400	702,300

[4] *Report on Tanganyika Territory 1918–20*, p. 38.

[5] See ibid., p. 37.

[6] The last German administration report had stated that the native population, excluding Ruanda and Urundi, numbered 4,145,000, the accuracy of the figures being 'about ± 100,000' (see *Die deutschen Schutzgebiete 1912/13*, p. 8).

native population of 4,107,000. In the 'census' report prepared by the Assistant Secretary, the enormous decrease in the figures for the Ujiji District (from 240,000 to 139,500) was mainly 'accounted for by the fact that the Germans in reckoning the population of that district calculated on the basis of 5 women and children to 1 man, whereas the correct figures work out about 3 women and children to 1 man'.[1] The large decreases in some other inland districts (Mahenge, Dodoma, Kondoa–Irangi) were attributed to military operations and to the famine of 1919, and in the coast districts[2] to venereal diseases, which 'increased greatly during the war with a resultant fall in the birth rate and increase in infant mortality'. Since the alleged overstatement of the 1913 population of Ujiji (80,000) was much greater than the total decrease for the Territory (38,000), the Assistant Secretary apparently believed that the population as a whole had not decreased.[3] But the Senior Sanitation Officer did not share the views of the Assistant Secretary. He believed that the population had actually decreased and attributed it to the death from disease of a great number of porters, to the 1918–19 influenza epidemics which caused 'between 50,000 and 80,000' deaths, to the famine of 1920, and to high infant mortality. As to the contended great increase of venereal disease during the war he stated that 'we do not know, because no one has taken the trouble to find out, whether, as a disease, it is increasing or diminishing'.[4] But it is noteworthy that neither the Assistant Secretary nor the Senior Sanitation Officer doubted the accuracy of the 1921 count.

It was only four years later that the Administration came to the conclusion that the 1921 returns were incomplete. The *Report to the League of Nations* for 1925 stated:[5]

> The total native population is estimated at 4,319,000 as against 4,107,000 according to the census of 1921, but it must not be assumed that there has been a general

[1] *Report on the Native Census, 1921*, p. 1. Actually there were in 1921 in the Ujiji District 49,384 men, 60,601 women, 15,388 boys, and 14,116 girls, or only 1·8 women and children to 1 man; see ibid., p. 10.

[2] The 'census' report emphasized that 'the populations of all the coast districts have decreased (Lindi for example shews a decrease of 38%).' But the apparent decrease in the Rufiji District from 89,100 to 83,200 was due to the fact that this District included in 1913 the Mafia Island (with a population of 9,500 according to *A Handbook of German East Africa*, p. 183), while the island was not included in the 1921 census, since it was administered from 1916 to 1922 by the Zanzibar Government. As to the decrease of Lindi, it was due, although only to a small part, to the cession of the 'Kionga Triangle' to Portugal in 1919. (I have not been able to find a population figure for this Territory. Estimates of its area vary between 60 square miles—see Arning, *Deutsch-Ostafrika gestern und heute*, p. 77—and 400 square miles; see, for example, *South and East African Year-Book 1939*, p. 773. To judge from Map VII of *A Manual of Portuguese East Africa*, 60 square miles is a gross under-estimate, and 400 square miles a gross over-estimate.)

[3] Yet, the Administration, as late as 1924, in a note to the East Africa Commission, said that 'most of the apparent decrease' arose from this German overstatement of the population in Ujiji. 'Deaths during the famine in 1919 in Dodoma and Kondoa–Irangi and deaths due to the war account for the real decrease' (*Report of the East Africa Commission*, pp. 184–5). At last, however —evidently in order to take account of that apparent overstatement for Ujiji—the Administration in its 1928 *Report to the League of Nations* (p. 79) gave as the 1913 population of Kigoma (formerly Ujiji *and* Ufipa) 240,000 (the German figure for Ujiji), thus omitting altogether the population of Ufipa (81,700), and gave as the 1913 population of the whole Territory 4,063,300 instead of 4,145,000.

[4] See *Medical Report 1921*, pp. 80–1.

[5] *Report 1925*, p. 25.

increase of population but rather that the enumeration in 1925 is more accurate than that of 1921.[1]

Three years after the 'enumeration' of 1925, another count was made which yielded a still much higher total.

A census of the native population was taken by the Native Administrations of the Territory in April, 1928, and may be regarded as containing the most accurate statistics yet obtained of the native population. The total native population was shown to be 4,740,706.[2]

Finally, the count made in the spring of 1931 showed a native population of not less than 5,022,640.

TABLE 1. *Native Population of Tanganyika Territory, 1913–31*[1]

Provinces 1931	*Provinces or Districts 1913–28*	*Population*				
		1913	*1921*	*1925*	*1928*	*1931*
Lake	Mwanza	620,000	702,300	702,000	798,647	868,664
	Bukoba	270,500	320,100	329,000	348,036	377,409
Western	Tabora	437,500	502,100	530,000	533,746	548,286[3]
	Ufipa	81,700[3]	93,600	68,000	88,019	78,501[3]
	Ujiji	240,000	139,500	192,000[4]	202,500	215,441
Central	Dodoma	299,400	270,900	325,000	607,467[5]	579,712[3]
	Kondoa–Irangi	218,300	196,700	181,000		
Eastern	Morogoro	158,400	174,300	180,000		
	Dar es Salaam	161,500	149,100	116,000	519,216	526,039
	Rufiji	89,100	83,200	79,000		
	Bagamoyo	72,800	57,100	57,000		
Iringa	Rungwe	195,800[6]	237,200	237,000	413,882	491,911[3]
	Iringa	90,000	104,800	104,000		
Lindi	Lindi	395,500	243,400	320,000	357,255	427,627
	Kilwa	96,200	84,000	98,000		
Tanga	Usambara	98,600[7]	107,400	113,000		
	Tanga	108,400	86,700	63,000	349,375	355,914
	Pangani	98,500	74,900	85,000		
Northern	Moshi	118,300	158,200	186,000	324,991	344,198
	Arusha	84,200	97,700	143,000		
Mahenge	Songea	90,300	148,200	136,000	99,555	115,786
	Mahenge	120,000	74,600	75,000	98,017	93,152
Total	..	4,145,000[8]	4,107,000[9]	4,319,000	4,740,706	5,022,640

[1] Computed from *Die deutschen Schutzgebiete 1912/13, Statistischer Teil*, p. 36; *Report on the Native Census, 1921*, p. 3; *1931*, pp. 10–13; *Report to the League of Nations 1925*, p. 25; *1928*, p. 79.

[2] 1931 Tabora figures include 23,600 who in 1928 were included elsewhere (16,000 in Ufipa District, 5,400 in Central Province, and 2,200 in Mbeya District; see *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 10–12).

[3] Bismarckburg.

[4] Kigoma. The 1925 Report gives as population of 'Kigoma' (formerly Ujiji) for 1921, 139,500 and for 1925, 192,000. The 1928 Report gives as population for 'Kigoma' (formerly Ujiji and Ufipa) for 1913 and 1921, 240,000 and 233,100.

[5] Incorrect figure (over-estimate of females). [6] Langenburg. [7] Wilhelmstal.

[8] Later reduced to 4,063,300 (see footnote 3, p. 326). [9] Total of items is 4,106,000.

It might have been expected that the returns of 1928 and 1931 would shatter confidence in the completeness of the 1921 count still more

[1] A small part of the apparent increase was due to the fact that in 1922 the island of Mafia had been transferred from Zanzibar to Tanganyika. It should be noted, moreover, that for 5 Districts (Mwanza, Bagamoyo, Rungwe, Iringa, Mahenge), which in 1921 comprised 29 per cent. of the total population, the figures for 1925 were practically the same as for 1921.

[2] *Report to the League of Nations 1928*, p. 78.

than did the 'enumeration' of 1925. But this was not the case. Far from believing that the 1921 figure was too low, the Secretary for Native Affairs now thought that this figure, and still more so that of 1913, had been an over-estimate. In his report on the 1931 count he says that 'despite the probable tendency to over-estimate in early enumerations the 1931 census shows an increase since 1921 of over 22 per cent., sufficient evidence to enable us to state with conviction that the population is steadily increasing'.[1] I shall deal more fully with the question of the increase of the native population in Section VII of this chapter,[2] and shall confine myself here to the question of the accuracy of the counts of 1928 and 1931.

No special report has been published on the 1928 count. But the report on the 1931 count states:

The count made by the Native Administrations in 1928 was more reliable than those of 1913 and 1921. It recorded large increases since 1921, in particular in the coastal districts, due to some extent no doubt to the influx of plantation labour. The 1931 figures support the belief in the general accuracy of the 1928 enumeration.[3]

It will be observed that in one province only the population appears to have declined. This is the Central Province, where there is an apparent decrease of 27,755; of this number, 5,400 are accounted for by an alteration in the provincial boundary. It is believed that the 1931 census of the Kondoa-Irangi District, which shows a decrease of 42,168 since 1928, is correct, but that the figures collected in 1928 were erroneous. This belief is based on the following figures of the population of the Irangi tribe living in that district:—

Year	*Males*	*Females*	*Percentage of men to women*	*Total*
1921	21,259	22,022	96	43,281
1928	37,254	82,634	45	119,888
1931	38,419	40,435	95	78,851

There can be no reasonable doubt that the 1928 figure for females was completely inaccurate; it was so regarded at the time, and the present census proves it. These figures and the fact that the accuracy of the 1931 census of the district is supported by statistics of taxpayers (Table V) indicate that an error of 43,000 was made in the 1928 figures. If this is accepted, then the population of the Central Province has, in fact, increased since 1928 by approximately 20,000.[4]

As to the methods and results of the 1931 count the report says:[5]

In a country such as Tanganyika extending over 366,000 square miles (excluding water) and containing large sparsely populated areas and a population an insignificant proportion of which is literate, it is impracticable to attempt the taking of a general census of a standard, as regards accuracy and detailed information, such as has been attained in Europe. The need for economy precluded the employment of

[1] *Census of the Native Population 1931*, p. 3.

[2] An attempt to provide comparable figures has been made in Table 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

[4] Ibid., p. 3. However, the representative of the Administration at the meeting of the Permanent Mandates Commission, on 16 Nov. 1932, still maintained that the decrease of the population in the Central Province was due to the alteration in the provincial boundary (see *Minutes*, 22nd Session, p. 158).

[5] *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 1-2.

any but the normal administrative machinery; but even if it had been possible to engage special staff for the census, it is doubtful if, at this stage of development, any appreciably improved standard of accuracy could have been reached. The census taken in 1931 must be examined with these limiting factors in mind, but in spite of them there are good grounds for believing it to be generally accurate, and it is certainly a great advance in this respect on any previous census in Tanganyika, though, as will be explained later, the general level of accuracy reached elsewhere cannot be claimed for the figures from the Tabora[1] and Kondoa–Irangi Districts.[2]

The compilation of the census was undertaken by the District Officers, under the general supervision of their Provincial Commissioners, through the agency of the native authorities, in accordance with a standard procedure laid down in instructions circulated from the Secretariat. The reliability of the returns, therefore, depended mainly on the capacity of the native authorities, many of whom are not yet sufficiently educated to make possible an enumeration of the population on a single day throughout the Territory. In 1928 an attempt was made to arrange for actual counts on fixed days, but the experience showed that this method was inefficient. In 1931, therefore, investigations were carried out by District Officers through the Native Administrations over a period of several months during which test checks were instituted by actual enumeration in selected and typical villages or groups of villages, a single date having been fixed for the termination of these investigations and the compilation of returns. In view of the particular difficulty presented by travelling natives and in order to reduce to a minimum the risk of double enumeration, it was considered desirable that the preliminary investigations should proceed during the period leading up to the harvest and should be completed as soon as possible after the harvest, since it is during that period that movement is reduced to a minimum and the great majority of natives may be expected to be at their homes or their place of permanent employment. There is considerable variation in the Territory as regards the date of the harvest, but the first of July was chosen as a suitable general date on which to conclude the preliminary investigations. It was found that even at that season the task of enumeration was complicated by travelling natives whose numbers were increased in 1931 on account of the scarcity of and

[1] See ibid., p. 4: 'Although since 1928 the Kitunda area, having a total population in 1931 of 21,434, has been included in the Tabora District, yet the return submitted showed a decline of 33,450, i.e. a real decrease of 54,884 or 30 per cent. in respect of the district as it was in 1928. The figures were challenged and a test check was taken in the compact Chiefdom of Uyui, which showed that the first return was entirely inaccurate. The Provincial Commissioner considered that no decline in the population of the district had taken place and that the census in this district had been so inefficiently taken as to make it valueless. Previous experience in Kondoa-Irangi, the 1928 census, and the tax registers all support the result of the test check and the personal observations of the Provincial Commissioner (whose knowledge of this district goes back to 1920). While, therefore, there can be no reasonable doubt of the general accuracy of the figures, it must nevertheless be noted that for the Tabora District they are an estimate which claims to be only approximately accurate.' The estimate entered in the tables was 211,434 (while the submitted return had been 149,468).

As usual, returns seem to have been challenged in 1931 only when they showed a marked decrease as compared with 1928, but not when they showed a most unlikely increase. In this connexion the following statement by Mr. and Mrs. Culwick ('A Study of Population', p. 366), who made a detailed investigation in the Kiberege Division of the Ulanga District, deserves attention:

'. . . The 1928 Census gives a figure of 42,463, and the 1931 Census 53,948.

'The last, with all its shortcomings, was probably the least inaccurate that has yet been taken, but that is not saying much, and as one of the writers was responsible for it we are in a position to state with authority that the figures cannot be relied upon. The machinery available for carrying out the count was entirely inadequate, and the resulting errors were without doubt so great as to render the final results extremely untrustworthy.

'In short, none of the census figures can be accepted as a basis for serious study . . . .'

[2] The report actually does not explain the inaccuracy of the figures for Kondoa–Irangi, but states on the contrary that the count in this district was correct (see p. 328 above).

consequent search for work, e.g. a count showed that 1,021 travelling alien natives were in the Biharamulo District (excluding Ngara sub-division) on the night of the 26th of June.

In 1928 no attempt was made to obtain separate figures showing the proportion of the adult to the non-adult population, as it was considered that the Native Administrations would already be sufficiently taxed if particulars of sex and of tribes were called for. In 1931, the Native Administrations were successful in making a classification into two age groups as well as by sex and tribe. The population of the principal townships and statistics of taxpayers were also asked for and compiled by the District Officers.

. . . Evidence of the general accuracy of the 1931 census is afforded by the statistics of hut and poll taxpayers given in Table V, an examination of which shows that the proportion of population to taxpayers varies within narrow limits, except in a few cases in regard to which the larger variation can be explained by differences in the social factors affecting the tribes. The tax assessment rolls are compiled by the District Officers and their staffs and revised from time to time; the census figures were collected independently by the agency of 146 different native administrations. Normally every adult male is a hut-owner, or pays a poll tax, unless he is exempted, and in addition tax is due on additional wives numbering approximately one-eighth of the total adult males. The number of adult males was 1,484,849; if this number is increased by one-eighth on account of additional wives in respect of whom tax is payable, we get a total of 1,670,456. We know from the assessment rolls, compiled quite independently that the number of taxes due is 1,588,568. If to this figure are added the 76,916 exemptions granted for various reasons we get a total of 1,665,484 as against the total of 1,670,456 arrived at from the census figures, giving a margin of error of just under 5,000 or 0·3 per cent.

The picture conveyed by this lengthy description is quite obscure. It seems that an actual enumeration took place only in exceptional cases. But how the native administrations obtained the 'census figures' is not clear. That they should not have known the number of taxpayers in their districts is most unlikely.[1] The coincidence of the count and assessment results is, therefore, no proof of the accuracy of the count.[2]

[1] See *Collection of Hut and Poll Tax* (1929):

'In areas under indirect administration, the Chief or Head of the Native Administration unit is responsible to the District Officer for the receipt and custody of books of tax receipts and for the collection of the tax in accordance with instructions issued to him' (p. 2).

'In areas under direct administration, Liwalis or Headmen in charge of townships or rural areas are responsible as collectors of revenue to the District Officer for all duties entrusted to them' (p. 3).

'. . . it is desirable that all collectors, *i.e.*, Native Authorities or Government Headmen, as the case may be, should have copies of it [Assessment Roll] for the areas in which they collect the tax . . .' (p. 4).

'The following books of record must be kept by all Native Authorities or Government Headmen:—

(I) A copy of the District Officer's Assessment Roll for the area for which they are responsible.

(II) "Register of Hut and Poll Tax Books (for use by Native Authorities)" . . .' (p. 5).

'. . . Native Administrations charged with the collection of tax must be in possession of copies of the District Officer's Assessment Roll for their particular area' (p. 13).

'Where no Native Administrations have been set up, the collection of tax will be undertaken by the heads of Clans or similar units, or by village or town Headmen (which term includes Liwalis where they are employed), or by salaried native collectors' (p. 14).

[2] It may be mentioned incidentally that the number of male tax-payers was only 1,588,568—206,151 or 1,382,417. If to this figure are added the 76,916 exemptions granted, the total number of adult males according to the tax assessment rolls works out to be 1,459,333, as compared with 1,484,849 according to the census returns. Moreover, the figure of 1,588,568 includes additional taxes due by taxpayers on account of huts not occupied by wives but by others, and taxes paid

'The need for economy precluded the employment of any but the normal administrative machinery.' The cost of making the count, therefore, was nil. But the impossibility of getting something for nothing had been clearly demonstrated shortly before the 1931 count at the enumerations made in the Kahama District. In this area which covered about 7,000 square miles and comprised 88 villages with about 80,000 inhabitants, special efforts were made in 1928 and 1929 to obtain accurate population figures. The *Medical Report* for 1929 stated:[1]

The enumeration of the people according to sex and two principal age groups—those under and over a year is undertaken annually.

The native chiefs of the district, of whom there are eleven, with a few of the sub-chiefs, are called to a meeting in Kahama by the Administrative Officer. Only one of these is able to understand and read and write the *lingua franca* of the territory—Kiswahili. The remainder speak their own dialects and are made to understand the subject of discussion through an interpreter. None shows any marked astuteness, and all are willing to agree to the proposals in principle, reserving mentally to themselves the right to interpret these as seems expedient. The counting of the people may have its uses to the Government, especially, they consider, in the matter of tax, but though done only once in the year it has its inconveniences and disadvantages. None is enthusiastic in the spirit. This in general is the atmosphere of the meeting.

The Administrative Officer explains the purpose of the convention, expatiates on the methods to be adopted, asks opinions and endeavours to dispel doubts. A date is fixed on for the census. The intention is to obtain a count of the people in the district on a particular day. In practice, two or three days may be taken in some parts, dependent on the weather and the energy of the enumerator.

The chiefs disperse to their homes and call in the headmen of their sultanates, the wanangwa. To these they explain the position and requirements. Every soul under each mwanangwa has to be counted on a certain date. Coloured strings, representing sex and age groups—four colours only to avoid confusion—are distributed. Each colour represents a particular sex and age group, and these are the same for the whole district. The enumeration is effected by knots in the string of appropriate colour—one knot per person. The four strings of each mwanangwa are collected, tied and labelled by the clerk of the chief, as soon after the census as possible. When all have been delivered to the chief's clerk, they are sent to us and the counting and checking of knots and the tabulation on paper of the results is undertaken.

This then is the method of census-taking which has obtained for the last two years, and this in the absence of a literate subordinate executive, is the best that has been possible hitherto.

Results are therefore approximate. The system cannot be imagined to have even the advantage of a constancy in error, left ultimately to the vagaries of a prejudiced, unsupervised, illiterate and unenthusiatic collector as it is. But this has to be

by women living independently. On the other hand, the figure of 76,916 covers only the number of exemption certificates actually issued, but not the exemptions granted without the issue of such certificate. The comparability of the count and the assessment results is furthermore impaired by the fact that the poll-tax has to be paid by a male native 'of the apparent age of sixteen years or over', while at the census the criterion of an adult was fixed as puberty, and that a native not domiciled in Tanganyika is liable for hut tax as from the date upon which he becomes the owner of a hut, while tax will not be demanded of a native immigrant until he has been in residence for six months. See ibid., pp. 12, 19, and *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 5, 15.

Finally, it should be noted that in any case identity of the count and assessment results could be accepted as evidence of the accuracy of the count only if the assessment results were accurate. But according to Mr. and Mrs. Culwick (p. 367) 'considerable errors are bound to occur' in the registers of tax-payers.

[1] *Medical Report 1929*, pp. 145–6.

TABLE 2. *Native Population of Kahama District, 1928–9*[1]

Sultanate	Area square miles	Total			Under 1 year				1 year and over			
					Males		Females		Males		Females	
		1926	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929	1928	1929
Kahama and Township	500	20,200	22,893	23,053	630	600	701	686	9,356	9,731	12,206	12,036
Usumbwa	3,000	7,000	18,833	16,219	464	627	553	688	8,045	7,184	9,771	7,720
Ngogwa	800	7,300	7,144	7,339	188	158	169	186	2,927	3,037	3,860	3,958
Ukamba	500	3,800	3,688	3,614	81	110	90	127	1,569	1,493	1,948	1,884
Mbogwe	500	5,100	5,719	5,714	263	198	241	172	2,328	2,432	2,887	2,912
Uyogo	350	7,300	7,299	8,780	351	240	335	278	3,231	3,590	3,382	4,672
Msalala	350	3,600	3,182	3,319	78	78	86	101	1,297	1,363	1,721	1,777
Busangi	350	5,300	5,129	5,205	257	135	228	173	1,966	2,147	2,678	2,750
Bulungwa	200	4,200	4,040	4,286	103	145	83	124	1,785	1,767	2,069	2,250
Ungoni	100	1,000	1,023	1,209	96	100	102	83	339	405	486	621
Bugomba	500	1,100	1,084	847	27	63	20	59	442	309	595	416
Total	7,150	65,900	80,034	79,585	2,538	2,454	2,608	2,677	33,285	33,458	41,603	40,996

[1] See *Medical Report 1929*, p. 150. For Usumbwa 1926, see ibid. *1928*, p. 110.

tolerated at present. To a man who cannot reckon higher than the number of fingers on his hands, who is apt to confuse colours in strings and the purpose of each, who is clumsy at tying knots, who is absent-minded and inattentive at his work, and further distracted by being drawn into conversation with friends and acquaintances during it, who is incapable of organising a procession of his people in single file according to sex or age, who dimly comprehends the object in view and misinterprets it at will, who has little or no interest in the proceedings, who is unsupervised, but who, mindful of instructions, is determined to supply the material required in however defective a form, to a man, in short, with all these handicaps in knowledge and inclination, the work is distasteful. The results are, moreover, inaccurate. No legal compulsion attends the taking of the census, and the minimum of inconvenience to the people is the aim.

Why, it may be asked, proceed with a system so obviously fallible? The reply is not so conclusive as explanatory. Its fallibility and fallacies are known, and due allowance made. Without an expensive executive the method cannot at the moment be improved upon. This method costs nothing and its value is at present slightly higher in proportion to the cost. . . .

Notwithstanding the obvious defects there cannot be any doubt that the results obtained at these enumerations were more trustworthy than the earlier figures arrived at by estimates. In comparing the Kahama data for 1926 and 1928 the Medical Report stated:[1]

It will be noted that the population of Usumbwa, the largest sultanate in point of area, was, from erroneous information supplied, entered as 7,000 souls in the last report. . . . The error was due to an omission in the map setting forth populations of each district. It is to be remarked that figures for 1926 and 1928 coincide in the case of three sultanates; in five instances the estimated figures are in excess to the extent of 1,100 in total, and in three are deficient to the extent of 4,000. No inferences can be drawn as to increase or decrease of population from these figures, as the earlier ones were estimated by multiplying the number of taxpayers by a factor of convenience.

But the 1929 figures again differed considerably from those for 1928 in several sultanates. The 1929 report contained the following comment:[2]

Bearing in mind the numerous fallacies to which the figures obtained are subject and adding one or two that have been particularly in operation in this year, namely, the movement of large numbers of people to new settlements within the district on account of sleeping sickness and the unauthorised and unreported emigration of many from sultanate to sultanate and outside the district, their value is seen in truer perspective. . . .

It will be noted that there appears to have been a substantial decrease of population compared with 1928 in the sultanates of Usumbwa and Bugomba. How far this is real it is difficult to say, though both sultanates are notoriously tardy in giving their returns and their authenticity is very doubtful. At the same time, both have been badly smitten with sleeping sickness in the course of the last year. Ukamba and Mbogwe, also both in the sleeping sickness area, have suffered a minor diminution of population. All others show an increase, though all except Kahama Sultanate itself are known to have infected tsetse fly. It is our opinion, great as has been the devastation wrought by the pestilence of trypanosomiasis, that deaths from it directly do not solely account for the diminution in population in the sultanates mentioned. Unauthorised emigration must certainly account for a good number, though the exact extent of this is unknown. For the rest, the inaccuracy of computation must be held responsible.

It is to be noted too that the number of children under a year, an indirect gauge

[1] *Medical Report 1928*, p. 110. [2] Ibid. *1929*, p. 147.

of births, bears no constant proportion to the total population in each sultanate, nor even to the female section of it.

As a check to the figures obtained at these general enumerations, nominal rolls of the inhabitants were taken in three special areas by a native census clerk. 'The period of the census of these areas is spread over a fortnight or a month.'[1] It is very much to be regretted that the reports do not indicate how these rolls were taken and that furthermore for two of these areas the results obtained at the general enumerations are not given. For one area only, the Ungoni Sultanate, is it, therefore, possible to study the differences between the results obtained by the knots-in-the-string method and by nominal rolls.

The general count of 1928 had been made here in April. It yielded a population of 1,023. But the nominal enumerations carried out in July and November showed a population of 1,212 and 1,257 respectively. The 1928 report made the following comment:[2]

> Subtracting the number of deaths over and under a year from the total births, the increase in the year is 7 souls, which brings the total population to 1,030 on the General Census. The greatest difference between the three counts is 234 . . . The number of immigrants into Ungoni is, in any case, not nearly equal to this figure, as the total of immigrants in to the whole district did not exceed 209. It is possible that many absent from the sultanate but still in the district, returned after or hid during the census and withheld their names. It is also possible that the husbands or wives in case of intermarriage were not held to be true Wangoni and were excluded from the totals. It is also more than likely that the first was a miscount from inefficiency and carelessness. The error is not, however, considered to be as high as 22·8 per cent. on carelessness alone. The other factors probably also enter into it, to a greater or less extent.

TABLE 3. *Native Population of the Ungoni Sultanate, Kahama District, 1928–9*[1]

Count	*Under 1 year*		*1 year and over*		*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
General 1928 April	96	102	339	486	435	588	1,023
1st Special 1928 July	16	24	470	702	486	726	1,212
2nd Special 1928 Nov.	..	..	..	..	506	751	1,257
General 1929	100	83	405	621	505	704	1,209
Special 1929	21	16	498	708	519	724	1,243

[1] See *Medical Report 1928*, pp. 113–14; *1929*, pp. 150, 155.

It would be, however, a mistake to assume that even a part of the apparent increase in the population of the Ungoni Sultanate was due to immigration. According to figures subsequently published[3] only 1 person immigrated into Ungoni from April to November, while 47 emigrated. The carelessness in taking the general count appears also from the fact that no fewer than 19 per cent. of the total population were reckoned as under one year old! At the general count of 1929 the number of infants was again enormously overstated, but the total population enumerated (1,209) was only slightly inferior to the totals ascertained at the nominal

[1] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 146. [2] Ibid. *1928*, p. 114. [3] See ibid. *1929*, p. 153.

counts of 1928 (1,212; 1,257) and 1929 (1,243). In comparing the results of the general and the special counts of 1929 the Medical Report says that 'the discrepancies are indices of error, in the former more than in the latter, though both are in all probability inaccurate in degree from various causes'.[1]

It was reasonable to expect that in the course of time the results of the counts in Kahama would have become more accurate,[2] and it is interesting to note that the medical authorities, quite apart from this special experiment, which was prematurely abandoned, repeatedly demanded the making of counts at shorter intervals. Thus, the Medical Officer of Health for Dar es Salaam, who had urged the taking of more frequent enumerations in the township already in previous years,[3] said in his Report for the year 1927:[4]

I am convinced that a census of the whole population of the town should be taken annually for the next ten years, firstly, to obtain exact figures and to establish rates of increase on which the Registrar could work thereafter, and secondly, to accustom the population to census-taking. It is not a difficult procedure in a town like this, and if the procedure was recognized as usual among a large urban population like this, it is probable that it would come to be regarded with less suspicion in other places.

The same officer, when he had become Director of Medical Services for the Territory, stated in his report for 1936:[5]

I consider that one [census] should be taken as soon as possible and I advocate that from 1941 it should be quinquennial. I believe that the prejudices that primitive people undoubtedly have against census-taking would tend to disappear in Tanganyika with a quinquennial census. Moreover, the staff engaged in taking the census would have a fair degree of continuity and there would be less liability to error than with a decennial one.

Five years later he wrote:

The census, on which all other vital accounting depends, has never had the attention it deserves and the year 1941 when the decennial census should have been retaken, and which should have been an important reckoning point, has gone beyond recall, no census having been possible during war-time.[6]

2. *Non-Native Censuses*

The first census under British administration was taken on 24 April 1921.[7] Another census was planned for 1930. The 1929 *Report to the League of Nations* stated:[8]

As it was considered desirable for administrative reasons to obtain a census of non-natives in certain provinces in 1930 an Ordinance was passed in December,

[1] Ibid., p. 149.
[2] See ibid. *1928*, pp. 111, 114; *1929*, p. 146.
[3] See ibid. *1923*, p. 60; *1924*, pp. 142, 155.
[4] Ibid. *1927*, p. 45.
[5] Ibid. *1936*, p. 6.
[6] 'Future Development of Medical Services', 31 Mar. 1942, *An Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 27.
[7] This census was authorized by 'An Ordinance to make provision for the taking of a Census of Non-Natives in the Tanganyika Territory' (No. 1 of 1921, 14 Jan.), reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances*, &c. *1921*, pp. 1–3.
[8] *Report 1929*, p. 88.

1929,[1] to give legislative sanction for this purpose. This will not affect the taking of the decennial census of the whole population which is due to be made in 1931.

But the intention of taking a census in 1930 was not carried out.[2] The Ordinance providing for this census was repealed and re-enacted (in almost identical form) in 1931[3] by the following Ordinance:[4]

1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Census Ordinance, 1931.

2. In this Ordinance the expression 'Non-Native' shall mean and include any person who on the night of the appointed day, is within the boundaries of the Territory and is not by birth or adoption a member of any of the aboriginal races or tribes of Africa or a Somali or Swahili.

3.—(1) A census of all non-natives shall be taken in the year 1931 on such a day (in this Ordinance referred to as the 'appointed day') as the Governor may by notice in the *Gazette* appoint.

(2) The census shall be taken throughout the Territory or in such provinces of the Territory as may, in the said notice, be specified.

4. The Governor may appoint some fit and proper person to be Census Officer, who shall, subject to the approval of the Governor, and in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance, take all necessary measures for the taking of the census.

5. The Census Officer shall have power, with the approval of the Governor—

(*a*) to appoint such assistant census officers in each district as he may consider necessary;

(*b*) to issue such instructions to assistant census officers as may be necessary for carrying out the object of this Ordinance;

(*c*) to prepare and provide the forms as hereinafter provided for to be filled up; and

(*d*) to incur all expenses necessary for the purposes of taking the said census.

6. Each assistant census officer shall divide his district into enumeration areas, and shall appoint an enumerator for each such area.

7. The Census Officer shall prepare forms to be filled up by or on behalf of the occupier of any dwelling in which there may be a non-native, showing the following particulars of every such non-native person who abode in such dwelling on the night of the appointed day—

[1] No. 24 of 1929 (24 Dec.), 'Census Ordinance, 1929', reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1929*, pp. 121–4.

[2] The *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 9, states that the census was deferred until 1931 in order 'to retain the decennial period and to bring the Territory into line with the United Kingdom and most of the other British Colonies and Dependencies'. The above quotation from the 1929 Report to the League, however, shows that this cannot have been the motive for giving up the 1930 census. That this census was meant to provide more accurate *intercensal* figures than had been obtained so far appears also clearly from the following statement made by the Chief Secretary at the Second Reading of the Bill on 11 Dec. 1929 (*Proceedings of the Legislative Council 1929/30*, p. 123):

'This Bill is being introduced to enable the Government to take a census of non-natives on more formal and scientific lines than is possible at present. Hitherto the task of taking count of the non-native population has been entrusted to District Officers, and with the limited means at their disposal they have undoubtedly done their best. But they are faced with difficulties, when they come across residents who desire to obstruct the census or to give false information; and it is necessary that the District Officers should have behind them some law on the subject. In particular, the Government has in mind the taking of a census in the northern portion of the Territory in connection with the scheme for local government.'

[3] The Chief Secretary stated on 16 Jan. 1931 at the Second Reading of the 1931 Census Bill: 'It is identical with the Bill which I introduced at Arusha thirteen months ago of which it has not been found possible to make use' (ibid. *1931*, p. 159).

[4] No. 11 of 1931 (30 Jan.), 'An Ordinance to provide for the taking of a Census of Non-Natives in the Tanganyika Territory', reprinted in *Tanganyika Territory Ordinances, &c. 1931*, Part I, pp. 29–32, and in *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 55–6.

The name, birthplace, race or nationality, sex, age, occupation, religious persuasion, condition as to marriage, relation to head of family and literacy in the English language,

and also, in any case where any such person is the owner or occupier of any house or land, particulars as to the assessment for house tax of such house, or area of such land.

8. An enumerator shall deliver to the occupier of every such dwelling and to the person in charge of any public institution, hotel or lodging house not later than the appointed day one or more of such forms, it being clearly stated on such form that it is to be filled up by the occupier or the person in charge as the case may be on the night of the appointed day, and that it will be collected by an enumerator as soon thereafter as may be.

9. Every such occupier or other person as aforesaid shall fill up the said form or cause it to be filled up to the best of his knowledge and belief so far as relates to all non-native persons abiding in the house occupied by him or in his charge on the night of the appointed day, and shall sign his name thereto and shall deliver the form so filled up and signed to the enumerator when required to do so by him.

10. Every such dwelling, public institution, hotel or lodging house shall be visited by an enumerator as soon as possible after the appointed day and all forms shall then be collected by him.

11. The Census Officer shall obtain returns of the particulars required by this Ordinance with respect to persons who, during the night of the appointed day were travelling by rail, ship or otherwise within the Territory or for any reason were not abiding that night in any house of which account is to be taken by the enumerators, and shall include these returns in the report to be made under this Ordinance.

12. The Census Officer shall make a report to the Governor on the returns so obtained and such report shall be in such form and contain such particulars as the Governor may require.

13. Every enumerator shall make a declaration before the magistrate of a subordinate court to the effect that the returns furnished by him in pursuance of this Ordinance have been truly and faithfully made and that any instructions issued thereunder have been carried out and that to the best of his knowledge the said returns are correct as far as may be known.

14.—(1) Any person employed for the purposes of this Ordinance who makes wilful default in the performance of any of his duties under this Ordinance or makes any wilfully false declaration shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction for each such offence to a fine not exceeding two hundred shillings.

(2) If any person for whom a form is left as hereinbefore provided—

(*a*) wilfully refuses or without lawful excuse neglects to fill up the form or cause it to be filled up to the best of his knowledge and belief or to sign or deliver it as in this Ordinance required; or

(*b*) wilfully makes, signs or delivers or causes to be made, signed, or delivered any false return of any matter specified in the form; or

(*c*) refuses to answer, or wilfully gives a false answer to, any question necessary for obtaining the information required to be obtained under this Ordinance,

he shall be guilty of an offence and shall for each such offence be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding two hundred shillings.

(3) If any person—

(*a*) being a person employed for the purposes of this Ordinance publishes or communicates to any person, without lawful authority, any information acquired by him in the course of his employment; or

(*b*) having possession of any information which to his knowledge has been disclosed in contravention of this Ordinance, publishes or communicates that information to any other person,

he shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on conviction to imprisonment of either description for three months or to a fine not exceeding two thousand shillings or to both.

15. The Census Ordinance, 1929, is hereby repealed.

The household schedule[1] contained the following headings:

(*a*) Name and Surname—Of the Head of the Family, Household or Establishment and every other person, whether member of the family, visitor, boarder or servant who:—
(1) Passed the night of the 26th April 1931 in this dwelling.
(2) Arrived in this dwelling on the morning of the 27th April, 1931 not having been enumerated elsewhere.

(*b*) Relationship to Head of Household—State whether 'Head' or 'Wife', 'Son', 'Nephew' or other relative, 'Visitor', 'Boarder', or 'Servant'.

(*c*) Age—Last birthday. If under one year old write 'Infant'.

(*d*) Sex—If male write 'M'. If female write 'F'.

(*e*) Condition as to Marriage—State whether 'Single', 'Married', 'Widowed', 'Divorced'. If remarried write 'married'.

(*f*) Race—The exact race should be stated, *e.g.*, 'Scottish', 'English', 'Tamil', 'Sinhalese', 'Mahratta', 'Greek', 'American', etc.

(*g*) Nationality—'British', 'Naturalised British', 'American', 'Belgian', 'French', 'Turkish', etc. If without nationality, write 'none'.

(*h*) Birthplace—'Scotland', 'Kenya', 'Irish Free State', 'South Africa', 'France'. If in India state the Province or State, *e.g.*, 'Mysore', 'Punjab', 'Bengal', etc.

(*i*) Religion—'Church of England', 'Lutheran', 'Dutch Reformed', 'Roman Catholic', 'Greek Orthodox', 'Hindu', 'Parsee', 'Sikh', 'Jain', 'Mohammedan', 'Agnostic', etc.

(*j*) Education—If attending school write 'S'. If receiving private tuition write 'P.T.' If neither, write 'Nil' (for persons under 18 years).

(*k*) Occupation—State the exact nature of the occupation or means of subsistence. (*See* Instructions, Note 6.) For children under tuition write 'Scholar'.

(*l*) Literacy—State whether able to read and write and if so in what language. State whether able to speak English.

(*m*) House or Land held—If the owner or occupier of any house or land, give particulars as to the assessment for house tax of such house, or state the area of such land.

The census which had been planned for 1930 apparently was to cover only certain provinces. The Census Ordinance 1929, therefore, had provided that 'the census shall be taken throughout the Territory or in such provinces of the Territory as may be specified' in a Governor's Notice in the *Gazette*. The Census Ordinance 1931 contained the same provision. But the 1931 census, from the outset, was planned as an all-inclusive census, and the Government Notice of 7 March 1931[2] which appointed the census day stipulated:

His Excellency the Acting Governor has been pleased to appoint Sunday the twenty-sixth day of April 1931 to be the appointed day for the purpose of the taking of a census throughout the Territory of all non-natives.

The total cost of the census was £104[3] or £2. 10*s*. 9*d*. per 1,000 enumerated persons. The funds available for the remuneration of enumerators were

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, Appendix D.

[2] No. 23 of 1931, reprinted in *Tanganyika Territory Ordinances, &c. 1931*, Part II, p. 20, and in *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 56.

[3] See *Report by the Treasurer 1931–2*, p. 64.

very small. A Circular sent on 14 March 1931 by the Census Officer to all District Officers[1] stated:

> The amount allocated for the services of enumerators and their travelling expenses is £90 for the whole Territory. This amount will not allow for the general employment of paid enumerators, and as much use as possible should be made of the voluntary services of other Government servants in your district. Heads of Departments have been circularised by the Governor with a request that they instruct their staffs to co-operate with you as far as possible. Where the employment of paid enumerators is unavoidable, the necessity for the most rigid economy should be kept in mind.
>
> It is suggested that in township areas the heads or representative associations of religious or racial communities will be more than willing to assist, either by providing enumerators for their own communities, or by acquainting the members thereof with the importance of rendering full and accurate returns. In Mombasa in 1926 a number of booths or offices were opened in which Arab or Indian schoolboys filled up the schedules for illiterate persons of those races. This method, though unorthodox, might be adopted in conjunction with the usual house to house visits. Where a District Officer is aware that a non-native is resident at a distance which would make a special visit unnecessarily expensive or onerous the schedule may be sent by post accompanied by an official franked envelope, but this procedure should not be adopted as a general practice.

The census report states[2] that 'on the whole, the schedules were carefully and accurately completed'. The tabulation of the returns from the completed schedules was effected by the Statistician to the Conference of the East African Governors who utilized Hollerith machines.[3]

II. Total Population

The population ascertained at the various enumerations was as follows:[4]

Year	*Natives*	*Non-Natives*	*Total*
1921	4,106,890	17,438	4,124,328
1928	4,740,706	..	..
1931	5,022,640	41,020[1]	5,063,660

[1] Including 377 crews and passengers of ships in harbour in Dar es Salaam; see *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 11.

The area of the Territory is about 360,000 square miles (including 20,000 square miles of water), and there were in 1931 about 14 persons per square mile. Thus, population density, as a whole, is low. But it varies enormously in the various sections. While 5 of the 46 districts (Masai, Kigoma, Ufipa, Manyoni, and Kilwa) had less than 5 inhabitants per square mile, 4 districts (Rungwe, Kwimba, Moshi, and Tanga) had over 75. However, the districts are far too large to convey a true picture

[1] Reprinted in *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 57.

[2] See ibid., p. 10.

[3] See ibid., pp. 6, 10, and *Report on the Statistical Department of the Conference of East African Governors 1931*, p. 6.

[4] See *Census of the Native Population 1931*, p. 10; *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 10.

TABLE 4. *Population Density, Tanganyika Territory, 1931*[1]

District	Square miles	Population			
		Native	Non-native	Total	Per sq. m.
LAKE PROVINCE					
Bukoba	7,010	277,201	1,241	278,442	39·7
Mwanza	5,580	254,448	1,763	256,211	45·9
Maswa	10,870	230,126	211	230,337	21·2
Kwimba	1,830	200,062	305	200,367	109·5
Musoma	7,250	184,028	263	184,291	25·4
Biharamulo	6,556	100,208	36	100,244	15·3
Total	39,096	1,246,073	3,819	1,249,892	32·0
WESTERN PROVINCE					
Tabora	38,600	211,434	2,311	213,745	5·5
Shinyanga	3,500	144,536	726	145,262	41·5
Nzega	6,000	116,076	307	116,383	19·4
Kasulu	3,830	103,127	58	103,185	26·9
Kibondo	5,580	81,462	27	81,489	14·6
Ufipa	25,390	78,501	191	78,692	3·1
Kahama	8,400	76,240	175	76,415	9·1
Kigoma	11,600	30,852	755	31,607	2·7
Total	102,900	842,228	4,550	846,778	8·2
CENTRAL PROVINCE					
Singida	4,902	132,521	302	132,823	27·1
Dodoma	7,363	130,349	1,316	131,665	17·9
Kondoa	5,750	118,151	242	118,393	20·6
Mkalama	3,174	117,718	230	117,948	37·2
Manyoni	13,030	43,593	420	44,013	3·4
Mpwapwa	3,278	37,380	220	37,600	11·5
Total	37,497	579,712	2,730	582,442	15·5
EASTERN PROVINCE					
Morogoro	7,620	155,073	1,066	156,139	20·5
Dar es Salaam	4,080	152,859	11,650	164,509	40·3
Rufiji	5,103	87,364	1,011	88,375	17·3
Kilosa	6,000	68,686	794	69,480	11·6
Bagamoyo	3,910	62,057	854	62,911	16·1
Total	26,713	526,039	15,375	541,414	20·3

[1] See *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 11–13; *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 12–13.

District	Square miles	Population			
		Native	Non-native	Total	Per sq. m.
IRINGA PROVINCE					
Rungwe	1,750	195,062	185	195,247	111·6
Njombe	8,330	125,463	176	125,639	15·1
Iringa	11,911	86,795	674	87,469	7·3
Mbeya	16,540	84,591	370	84,961	5·1
Total	38,531	491,911	1,405	493,316	12·8
LINDI PROVINCE					
Lindi	8,148	128,374	928	129,302	15·9
Kilwa	18,636	81,406	414	81,820	4·4
Newala	1,900	75,512	19	75,531	39·8
Masasi	6,716	49,092	92	49,184	7·3
Mikindani	1,595	46,764	288	47,052	29·5
Tunduru	4,830	46,479	24	46,503	9·6
Total	41,825	427,627	1,765	429,392	10·3
TANGA PROVINCE					
Usambara	3,624	111,777	1,183	112,960	31·2
Tanga	1,457	104,450	5,187	109,637	75·2
Handeni	5,930	63,930	110	64,040	10·8
Pare	3,870	57,911	107	58,018	15·0
Pangani	1,221	17,846	871	18,717	15·3
Total	16,102	355,914	7,458	363,372	22·6
NORTHERN PROVINCE					
Moshi	2,120	164,119	1,771	165,890	78·3
Mbulu	5,160	98,816	308	99,124	19·2
Arusha	6,250	49,095	1,440	50,535	8·1
Masai	18,470	32,168	44	32,212	1·7
Total	32,000	344,198	3,563	347,761	10·9
MAHENGE PROVINCE					
Songea	16,398	115,786	160	115,946	7·1
Mahenge	15,570	93,152	195	93,347	6·0
Total	31,968	208,938	355	209,293	6·5
TANGANYIKA TERRITORY					
Total	366,632	5,022,640	41,020	5,063,660	13·8

of the diversity of population density.[1] Mr. C. Gillman, who prepared a population map of Tanganyika[2] on the basis of 2,977 territorial units, came to the following conclusion:

The well watered parts of the country contain two-thirds of the whole population on one-tenth of the total area, the fairly well watered areas one-sixth of the population on one-twelfth, and the poorly watered areas, as far as they are inhabited, another sixth on one-fifth of the land. Nearly two-thirds of the Territory are entirely uninhabited.[3]

[1] It should be noted, moreover, that while the area for the whole Territory is known approximately, the figures for administrative sub-divisions are most uncertain. This can be inferred from the areas given in the Reports to the League and in the Blue Books for 1925–33:

	Area in square miles								
Province	*R.L. 1925–6*	*B.B. 1926*	*R.L. 1927*	*B.B. 1927–9*	*R.L. 1928–31*	*B.B. 1930*	*B.B. 1931*	*R.L. 1932–3*	*B.B. 1932–3*
Mwanza	27,940	39,200	25,530	25,530	25,530	25,530	46,679	40,040	51,200
Bukoba	11,000	13,566	11,010	13,566	11,010	13,566			
Tabora	36,774	36,774	40,230	41,000	40,230	56,500	102,900	85,075	91,550
Kigoma	59,816	59,402	48,345	59,400	48,345	46,400			
Iringa	37,527	41,031	41,450	41,031	41,450	38,531	38,531	41,450	37,600
Mahenge	39,401	33,000	32,730	31,968	32,730	31,968	31,968	—	—
Lindi	37,355	41,825	40,489	41,825	38,910	41,825	41,825	55,308	54,970
Eastern	26,320	24,456	27,320	26,713	27,320	26,713	26,713	42,890	41,970
Central	38,078	51,064	38,770	37,497	38,770	37,497	37,497	38,770	36,320
Tanga	13,319	13,760	14,450	16,102	13,863	16,102	16,102	13,863	13,530
Northern	36,018	19,416	33,770	32,000	33,770	32,000	32,000	33,770	32,860
Total	363,548	373,494	354,094	366,632	351,928	366,632	374,215	351,166	360,000

(See *Report to the League of Nations 1925*, p. 6; *1926*, p. 6; *1927*, p. 7; *1928*, p. 9; *1929*, p. 10; *1930*, p. 9; *1931*, p. 10; *1932*, p. 10; *1933*, p. 10; *Blue Book 1926*, p. 88; *1927*, p. 84; *1928*, p. 88; *1929*, p. 96; *1930*, p. 104; *1931*, p. 108; *1932*, p. 111; *1933*, p. 120. The figures in the 1931 Census Report are the same as those in *Blue Book 1930*.) The transfer of areas from one province to another can, of course, not explain the enormous divergencies between figures referring to the same date.

For 1934–8 the figures for the areas of the various provinces are the same in the Reports to the League and the Blue Books and they are identical in each year, but they differ in part considerably from the figures used by Mr. Gillman in preparing the 1935 population map:

	Lake	*Western*	*Southern Highlands*	*Southern*	*Eastern*	*Central*	*Tanga*	*Northern*	*Total*
Rep. League; B.B.	51,200	85,165	43,985	54,970	41,970	36,320	13,530	32,860	360,000
Gillman	38,540	78,460	47,060	54,630	41,360	35,200	13,360	33,690	342,300

(See *Report to the League 1934*, p. 11; *1935*, pp. 8, 200–1; *1936*, p. 8; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 10; *Blue Book 1934*, p. 121; *1935*, p. 126; *1936*, p. 129; *1937*, p. 133; *1938*, p. 143.) Only a few of the divergencies may be explained by the fact that Mr. Gillman probably excluded the area of some inland waters. Moreover, other official documents give still other areas. Thus the Provincial Commissioners give as areas of the Southern Province 58,000 or 55,300 square miles, the Central Province 37,490 square miles, the Tanga Province 16,102 square miles, and the Northern Province 31,514 square miles (see *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 53; *1937*, pp. 5, 39, 53; *1938*, p. 39; *1939*, pp. 45, 60).

[2] 'As a rule, the maps used were the sheets of the old 1 in 300,000 map of German East Africa .... Only in a few instances were more recent and improved maps available' (*Report to the League of Nations 1935*, p. 198).

[3] Ibid., p. 206. The population within the inhabited area is not satisfactorily distributed. The Central Development Committee reported in 1940: 'Soil fertility is by no means uniform and both the human and stock population is badly distributed. There are large areas of land where soil fertility is low and population sparse; there are also areas of low soil fertility which carry a

Since the census of 1931 the population on 31 December has been estimated in the *Blue Books* as follows:[1]

	1932	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
Native .	4,933,179	5,000,160	4,950,505	5,096,178	5,105,705	5,140,368	5,217,345
Non-Native	39,628	38,430	37,833	41,902	41,181	42,147	43,139
Total	4,972,807	5,038,590	4,988,338	5,138,080	5,146,886	5,182.515	5,260,484

	1939	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*
Native . .	5,243,167	5,254,548	5,191,709	5,271,229	5,355,786	5,437,069
Non-Native .	40,726	40,996	40,264	49,974	61,808	62,670
Total .	5,283,893	5,295,544	5,231,973	5,321,203	5,417,594	5,499,739

The estimates for the native population are based on the number of taxpayers[2] and, therefore, are most uncertain. But even the figures for non-natives are far from accurate.

While the trend of the non-native population is mainly determined by immigration and emigration, changes in the numbers of the natives are due preponderantly to the balance of births and deaths. But migration into and from the Territory is by no means negligible, though it is impossible to say how large it is. The Committee on Questions relating to the Supply and Welfare of Native Labour reported in 1937:

> Accurate statistics are not available, but it is estimated that immigrant labour amounts to 45,000, of which 30,000 are estimated to come from territories to the south and 15,000 from Belgian territory.
>
> The Territory loses little in the way of emigrant labour, but since the time of European occupation the clove industry in Zanzibar and Pemba has obtained its seasonal labour from the mainland, albeit in decreasing numbers, while the gold-fields of Kenya now attract labour from the Lake and Western Provinces. The

population density so high that the soil is in danger of exhaustion and special efforts are considered necessary to restore them to fertility. The rest of the Territory consists of productive land and much of this productive land is inadequately peopled.' (*Report*, p. 21.)

A particularly serious problem is soil erosion, and it is interesting to note that the need for soil conservation work was apparently realized first by the natives. The Commissioner of the Eastern Province reports: 'The checking of soil erosion is one of the most pressing problems of Morogoro District more especially in the Uluguru and Nguru Hills.... The greatest success has been achieved in Uvidunda where anti-erosion methods were no new idea to the older men who said: "Our fathers used to lay elephant grass across the shambas to hold up the soil but the young men of to-day think our advice is worthless. Now, however, that they see that the Europeans say the same thing they may listen to us."' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 16.) But it is not easy to prevent soil erosion on native land. The Commissioner of the Northern Province writes: 'Anti-soil erosion measures have continued throughout the year in the Moshi District, notably in the Rongai area, but while many natives are punished for soil erosion offences they find it difficult to understand why their European neighbours should go unpunished for similar land destruction' (ibid. *1944*, p. 59). See also in this connexion Orde Browne, *Labour Conditions in East Africa* (1946), p. 20: 'Soil erosion has developed rapidly; and the introduction of the plough has probably served to intensify the effect.'

[1] See *Blue Book 1932*, p. 111; *1933*, p. 120; *1934*, p. 121; *1935*, p. 126; *1936*, p. 129; *1937*, p. 133; *1938*, p. 143; *1939*, p. 34; *1940*, Section 15; *1941*, p. 44; *1942*, p. 43; *1943*, p. 45; *1944*, p. 44.

[2] See, for example, Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes*, 31st Session (3 June 1937), p. 49; *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1938*, p. 39.

drain on the Territory's man-power is, however, not severe and the efflux is certainly much less than the influx.[1]

It is no doubt true that the bulk of the immigration came from the territories to the south—Portuguese East Africa,[2] Nyasaland,[3] and Northern Rhodesia[4]—and Ruanda-Urundi.[5] But there was also some immigration from Kenya.[6] Emigration, on the other hand, was not

[1] *Report*, p. 9.

[2] See, for example, *Report of the Labour Inspectorate 1939*, p. 4; *Labour Department Report 1941*, p. 7, *1942*, pp. 6–7, *1943*, p. 11; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, pp. 41, 44, 55, *1942*, p. 57, *1943*, p. 61; Orde Browne (1946), p. 51. See also *Labour Department Report 1940*, pp. 7–8: 'The labour force employed on these estates [sisal estates] is drawn partly from local tribes and partly from natives who cross the border from Portuguese East Africa in search of work. The latter enter the Territory in large numbers each year, often with their wives, and work for varying periods from six months upwards. They are of an adventurous disposition and if work does not offer in the Southern Province they wander along the coast and find their way as far afield as the Tanga and Morogoro districts. A certain percentage become semi-permanent squatters but the large majority work for a definite period and then return home.' According to ibid. *1942*, p. 6, a survey 'made in the Southern Province by a Labour Officer during October and November revealed that the total male labour force of 12,901 on sisal production in that area included no less than 6,348 immigrants from Portuguese East Africa, or just under 50 per cent of the total'.

[3] See, for example, ibid. *1940*, p. 6; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1941*, p. 64. The number of Nyasaland natives employed in Tanganyika Territory was estimated at 5,890 for 1 Jan. 1939, at 5,967 for 31 Dec. 1939, at 800 for 31 Dec. 1940, and at 1,500 for 31 Dec. 1941; see Chapter XII, Section III. While natives from Tanganyika are inclined to take up work in the mines as a seasonal job and to return to their villages after a few months, 'Natives from Nyasaland are usually willing to stay for a longer period, and this seems to be the main reason why they occupy most of the skilled and better paid jobs' (Leubuscher, *Tanganyika Territory*, p. 57). During the second half of 1938 'an approximate count was made by administrative officers of the native population of the Lupa goldfield which is almost entirely engaged in mining'. It appeared that of 17,000 natives 4,000 were aliens. 'The alien natives were mostly from Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia' (Department of Lands and Mines, *Report 1938*, p. 88). For the end of 1939 it was estimated that one-quarter of the 10,000 natives employed by diggers and on mines were aliens (see *Labour Inspectorate Report 1939*, p. 2).

[4] See, for example, *Labour Department Report 1940*, p. 6; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 55, *1941*, p. 64, *1942*, p. 78. The number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed in Tanganyika Territory was estimated at about 12,000 in 1937–8, at about 10,000 in 1940, and at about 5,000 in 1941–3; see Chapter XI, Section III.

[5] See Orde Browne (1946), p. 48: 'The tendency to travel from Ruanda-Urundi into Tanganyika is an old established one; the density of population and the periodical shortages of food are factors which have promoted movement on a scale which in some years has assumed very large proportions. During the last twenty years there have been several of these large scale migrations causing grave embarrassment to the Tanganyika administration and to the Medical authorities. Weak and undernourished and in many cases already suffering from various diseases, those unfortunate people filled the hospitals and overstrained the resources of the Native Authorities in the areas which they entered; the death rate was deplorably high and few of the travellers were capable of any real work. This state of affairs arose only in those years when there was a serious shortage of food in Belgian Territory, but there is always an appreciable influx into Tanganyika of men attracted by the higher wages and more ample supplies available in that country. Unfortunately statistics of the numbers involved are non-existent; all that can be said is that the annual variation is large but that the numbers always amount to some thousands.'

See also footnotes 5 to pp. 241 and 242 above.

[6] The Commissioner of the Northern Province reported: 'Masai from Kenya now fill sixty per cent of the Native Administration offices . . .' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, pp. 47–8). In 1942 a number of Kenya squatters in the Northern Province were repatriated. 'After voluminous correspondence, covering a period of five years, arrangements were finally completed for the repatriation to Kenya of the Kikuyu squatters at Usseri. Thirty-eight men and two hundred and ninety-two women and children were successfully repatriated in August without incident . . . .' (Ibid. *1942*, p. 40.) But other people came. 'A careful watch is kept by the Police on all natives arriving [in Tanga Province] from Kenya, especially those coming from Mombasa, some of whom were found to have a bad criminal record' (ibid. *1944*, p. 99).

confined to Zanzibar and Kenya. Numerous Tanganyika natives go to Uganda,[1] to the Rhodesian copper belt, and to the Rand.[2] Nor is emigration confined to male labourers.[3]

During the war many Tanganyika natives joined the army and left the country. Military service at first was to be voluntary. The Commissioner of the Lake Province, for example, reported:

In a few areas of the province, notably the Biharamulo District, the outbreak of war caused a genuine apprehension, understandable in view of their experiences in the last war, that the young men would be taken as carriers. The timid Bazinza and other tribesmen of the Biharamulo District disappeared in large numbers into the bush for some days. In this district, as in others, well attended meetings were held by the District Officers, and later by the Provincial Commissioner, at many Native Authority headquarters with a view to explaining the effect of the war on native life, to allay fears as regards conscription and to impress on the chiefs and people that their contribution to the common cause must be the increased production of food and economic crops. They were obviously much relieved when they realized that the war would not prevent them from leading their normal lives and all that was required of them was a bigger agricultural effort. . . .

In most of the districts of the province the response to the call for military volunteers was excellent, particularly in the Musoma District where far more than the number required applied for enrolment. A great many trained drivers also volunteered for service with the Military Transport Corps and many retired soldiers returned to the colours.[4]

But in 1940 it became necessary to introduce conscription.

As a result of increased military demands for African recruits, it has been deemed necessary to extend the scope of the Compulsory Service Ordinance to apply to all Africans resident in the Territory.[5]

1940. Eastern Province. Recruiting for the East African Military Labour Service began in November and for the Kenya and Uganda Railways and Harbours in December. It was unfortunate that the time factor did not admit of entirely voluntary recruitment but, on the whole, recruits, especially those who had been accustomed to work on sisal estates, showed no great objection to being called up though the more timid tribesmen betrayed nervousness and in some cases retired to the bush.[6]

Lake Province. In the latter half of the year, as the result of war breaking out in East Africa, a big demand was made on the Lake Province for African combatant recruits. Including volunteers from the Musoma District in 1939, over 3,500 young men were drafted to military centres for combatant service. Many, however, failed to pass the stringent final medical examination and a number of Sukuma, particularly from the Maswa District, deserted. The majority from the Sukuma districts, excepting Mwanza, were conscripts, but all those from the Musoma District were

[1] See pp. 242–50 above.

[2] See *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, p. 58: '. . . a recent count of the Lake Nyasa area of the Songea District which has a tax paying population of about 5,000 showed 1,292 men away at work in the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias.' See also ibid., p. 69, and ibid. *1944*, p. 79.

[3] See ibid., p. 46: 'Any step to improve the status of women is particularly welcome in Bukoba where the notorious exodus of women to all parts of East Africa to become prostitutes is the direct result of their oppression at home.'

[4] Ibid. *1939*, pp. 28–9.

[5] Governor Young, 9 Dec. 1940, Legislative Council, *15th Session*, p. 12. Conscription was introduced in July by the Compulsory Service Ordinance (No. 23 of 1940), which made all male British subjects or British protected persons between the ages of 18 and 45 liable to military service in defence of the Territory or to such other service connected with the prosecution of the war as the Governor may order.

[6] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 12.

enthusiastic volunteers, nearly fourteen hundred presenting themselves for enlistment during the year under review.[1]

Southern Highlands Province. At first the call for recruits was undoubtedly most unwelcome. Men were wanted quickly and there was no time for preliminary ground work designed to counteract memories of the carrier corps of the last war. . . . Recruiting commenced in October and the quota required from the province up to the end of December was almost fulfilled. Recruits came forward voluntarily for the K.A.R. and it is pleasing to note that now a few natives are even volunteering for military labour.[2]

Western Province. As was to be expected conscription for the East African Military Labour Service proved too sudden an innovation for the backward and suspicious Waha of Kigoma District who took alarm despite all measures taken to assure them that they were not required for combatant service. The repercussions spread northwards to the Kibondo Division although it was never intended to introduce conscription there, and it became evident that conscription could only be carried out at the expense of the complete disruption of native life and the native administration so laboriously built up in the past years. As to continue the attempt would inevitably have resulted in a mass exodus of the people to the bush and into neighbouring territories with the consequent break up of the Sleeping Sickness Concentrations followed by famine due to neglect of the fields, it was decided to suspend activities and to concentrate on the restoration of confidence and normality. . . .

Whilst the most violent reaction to conscription came from the Waha, the Wafipa were not unalarmed. When it was introduced into Ufipa with very little warning early in October, many took to the bush or vanished across the border into Northern Rhodesia. They believed that they would be sent to fight and be killed, and the fact that they were given a few days' leave home before setting out was taken to mean that they would never see their homes again. As a result however of time and intensive propaganda the people are now reassured.[3]

1942. Central Province. An increasing number of the men returned elected to re-enlist and there have been several cases of time-expired members of the Pioneer or Labour Corps declining to take the full leave to which they were entitled, so eager were they to return to surroundings in which the provision of food and other amenities was a responsibility removed from their own hands.[4]

Tanga Province. Notwithstanding the very heavy demands within the province for labour, first on sisal estates and later for rubber, calls for recruits for the Forces have remained high. In the Tanga District it has been easy to meet requirements, as there is a constant drift of volunteers, mainly time-expired estate labourers, while unemployed township natives and able-bodied tax-defaulters were directed to the recruiting depot. Towards the middle of the year there was a slight decline in the number of volunteers. A systematic conscription of the indigenous tribes was begun in August.[5]

1943. Southern Province. Recruitment varied in popularity from district to district; in one volunteers were plentiful, in another active steps were only found necessary towards the end of the year whilst in others conscription was found necessary throughout the year.

While conscription is nowhere popular and is, naturally, avoided where possible, there is a brighter side to the picture and on the balance the conscript reaps the benefit. Military conscripts enjoy excellent health and abundance of cash.[6]

[1] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 19. See also ibid. *1944*, p. 35: ' . . . at present most Africans, in this province at least, prefer military to civil labour and will volunteer for the former, but, with very few exceptions, can only be obtained by conscription for the latter.'

[2] Ibid. *1940*, p. 55. [3] Ibid., p. 70. [4] Ibid. *1942*, p. 4.

[5] Ibid., p. 83. See also ibid. *1943*, p. 84: 'More recruits for the forces were required from Tanga than the much larger Korogwe District and yet the total demand for the year was exceeded before the middle of December. About seventy per cent of the Tanga District recruits were volunteers including an increasing proportion of indigenous natives.' [6] Ibid., pp. 60–1.

Governor Jackson, on 7 December 1944, said in the Legislative Council:

It is clearly impossible to give details or numbers but they have involved the withdrawal for the duration of the war from the ordinary native life of the Territory of a proportion of the younger men which taken together with the expanded demands of industry has been nearly double that ordinarily required in peace-time. This may not sound very large compared with the ratios in Europe, but it must be remembered that under African conditions where the first call on the activities of the individual is production for his own subsistence and that of his family the withdrawal of a large percentage of the able-bodied men involves a serious disruption in social and economic life. The proportion of men furnished to the Forces by this Territory has been among the highest ratios in the African territories.[1]

The largest town in the Territory is the capital Dar es Salaam. The census reports tell very little about its population. The report on the 1921 native count shows merely that the native population was '(Approx.) 25,000';[2] it is the only area for which the native population was not classified by sex or age. The report on the 1931 native count gives as native population for 1921, 25,000, 'a rough estimate, 20,000 would probably have been a more approximate figure'; for 1928, 21,930; and for 1931, 22,732.[3] The report on the 1931 Non-Native Census does not show separately the non-native population of the town.[4] More details are given in the Medical Reports. They may be summarized here for what they are worth.

Date	Natives		Non-Natives	Total	Source
	Civilian	Others[1]			
1919 . .	16,439	...	2,869	19,308	*M.R. 1921*, p. 125.
(31) Dec. 1921 . .	10,901	1,422	4,563	16,886	*M.R. 1921*, p. 125; *1925*, p. 42.
1924 . .	24,000[2]	1,325	..	..	*M.R. 1924*, p. 165.
30 May 1925[3] . .	19,600	1,018	5,150	25,768	*M.R. 1925*, p. 42.
31 Dec. 1925[4] . .	22,984		5,262	28,076[5]	*M.R. 1927*, p. 47.
(31 Dec.) 1926[6] . .	30,000	1,235	6,900	38,135	*M.R. 1927*, p. 47.
31 Dec. 1927[7] . .	28,464	1,536	6,674	36,674	*M.R. 1927*, p. 47.
1928[8] . .	21,930[9]	1,310	7,151	30,391	*M.R. 1928*, p. 54.
1929 . .	22,632	1,174	7,553	31,359	*M.R. 1929*, p. 50.

[1] King's African Rifles and Police.

[2] 'Estimated by Senior Commissioner in his Annual Report.'

[3] 'Estimated by Senior Commissioner on 30th May, 1925, by calculation from inhabited houses and other figures.'

[4] 'Population on December 31st, 1925, based on figures obtained by the Administration on May 30th, 1925.' [5] Total does not agree with items; see *Medical Report 1925*, p. 42.

[6] 'Estimated by District Officer.'

[7] 'Estimated by the District Officer for the information of the Legislative Council as at December 31st.' [8] 'Supplied by District Officer.' [9] Census figure.

[1] *19th Session*, pp. 2–3. On 9 Dec. 1941 Acting Governor Freeston had stated that on 14 June 1941, 17,500 Africans from Tanganyika Territory were serving under the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, East Africa, and that in addition 'many thousands of Tanganyika Africans . . . have joined the military forces during the last six months' (*16th Session*, p. 2). In his report for 1944 the Commissioner of the Central Province said that '825 men went to the Forces during the year bringing the total of military recruits for the province to 8,523 since 1941' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 10).

[2] *Report on the Native Census, 1921, p. 5.* [3] See ibid. *1931*, p. 14.

[4] This is the more surprising as the report shows (p. 11) with great detail the 'Crews and Passengers of Ships in Harbour in Dar es Salaam', on the night of the census, by race, sex, and age.

From 1930 on the Medical Reports are less detailed and do not contain population data for Dar es Salaam. But the native population of the town apparently did not change essentially in the 1930s, since the total population, at the outbreak of the war, was estimated at 30,000.[1] During the war there was a large influx.

The institution of a rationing system in Dar es Salaam for natives in May 1943 was preceded by a registration of all African townsmen and revealed the fact that the figure of 33,000 which had previously been accepted as the total population had risen to some 45,000 souls. There is no doubt that the prospect of being able to get regular supplies of foodstuffs in Dar es Salaam when food was in short supply everywhere attracted many natives to the town.[2]

Owing probably to a better harvest in 1944[3] the native population of Dar es Salaam decreased. The Commissioner of the Eastern Province in his report for that year speaks of 'Dar es Salaam's African population of some thirty-nine thousand souls'.[4]

III. Composition of Native Population

Sex. According to the counts of 1921 and 1931 the ratio of females to 100 males was 103·9 and 106·8 respectively.[5] But this does not necessarily mean that the excess of females actually increased, since the data for 1921 may have been wide of the mark. It will suffice to mention that according to the 1921 returns the Nyamwezi consisted of 177,000 males and 90,000 females, while according to the 1931 count the males numbered 170,661 and the females 178,823.[6]

The ratio of females to 100 males varied in 1931 in the 9 provinces[7] between 88·0 (Tanga)[8] and 127·0 (Iringa), and among the 30 tribes whose strength exceeded 50,000[9] between 95·1 (the Mbulu) and 139·8 (the Kukwe).

Age. The report on the 1921 count, after having pointed out that since 1913 the populations of most of the inland districts 'have increased, some of them very considerably, and that the populations of all the coast

[1] See *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 484.

[2] *Annual Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1943*, p. 24. See also ibid., p. 25: 'Dar es Salaam town is, quite apart from its resident population, the standby for peasants whose crops have failed or who for various reasons are unable to earn the wherewithal to pay their tax in their home areas.'

[3] 'At the beginning of the year, scarcity of foodstuffs was acute with particular effect in urban areas but this position was rectified when good grain crops were harvested in quantities well above average in some areas' (ibid. *1944*, p. 13).

[4] Ibid., p. 31.

[5] See *Report on the Native Census, 1921*, pp. 5–10; *1931*, p. 5.

[6] See ibid. *1921*, p. 11; *1931*, p. 20.

[7] See *Census of the Native Population 1931*, p. 13.

[8] Tanga Province had a large immigration from other Provinces and neighbouring countries. See, for example, *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 53: 'Tanga Province . . . contains 355,934 native inhabitants, of whom some 50,000 are immigrants from a multitude of East and Central African tribes, mainly employed by the sisal industry . . .' A survey made in 1941–2 to obtain reliable information of the labour available in the Tanga Province and to ascertain the proportion of immigrant tribesmen to indigenous workers 'showed that out of a total adult male labour force at that date of 38,585, employed by the sisal industry, the number of male aliens from other areas was 25,689' (*Labour Department Report 1942*, p. 6).

[9] See *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 16–23.

districts have decreased', states that 'in the coastal area the ratio of children to adults is, approximately, 1 : 2 (in Lindi 1 : 2·6) while in the other districts the ratio is approximately 1 : 1·5. This explains the decrease.'[1] But this argument, for various reasons, is not convincing.

(1) The 1921 age data, in many cases, are mere guesses. For the Mwanza District which contained about as many people as all the coast districts combined it was *assumed* that the number of children was equal to the number of adults.[2] It is not possible to tell what the ratio in this District was in 1931, but among the inhabitants of the Lake Province of whom more than two-thirds lived in the Mwanza District the ratio of children to adults is shown for 1931 as being 1 : 1·67 (1921 : 1·24) although the population of this Province is said to have increased between 1921 and 1931 by 22 per cent. In the Tabora District the ratio of children to adults was given in 1921 as 1 : 1·10; for the Nyamwezi, who constituted nearly one-half of the population of the District, the ratio was 1 : 1·02. But in 1931 the ratio for the Nyamwezi was shown to be 1 : 1·90 although the number of Nyamwezi in this District is said to have increased between 1921 and 1931 by 33 per cent.[3]

(2) Some inland districts the population of which, according to the official statistics, increased considerably between 1913 and 1921 showed a comparatively low ratio of children to adults in 1921 (for example, Bukoba 1 : 2·06; Iringa 1 : 3·54).

(3) There is no evidence that the proportion of children in the coast districts was lower in 1921 than in 1913.

The report of the Senior Sanitation Officer for the year 1921 contains another comment on the sex and age distribution of the population:[4]

> As regards sex distribution, among every 1,000 persons:—
>
> 286·6 are Men.
> 312·8 „ Women.
> 205·4 „ Boys.
> 195·2 „ Girls.
>
> That is to say that there are to every 100 males, 109 females.[5] This is a fairly normally constituted population. More male than female children are born into the world in Tanganyika as in Europe, and then, later, owing to the stress of life and other factors adult females predominate. But, numerically, the disturbing fact remains that there are for each 698 men and women only 400 children. Roughly 350 couples produce 400 children.

The author of this report would probably have found the situation less disturbing if his arithmetic had been in order because his conclusion would then have been that there are for each 599 men and women 401

[1] *Report on the Native Census, 1921*, p. 1.
[2] See p. 325 above.
[3] The sex and age composition of the Nyamwezi in the Tabora District was given as follows:

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Adults*	*Children*	*Total*
1921	70,104	44,064	83,326	28,127	114,168	111,453	225,621
1931	90,983	105,699	50,998	52,267	196,682	103,265	299,947

[4] *Medical Report 1921*, pp. 81–2.
[5] Should evidently read 'to every 100 men 109 women'.

children and that roughly 300 couples 'produce' 400 children. He might have realized furthermore that adults comprise very many persons who have not yet children but will have children later on and very many persons who have had children who themselves are now adults. If the 1921 returns could be trusted they would be evidence of a very high proportion of children.

According to the returns of 1921 and 1931 the proportion of children changed as follows:

	1921	*1931*
Children to adults . . .	1 : 1·49	1 : 1·67
„ „ „ . . .	0·67 : 1	0·60 : 1
„ „ female adults . .	1·28 : 1	1·14 : 1

It would seem, therefore, that the proportion of children has decreased considerably (in spite of an apparent population increase by 22 per cent.). But the 1921 figures are so untrustworthy that it may well be that this proportion has actually not decreased. The Secretary for Native Affairs in his report on the 1931 count does not mention the apparent decrease in the proportion of children. Without offering any evidence, he seems rather to assume that the proportion has increased.

Taking the Territory as a whole, the ratio of non-adults to adults is 60 : 100. This is high compared with other countries where conditions of life approximate closely, and is an indication that the general improvement in the economic position of the people, the better conditions of health and sanitation, the gradual sinking into desuetude of barbarous customs, and the spread of knowledge among women as regards nourishment and care of children, are tending to the [population] increase which the first table illustrated.[1]

The stages which the various tribes have reached in some directions towards social advancement may perhaps be roughly deduced from the age ratios e.g. there are only 24 non-adults per 100 adults amongst the Baha who are one of the most backward tribes in the Territory, while amongst the intelligent Wambulu (who, incidentally, are one of the tribes who practise a mild form of clitoridectomy) the number of non-adults exceeds the adults by 13 per cent.[2]

The report then investigates the relations of economic production and proportion of children among various tribes.[3]

It would be unwise to deduce too much from this classification, but certain deductions are of interest and reasonably reliable. Special considerations apply to the Masai who are entirely nomadic and to the Tusi who, though not nomads, are almost entirely dependent on their cattle, and are affected by certain other social factors of importance; these two tribes are, therefore, disregarded in the remarks which follow. With the exceptions noted, the first striking fact is that of the remaining 4,000,000 cattle in the Territory, not more than some 100,000 are owned by tribes in Group III, while Groups I and II contain only three tribes, the Luguru, the Mwera, and the Zigua, who are not cattle owners, and none who depend solely on their cattle. Of the tribes in Group III, the Bena (49 per cent.) were very severely punished after the 1906 rebellion and have never really recovered. The Ha (24 per cent.) are an extremely primitive and ignorant people who have barely emerged from what may be called the pre-European era. For generations they have been the serfs of Tusi overlords; missionary work has barely begun and cultivation is in

[1] *Census of the Native Population 1931*, p. 5. [2] Ibid., p. 7. [3] See Table 5.

a very primitive state among them. As regards the Hamba (48 per cent.) and the Nyaihangiro (46 per cent.), there is good reason for believing that, like most of the Bukoba tribes, they suffer from an abnormally high rate of infection by venereal diseases. The Nyamwezi, Sumbwa, Ngindo, Yao, Zaramo and Zinza are mainly dwellers in tsetse infested forest or at least wooded country, with tsetse belts so frequent as to preclude the keeping of cattle, while the Rufiji inhabit the peculiarly unhealthy valley of the Rufiji River.[1]

TABLE 5. *Ratio of Children to 100 Adults and Economic Production*[1] *in 36 Tribes, Tanganyika Territory*[2]

Group I. Over 80			*Group II. 60 to 80*			*Group III. Under 60*		
Tribe	*Children to 100 adults*	*Economic production*	*Tribe*	*Children to 100 adults*	*Economic production*	*Tribe*	*Children to 100 adults*	*Economic production*
Chagga	113	P.A.	Hehe	79	P.A.	Zaramo	59	A.
Mbulu	113	P.A.	Kerewe	77	P.A.	Yao	52	A.
Kuria	94	P.A.	Pare	77	P.A.	Nyamwezi	51	A.[3]
Nyakyusa	87	P.A.	Kukwe	74	P.A.	Masai	50	P.[4]
			Jita	72	P.A.	Bena	49	P.A.
			Nyaturu	72	P.A.	Ngindo	49	A.
			Luguru	71	A.	Zinza	49	A.
			Gogo	67	P.A.	Hamba	48	A.[3]
			Sandawi	67	P.A.	Nyasa	48	A.[3]
			Ngoni	66	P.A.	Nyaihangiro	46	A.[3]
			Shambaa	66	P.A.	Rufiji	45	A.
			Fipa	65	P.A.	Makonde	43	A.
			Mwera	65	A.	Sumbwa	43	A.
			Sukuma	65	P.A.	Tusi	34	P.
			Irangi	63	P.A.	Ha	24	P.A.
			Zigua	63	A.			
			Iramba	62	P.A.			

[1] P.A. = Pastoral and Agricultural; P. = Pastoral only; A. = Agricultural only.
[2] See *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 7–8, 16–23.
[3] 'These four tribes have a few herds of cattle but the bulk of the people in each case have none.'
[4] 'Entirely nomadic.'

It is very difficult to say whether these far-reaching conclusions are justified. A high ratio of children to adults, such as is shown for the Tanganyika Territory as a whole, coincides very seldom with good economic, health, and sanitary conditions. It is, as a rule, the result of a great mortality among adults and sometimes the result of a great mortality among young children. It is true, of course, that if the proportion of children to adults is actually among the Ha 24 : 100, and among the Chagga and the Mbulu 113 : 100, the Ha are dying out rapidly while the Chagga and the Mbulu must increase enormously.[2] But it seems most likely that the ratio has been overstated for the Chagga and the Mbulu, and in any case it seems doubtful whether it is correct to attribute the sterility of the Ha women to backwardness, and the excessive fertility of the Mbulu women to intelligence.[3] It is certainly very interesting that of the 20 pastoral and agricultural tribes all but 2 have more than 60 children

[1] Ibid., p. 7.
[2] Yet, according to the 'censuses', the Ha increased between 1921 and 1931 from 117,000 to 145,957 or by 25 per cent., the Chagga from 128,500 to 155,858 or only by 21 per cent., and the Mbulu from 34,000 to 66,050 or by 94 per cent. (see ibid., *1921*, p. 12; *1931*, pp. 16, 18).
[3] The ratio of children to women appears to be 45 : 100 among the Ha, and 261 : 100 among the Mbulu!

to 100 adults while of the 14 tribes which are 'agricultural only' all but 3 show less than 60 children to 100 adults. But the Ha who have the lowest ratio of children are pastoral and agricultural, and the 6 agricultural tribes with the highest ratio of children (which comprise 60 per cent. of the total population of the 14 agricultural tribes) have an aggregate ratio of 57 children to 100 adults, a rate which must be considered as high. It should be noted, moreover, that the 36 tribes listed comprise only 71 per cent. of the total native population and that the results may have differed if all tribes had been included.[1]

IV. Composition of Non-Native Population

Race. The distribution of the non-native population by races in 1921 and 1931 was as follows:[2]

Year	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Others*	*Total*
1921	2,447	9,411	798	4,041	741	17,438
1931	8,228	23,422	1,722	7,059	589[1]	41,020

[1] 178 'Coloured', 30 'Half-castes', and 381 'Other Races'; see *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 20–1.

At both censuses the Indians constituted the majority of the non-native population—54·0 per cent. in 1921 and 57·1 per cent. in 1931. The proportion of Europeans increased from 14·0 to 20·1 per cent. On the other hand, the proportion of Arabs decreased from 23·2 to 17·2 per cent., and that of all other races combined from 8·8 to 5·6 per cent. The large increase in the proportion of Europeans was due to the reappearance of Germans who in 1921 were still debarred from the Territory but who in 1931 constituted 5·2 per cent. of all non-natives.[3]

In the case of Europeans, 24 per cent. of the male adults are engaged in agriculture, and the same percentage is made up by Government servants.[4] . . .

The Indians are overwhelmingly commercial, Government servants and artisans making up most of the balance. The majority of Goan adults are engaged in clerical work, government and private employment taking an approximately equal number, while tailoring and commerce account for most of the remainder. The Arabs are, in accordance with tradition, traders, while a fair proportion have remained on the coconut and other plantations in which, in pre-European days, they held a virtual monopoly.[5]

[1] Among the 36 tribes listed there were 61 children to 100 adults, among the other tribes only 56.

[2] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 10.

[3] The representative of the Administration explained in the Permanent Mandates Commission on 16 Nov. 1932 that the increase of the European population from 2,447 to 8,228 'was due to developments in Tanganyika in the immediate post-war years' (*Minutes*, 22nd Session, p. 158). But this was apparently a mistake. The restrictions on the entry of ex-enemy nationals were not abolished before June 1925, and by the end of that year there were not more than 'about 3,500' Europeans in the Territory (see *Report to the League 1925*, pp. 25–6). The white population in the present area of Tanganyika had been about 1,200 in 1901 and nearly 5,200 on 1 Jan. 1913 (see *Die deutschen Schutzgebiete 1909/10, Statistischer Teil*, p. 3; ibid. *1912/13, Statistischer Teil*, p. 10).

[4] About one-half of the male adult British were Government servants; a large proportion of the Germans were engaged in agriculture.

[5] *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 43.

Since the census of 1931 the non-native population on 31 December has been given in the Blue Books as follows:[1]

	1931	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*
Europeans .	8,217	8,151	8,304	8,193	8,455	8,926	9,128
Asiatics . .	32,687	31,477	30,126	29,640	33,447	32,255	33,019

	1938	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*
Europeans .	9,165	7,925	7,245	6,474	14,383	16,709	16,112
Asiatics . .	33,974	32,801	33,751	33,790	35,591	45,099	46,558

The Reports to the League of Nations give slightly different figures for 1937 (9,107 Europeans and 32,794 Asiatics) and 1938 (9,345 and 33,784).[2] The Medical Report for 1942 shows 6,238 Europeans and 33,774 Asiatics and the Medical Report for 1943 5,122 Europeans and 35,591 Asiatics.[3] The former figures apparently refer to 1941 and the latter evidently to 1942. The reports say that the figures do not include 'Evacuees and Refugees in the Territory' who on 31 December 1942 numbered 8,410 (2,978 Italians, 4,988 Poles, 444 Greeks), and on 31 December 1943 9,261 (3,015 Italians, 5,727 Poles, 519 Greeks). The decrease in the number of European residents was due to the internment of Germans.

The Germans, in the 1930s, had played an ever-increasing part. The Commissioner of the Southern Highlands Province stated:

> The economic effect of the war on this province can best be illustrated by the following statistics:—
>
> (*a*) Approximately 90 per cent of the plantations and farms were in the hands of enemy aliens, employing a labour force of about 8,000 natives.
>
> (*b*) About 25 per cent of the alluvial diggings on the goldfield were worked by Germans, whose total labour force amounted to 3,000.
>
> (*c*) Fifty per cent of the garages and hotels were enemy owned.

[1] See *Blue Book 1931*, p. 108; *1932*, p. 111; *1933*, p. 120; *1934*, p. 121; *1935*, p. 126; *1936*, p. 129; *1937*, p. 133; *1938*, p. 143; *1939*, p. 34; *1940*, Section 15; *1941*, p. 44; *1942*, p. 43; *1943*, p. 45; *1944*, p. 44.

[2] See *Report 1937*, p. 168; *1938*, p. 167. To judge from the statistics given in the Tanganyika Medical Reports the number of European officials has decreased enormously; but according to the *East Africa Vital Statistics of European Officials* the decline was much smaller.

	1930	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
Total number resident* .	1,600	1,567	1,387	1,132	965	947	950	986	1,017
Average number resident* .	1,007	988	815	727	598	587	589	611	630
Average number in service† .	1,312	1,416	1,292	1,141	1,113	1,123	1,154	1,178	1,196

* According to *Medical Reports* (see Table 13 below).

† According to *Vital Statistics 1930*, p. 2, to *1938*, p. 2, 'Mean of Totals as at 1st January and 31st December.'

According to the Medical Reports the number of Asiatic officials has decreased even more than the number of European officials (see Table 13 below).

According to the censuses the number of European officials had increased between 1921 and 1931 from 621 to 1,121, and the number of Asiatic (Indian) officials from 804 to 1,528 (see *Medical Report 1922*, p. 39; *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 43–4).

[3] See *Medical Report 1942*, p. 9; *1943*, p. 12.

(*d*) German firms supplied 75 per cent of the materials utilized on the plantations and farms.

(*e*) Ninety per cent of the produce, excluding pyrethrum, was handled by German firms and the majority of plantations and farms were financed by enemy companies.[1]

The Commissioner of Police, in his report for 1939, said:

Out of a total of 1,161 enemy aliens to be arrested, some 65 fled, or attempted to escape, from the Territory, immediately on the declaration of hostilities, and of these 22 were subsequently arrested and interned, the remainder seeking refuge in neighbouring neutral countries.[2]

I think that I am safe in saying that the Tanganyika Police hold the record amongst Colonial Police Forces for the largest number of enemy aliens arrested at the outbreak of war—a total of just over a thousand.[3]

Governor Young, on 9 December 1940, stated in the Legislative Council:

. . . there were over 3,000 German and Italian nationals in the Territory on the outbreak of war, of whom approximately 1,470 were males, 1,170 females and 860 children. During the first six months of the year, 572 German males, 414 females and 366 children were repatriated to Germany, but with the entry of Italy into the war in June it became necessary to suspend repatriation arrangements.

In May and June it was considered advisable in the interests of public security to re-intern a number of enemy aliens who had been allowed to give parole and thereafter arrangements were made to concentrate the majority of those who remained on parole at five main centres, namely, Morogoro, Tabora, Old Shinyanga, Oldeani and Lushoto-Soni.

In July 506 enemy males, of whom 56 had been transferred from Kenya and Uganda, were sent to the Union of South Africa for internment there. These included 58 Italians.

There now remain in the Territory on parole 448 enemy males, 755 females, and some 500 children. Of these, 83 males, 90 females and a small number of children are Italians and 319 males and 337 females are missionaries.[4]

A year later, on 9 December 1941, Acting Governor Freeston said:

. . . in April of this year approximately six hundred German and Italian women and children from this Territory were transferred to Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, for internment. At the same time a further party of twenty-five male enemy subjects were sent to South Africa for internment, which brought the total of male internees from Tanganyika in the Union up to 475.

After the completion of these movements there remained in the country nine hundred and forty-eight enemy subjects, men, women and children.[5] These persons may be divided roughly into the following classes:—

Firstly, missionaries, male and female;

Secondly, persons opposed to the present regimes in Germany and Italy for one reason or another; and

Finally, a few persons who are either supporters of, or not opposed to, the present Governments in Germany and Italy, but who, because of age or infirmity, could not be removed to South Africa or Southern Rhodesia.

The first class—missionaries—accounts for nearly two-thirds of our total (six hundred and five persons in all); of this number all but about thirty persons are

[1] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, pp. 69–70.
[2] *Report on the Administration of the Police 1939*, p. 16.
[3] Ibid., p. 17.
[4] Legislative Council, *15th Session*, p. 11.
[5] By April 1941 all these enemy aliens had been released from internment.

Roman Catholic missionaries, who have given parole and are allowed to continue their missionary work, provided they confine themselves to the precincts of their mission stations. . . .

The second class is mainly composed of Jews, with a certain number of royalists and other persons who have fallen foul of the present regime in Germany for some reason connected with their race or their political views. . . .

Since the outbreak of war, we have ensured the physical removal from Tanganyika of about two thousand four hundred and thirty men, women and children of enemy nationality, and a good deal of housing accommodation in various parts of the Territory has thereby been released. . . .[1]

On 21 August 1942 the Acting Administrative Secretary said:

There are 3,000 Italians evacuated from Ethiopia interned in this Territory. There are no Italian evacuees in this Territory who are not interned. . . . There are no Italians interned in this Territory other than those evacuated from Ethiopia.[2]

The number of British residents, of course, was reduced through war service. Acting Governor Freeston stated on 9 December 1941 that 450 Europeans were serving under the General Officer Commanding-in-Chief, East Africa.[3] Governor Jackson said on 7 December 1944 that 'more than seven hundred persons have been made available from the small European population eligible for service in the Forces and auxiliary services'.[4]

There was, on the other hand, an influx of British and other refugees from Europe.

In the middle of the year [1941] a request was received from His Majesty's Government that Tanganyika, in common with other mainland territories of East Africa, should undertake to accommodate persons of British descent or British sympathy whom it was then thought necessary to evacuate from the Mediterranean area. This Government readily agreed to accept up to five hundred persons so evacuated, including two hundred Jews; and in pursuance of this undertaking accommodation was earmarked in the Tanga, Lake and Western provinces, and other preparations were made for their reception. The first party of these war-time guests came from Cyprus in August; it comprised seventy-seven British men, women and children, and six women and children of other nationalities. They were at once transferred to the accommodation which had been prepared for them in the Lushoto and Tanga areas.[5]

A further 176 refugees from Cyprus (all Jews), of whom 27 were British subjects, followed in December 1941.[6]

At the same time the Government had agreed to take up to 5,000 Polish refugees.[7] Those who came were mostly women and children.[8]

[1] Legislative Council, *16th Session*, pp. 4–5.

[2] Ibid., p. 147. For further details concerning enemy aliens see ibid., *15th Session*, p. 95; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, pp. 32, 56, 58–9, 64; *1941*, pp. 8, 67; *1942*, pp. 18, 66, 81, 99; *1943*, pp. 19, 82, 99; *1944*, pp. 30, 83.

[3] See Legislative Council, *16th Session*, p. 2.

[4] Ibid., *19th Session*, p. 3.

[5] Acting Governor Freeston, 9 Dec. 1941, ibid., *16th Session*, p. 5.

[6] Acting Administrative Secretary, 21 Aug. 1942, ibid., p. 147. The vast majority were Austrian and German Jews. For further details concerning the refugees from Cyprus see *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1941*, pp. 28, 67; *1942*, pp. 18, 82, 99; *1943*, pp. 19, 83; *1944*, p. 83.

[7] See Legislative Council, *16th Session*, p. 147.

[8] See Administrative Secretary, 6 Dec. 1943, ibid., *18th Session*, p. 34. For details concerning the Polish refugees see *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, pp. 13–14, 18, 50, 79, 82; *1943*, p. 83; *1944*, pp. 30, 65, 79.

The increase in the Asiatic population from 32,801 on 31 December 1939 to 45,099 on 31 December 1943 is rather puzzling. The total number of new Indian immigrants who entered Tanganyika during that period was only 1,233.

No records are available of the number of old residents returning to Tanganyika from India, as statistics are kept only of *new* immigrants, visitors, and passengers in transit.

No emigration figures are available to show the number of persons who left the Territory during these years, as no statistics of emigration are kept.[1]

Birthplace. Of the 41,020 Non-Natives enumerated in 1931, 12,778 were born in Tanganyika Territory, 3,260 in other British possessions in Africa, 225 elsewhere in Africa, 2,529 in British possessions in Europe, 3,381 elsewhere in Europe, 13,996 in India, 368 in other British possessions in Asia, 4,206[2] elsewhere in Asia, 140 in other British possessions,

TABLE 6. *Non-Native Population by Country of Birth and Race, Tanganyika Territory, 1931*[1]

Country of birth	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Coloured*	*Other races*	*Total*
Tanganyika Territory	984	7,598	333	3,740	50[3]	73	12,778
Kenya	108	605	13	146	3	4	879
Union of South Africa	632	14	1	3	1	—	651
Zanzibar	6	1,143	11	185	6[3]	8	1,359
Other British Poss. in Africa	59	115	3	85	100	9	371
Elsewhere in Africa	68	70	1	56	24	6	225
Africa Total	1,857	9,545	362	4,215	184	100	16,263
British Possessions in Europe	2,522	2	—	—	1	4	2,529
Elsewhere in Europe	3,375	—	1	2	—	3	3,381
Europe Total	5,897	2	1	2	1	7	5,910
India	135	13,742	62	16	4[4]	37	13,996
Other British Poss. in Asia	46	27	1	157	14	123	368
Arabia	6	24	27	2,655	—	3	2,715
Goa	1	76	1,266	7	—	2	1,352
Elsewhere in Asia	20	4	1	4	4	106	139
Asia Total	208	13,873	1,357	2,839	22	271	18,570
British Possessions in America	59	—	—	—	1	—	60
Elsewhere in America	132	—	—	—	—	1	133
America Total	191	—	—	—	1	1	193
British Possessions in Oceania	70	—	—	—	—	—	70
British Possessions not stated	5	2	—	1	—	2	10
Not stated	—	—	2	2	—	—	4
Total	8,228	23,422	1,722	7,059	208	381	41,020

[1] Computed from *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 17–21.
[3] Including 27 half-castes. [3] Including 2 half-castes. [4] Including 1 half-caste.

[1] Chief Secretary, 27 Apr. 1944, Legislative Council, *18th Session*, p. 134.
[2] This figure is probably too high since of the 2,655 Arabs who returned Arabia as their country of birth apparently many were born in East Africa (see *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 16).

and 137 elsewhere. Of 5,897 Europeans born in Europe, 2,308 were born in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 103 in the Irish Free State, 111 in British Mediterranean possessions, 1,828 in Germany, 516 in Greece, 225 in Switzerland, 171 in France, 131 in Italy, 113 in the Netherlands, and 391 elsewhere.

Nationality. The data in the census report referring to nationality are rather confusing. A 'summary table'[1] shows the following distribution:

Race	*British Born*	*Naturalized British*	*Other Nationality*	*Total*
Europeans	3,429	73	4,726	8,228
Indians	23,224	56	142	23,422
Goans	6	4	1,712	1,722
Arabs	212	18	6,829	7,059
Others	338	8	243	589
Total	27,209	159	13,652	41,020

This would indicate that one-third of the non-natives were foreigners, and the Administration, in analysing this table in the Reports to the League of Nations, actually stated every year:

> Of the non-native population 66·7 per cent were either born or naturalized British subjects and 33·3 per cent of foreign nationality.[2]

But it would be a mistake to assume that the group 'Other Nationality' includes only foreigners, since a table in the Census Report 'Birthplaces of the European population of Tanganyika, under Race, Nationality and Sex'[3] gives the following distribution:

Birthplace	*British born*	*Naturalized British*	*South African Dutch*	*Germans*	*French*	*Italians*	*Other foreigners*	*Total*
British Empire	3,352	41	580	261	38	22	349	4,643
Foreign Countries	77	32	2	1,878	161	128	1,307	3,585
Total	3,429	73	582	2,139	199	150	1,656	8,228

Finally, a table 'European Races, by Nationality and Sex'[4] shows 4,011 'British and Colonial'[5] and 4,217 'Foreign'. Thus the Reports to the League and the summary table of the census report treat the naturalized British as British and the South African Dutch as foreigners, while the table 'European Races by Nationality and Sex' treats the naturalized British as foreigners and the South African Dutch as British.

[1] See ibid.

[2] *Report to the League of Nations 1931*, p. 99; *1932*, p. 106; *1933*, p. 102; *1934*, p. 121; *1935*, p. 138; *1936*, p. 142; *1937*, p. 166; *1938*, p. 165.

[3] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 17–18.

[4] See ibid., p. 21.

[5] 1,934 English, 240 Irish, 635 Scots, 85 Welsh, 410 South African, 582 South African Dutch, 57 Australian, 26 Canadian, 3 New Zealand, 39 Others.

Between the census of 1931 and 31 December 1938 the European population by nationality has apparently changed as follows:[1]

Nationality	*1931*	*1938*	*Nationality*	*1931*	*1938*	*Nationality*	*1931*	*1938*
British . .	4,011	4,090[1]	Greek . .	918	893	Rumanian	10	3
Austrian . .	34	—	Hungarian .	4	2	Russian .	18	1
Belgian . .	98	32	Italian. .	150	184	Spanish .	2	—
Bulgarian . .	1	—	Latvian .	9	5	Swedish .	42	57
Czechoslovakian	15	7	Lithuanian .	3	—	Swiss .	220	349
Danish . .	49	50	Luxemburgian	5	4	U.S.A. .	88	114
Dutch . .	141	207	Norwegian .	22	19	Yugoslav .	4	2
French . .	199	105	Polish . .	13	4	Other .	18[2]	11[3]
German . .	2,149	3,205	Portuguese .	5	1	Total .	8,228	9,345

[1] Including 36 'Cypriot'. [2] Including 8 South American.
[3] 3 Persian, 8 Syrian.

The Germans increased from 2,149 to 3,205, while all others increased only from 6,079 to 6,140.

For 31 December 1940 the distribution was given as follows:[2]

Nationality	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Nationality*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
British . .	2,171	1,490	3,661	Nicaraguan . .	1	—	1
Argentinian . .	1	—	1	Norwegian . .	16	8	24
Belgian . .	18	10	28	Persian . .	5	3	8
Bulgarian . .	1	—	1	Polish . . .	3	7	10
Czechoslovakian .	16	14	30	Portuguese . .	1	2	3
Danish . .	48	38	86	Rumanian . .	3	—	3
Dutch . . .	180	51	231	Soviet . . .	3	4	7
Esthonian . .	2	1	3	Swedish . .	27	25	52
Finnish . .	2	—	2	Swiss . . .	228	121	349
French . .	80	31	111	Syrians . .	18	14	32
German . .	547	880	1,427	Turk . . .	2	—	2
Greek . . .	545	280	825	U.S.A. . .	74	54	128
Hungarian . .	6	6	12	Yugoslav . .	1	2	3
Italian . .	85	99	184	Stateless . .	6	2	8
Latvian . .	3	1	4				
Luxemburgian .	7	2	9	Total . .	4,100	3,145	7,245

The most striking changes were the enormous reduction in the number of Germans and the decline in the number of British.

Sex. Each race shows a great preponderance of males. In 1931 there were among the Europeans 57·4 females per 100 males, among the Indians 65·2, among the Goans 36·8, and among the Arabs 52·1. The proportion of females has increased for every race since 1921, and this increase has apparently continued also in recent years. According to the estimates for 31 December 1938 there were among the Europeans (5,598 males, 3,567 females) 63·7 females per 100 males and among the Asiatics (20,703 males, 13,271 females) 64·1.[3] From the end of 1938 to the end of 1940 the

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 21; *Report to the League of Nations 1938*, p. 167.
[2] See ibid. *1940*, p. 101.
[3] See *Blue Book 1938*, p. 143.

TABLE 7. *Non-Native Population by Race and Years of Age, Tanganyika Territory, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*	*Age (Years)*	*Europeans*	*Indians*	*Goans*	*Arabs*
0	181	920	82	161	47	129	77	14	16
1	134	470	33	141	48	128	108	17	23
2	139	841	61	229	49	95	44	11	12
3	139	750	47	211	50	108	292	19	249
4	137	698	37	223	51	73	34	5	7
5	110	748	45	207	52	89	73	9	11
6	118	636	36	200	53	76	32	3	12
7	90	603	25	210	54	67	24	9	9
8	73	597	27	196	55	81	154	10	68
9	76	444	19	136	56	55	20	6	10
10	58	501	10	201	57	52	25	3	6
11	44	370	12	71	58	43	52	4	6
12	37	398	7	165	59	35	13	1	5
13	35	294	5	90	60	28	186	5	128
14	43	308	1	103	61	31	19	—	4
15	52	339	2	143	62	19	29	3	7
16	53	415	5	91	63	25	17	—	4
17	49	376	5	78	64	23	14	2	8
18	62	569	11	193	65	19	75	—	40
19	80	342	22	56	66	8	8	—	1
20	93	888	33	356	67	16	9	1	2
21	72	406	50	41	68	6	6	—	2
22	127	811	51	133	69	5	5	1	—
23	139	528	49	53	70	7	69	—	62
24	204	493	58	89	71	6	2	1	—
25	226	943	81	381	72	9	6	—	2
26	252	497	56	63	73	3	4	—	1
27	287	428	45	74	74	2	3	—	1
28	278	500	45	125	75	2	26	—	10
29	243	255	44	37	76	1	1	—	—
30	313	973	68	513	77	5	—	—	1
31	261	309	42	30	78	2	4	—	—
32	265	479	34	88	79	1	—	—	—
33	234	271	28	24	80	2	21	—	23
34	207	232	42	21	82	—	1	—	1
35	212	755	53	321	83	—	—	—	1
36	225	231	35	58	85	—	8	—	4
37	207	232	33	36	86	1	1	—	1
38	189	287	36	50	87	—	—	—	1
39	157	103	26	24	88	—	1	—	1
40	209	626	53	377	90	—	6	—	10
41	145	96	24	19	95	—	1	—	—
42	171	229	31	42	96	—	—	—	2
43	144	95	23	23	99	—	1	—	1
44	122	96	15	10					
45	136	429	32	184	*Not*				
46	121	111	18	12	*stated*	27	29	1	12

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 24–31.

number of male Europeans decreased by about one-quarter and the number of female Europeans by about one-eighth.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the total non-native population of 1931 was 32·0 per cent.; among the Europeans only 17·2 per cent.; among the Indians 36·6 per cent.; among the Goans 26·0 per cent.; among the Arabs 36·0 per cent. The proportion of women of child-bearing age (15–49 years) among the total non-native population was 19·6 per cent.; among the Europeans 25·1 per cent.; among the Indians 19·1 per cent.; among the Goans 14·0 per cent.; among the Arabs 16·1 per cent. The proportion of old people (60 years and over) among the total non-native population was only 2·7 per cent.; 2·7 per cent. among the Europeans; 2·2 per cent. among the Indians; 0·8 per cent. among the Goans; 4·5 per cent. among the Arabs.

TABLE 8. *Non-Native Children and Adults by Race and Sex, Tanganyika Territory, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Race	Males						Females					
	Under 16		16 and more		Total		Under 16		16 and more		Total	
	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931
Europeans	229	746	1,483	4,480	1,712	5,226	214	720	521	2,282	735	3,002
Indians	1,611	4,457	4,370	9,720	5,981	14,177	1,499	4,460	1,931	4,785	3,430	9,245
Goans	62	226	594	1,033	656	1,259	62	223	80	240	142	463
Arabs	801	1,497	1,966	3,145	2,767	4,642	617	1,190	657	1,227	1,274	2,417
Others	109	77	333	315	442	392	137	67	162	130	299	197
Total	2,812	7,003	8,746	18,693	11,558	25,696	2,529	6,660	3,351	8,664	5,880	15,324

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, p. 35.

The small proportion of children among the Europeans is mainly due to the practice of sending them out of the Territory for the purpose of education.

Conjugal Condition. Of the non-native males 15 years and over 37·9 per cent. were bachelors (Europeans 53·0 per cent., Indians 29·9 per cent., Goans 45·4 per cent., Arabs 37·9 per cent.); 58·5 per cent. were husbands (Europeans 44·6 per cent., Indians 66·1 per cent., Goans 52·4 per cent., Arabs 57·9 per cent.); and 3·6 per cent. were widowers or divorced (Europeans 2·4 per cent., Indians 4·0 per cent., Goans 2·2 per cent., Arabs 4·2 per cent.). Of the non-native females 15 years and over 13·9 per cent. were spinsters (Europeans 31·4 per cent., Indians 7·2 per cent., Goans 4·1 per cent., Arabs 8·4 per cent.); 76·3 per cent. were wives (Europeans 64·1 per cent., Indians 80·6 per cent., Goans 95·5 per cent., Arabs 79·2 per cent.); 9·8 per cent. were widows or divorced (Europeans 4·5 per cent., Indians 12·2 per cent., Goans 0·4 per cent., Arabs 12·4 per cent.).

The number of married males greatly exceeded the number of married females. The ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 73·5 among the Europeans, 61·4 among the Indians, 42·4 among the Goans, 58·5 among the Arabs, and 62·1 among the total non-native population.

TABLE 9. *Non-Native Population by Race, Sex, Age, and Conjugal Condition, Tanganyika Territory, 1931*[1]

Age (Years)	Males				Females			
	Single	Married	Other	Total	Single	Married	Other	Total
EUROPEANS								
0–14	716	—	—	716	698	—	—	698
15–19	160	1	—	161	116	19	—	135
20–4	413	27	—	440	73	120	2	195
25–9	645	222	5	872	109	302	3	414
30–4	366	385	12	763	155	355	7	517
35–9	269	348	13	630	99	249	12	360
40–4	151	331	15	497	74	202	18	294
45–9	148	292	18	458	26	109	16	151
50–4	97	195	21	313	33	55	12	100
55–9	76	112	13	201	24	32	9	65
60–4	36	50	5	91	9	20	6	35
65–9	13	23	1	37	5	4	8	17
70 and more	11	12	6	29	1	1	10	12
Not stated	6	11	1	18	—	9	—	9
Total	3,107	2,009	110	5,226	1,422	1,477	103	3,002
ARABS								
0–14	1,389	18	—	1,407	1,043	93	1	1,137
15–19	282	34	—	316	55	183	7	245
20–4	277	136	5	418	14	230	10	254
25–9	214	242	14	470	8	192	10	210
30–4	168	302	13	483	12	172	9	193
35–9	82	296	19	397	6	72	14	92
40–4	72	269	21	362	3	82	24	109
45–9	36	158	19	213	1	24	9	34
50–4	39	174	9	222	4	36	26	66
55–9	20	59	6	85	1	5	4	10
60–4	21	98	8	127	2	8	14	24
65–9	4	29	5	38	—	2	5	7
70 and more	10	71	16	97	—	5	20	25
Not stated	3	4	—	7	2	2	7	11
Total	2,617	1,890	135	4,642	1,151	1,106	160	2,417
INDIANS								
0–14	4,242	31	1	4,274	4,252	52	—	4,304
15–19	979	146	4	1,129	292	615	5	912
20–4	949	971	17	1,937	33	1,133	23	1,189
25–9	456	1,274	57	1,787	6	807	23	836
30–4	241	1,348	61	1,650	2	582	30	614
35–9	139	1,005	51	1,195	3	366	44	413
40–4	64	707	42	813	6	231	92	329
45–9	48	491	42	581	4	122	62	188
50–4	22	256	30	308	2	62	83	147
55–9	19	127	18	164	2	37	61	100
60–4	9	118	34	161	2	20	82	104
65–9	6	39	19	64	—	6	33	39
70 and more	13	55	21	89	1	3	62	66
Not stated	15	8	2	25	1	2	1	4
Total	7,202	6,576	399	14,177	4,606	4,038	601	9,245

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 24–34.

TABLE 9—*contd.*

Age (Years)	Males				Females			
	Single	*Married*	*Other*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Other*	*Total*
				TOTAL[1]				
0–14	6,644	49	1	6,694	6,281	145	1	6,427
15–19	1,468	184	4	1,656	480	841	14	1,335
20–4	1,846	1,145	23	3,014	131	1,570	35	1,736
25–9	1,522	1,804	77	3,403	131	1,383	36	1,550
30–4	862	2,167	88	3,117	173	1,163	47	1,383
35–9	525	1,813	91	2,429	113	714	72	899
40–4	314	1,440	83	1,837	85	533	136	754
45–9	244	1,032	82	1,358	32	270	87	389
50–4	164	674	61	899	41	154	124	319
55–9	116	322	41	479	27	75	75	177
60–4	67	278	52	397	13	48	102	163
65–9	23	93	27	143	5	12	46	63
70 and more	34	140	44	218	2	9	94	105
Not stated	25	24	3	52	3	13	8	24
Total	13,854	11,165	677	25,696	7,517	6,930	877	15,324

[1] Including Goans and Others.

TABLE 10. *Non-Native Adult Population by Race, Sex, and Conjugal Condition, Tanganyika Territory, 1931*[1]

Race	Males 15 years and more					Females 15 years and more				
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Total*
Europeans .	2,391	2,009	75	35	4,510	724	1,477	87	16	2,304
Indians . .	2,960	6,545	378	20	9,903	354	3,986	585	16	4,941
Goans . .	469	542	23	—	1,034	10	230	1	—	241
Arabs . .	1,228	1,872	69	66	3,235	108	1,013	98	61	1,280
Others . .	162	148	10	—	320	40	79	10	2	131
Total .	7,210	11,116	555	121	19,002	1,236	6,785	781	95	8,897

[1] See *Report on the Non-Native Census 1931*, pp. 24–34.

TABLE 11. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Tanganyika Territory, 1930–41*[1]

Date 1 Jan.	20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
1930	63[2]	—	221	6	270	10	238	7	141	14	124	5	43	4	21	—	50	4	1,171	50
1931	85	1	285	6	304	14	266	13	161	8	122	7	56	3	18	1	81	2	1,378	55
1932	55	—	260	2	266	11	290	11	172	8	123	9	58	3	21	1	88	6	1,333	51
1933	26	—	200	1	233	9	258	13	180	12	110	10	41	—	5	2	83	9	1,136	56
1934	15	—	166	2	229	6	245	11	193	10	100	11	36	2	11	1	68	9	1,063	52
1935	14	—	130	3	236	5	242	9	195	9	108	11	48	4	13	—	68	9	1,054	50
1936	26	—	129	7	229	2	238	8	212	11	103	9	52	6	21	1	76	13	1,066	57
1937	27	—	107	8	234	5	224	4	223	11	119	10	60	7	22	—	93	17	1,109	62
1938	30	2	91	9	211	6	231	4	238	5	131	12	58	6	23	—	99	20	1,112	64
1939	24	—	100	11	184	8	230	3	236	6	148	10	57	5	29	2	132	30	1,140	75
1940	30[3]	1	124	10	153	7	231	2	215	3	144	4	51	8	22	1	26	18	996	54
1941	35[3]	1	122	10	147	8	222	2	213	3	154	4	57	6	20	1	30	17	1,000	52

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.
[2] Including 1 under 20 years of age. [3] Including 2 under 20 years of age.

V. Native Birth and Death Registration

Compulsory notification of native deaths was introduced in German East Africa as far back as 1894,[1] but I doubt whether it was ever enforced outside a few coastal towns, and no provision was made for the registration of native births.

The British authorities prescribed that the registrars in charge of compulsory registration of European births and deaths should register every birth and death the prescribed particulars of which were reported to them. Very few natives, of course, availed themselves of this opportunity.[2] It is noteworthy, however, that in the early years of British administration the lack of vital statistics for natives was considered a serious evil. The Senior Sanitation Officer in his report for 1921 stated:[3]

> It is not a question of registration that the sanitarian is concerned over, but to be without any statistical information, even as to crude numbers of births and deaths is absolutely crippling to a really scientific survey of the Public Health. No statistics as to *population* compensate for the absence of this information; nevertheless, many Assistant Political Officers, who really have their fingers on the pulse of their Districts, generally have a fairly accurate idea of the actual numbers of deaths that occur in the area they administer. In some districts, Assistant Political Officers make their Jumbes keep a record of deaths by tying a knot in a string as each death comes to their notice, and from time to time the string is brought into headquarters and the knots counted. Even this information is infinitely better than none at all. Meanwhile all that can be done is to look forward to the time when the Administration decides that Political Officers shall arrange somehow to collect this information about births and deaths.

At the same time the Medical Officer of Health for Dar es Salaam reported:[4]

> The necessity for the making compulsory in a large modern sea-port town of the registration of births and deaths in all classes of the community, cannot be too strongly emphasised; as things are at present we have no idea of the total number of births or of the infant mortality rate.
>
> The difficulties in the way of such registration do not appear to be very great, while the importance of knowing the state of our population is self-evident. . . .
>
> In the case of deaths there is a somewhat more accurate knowledge of the numbers, since it has been the custom since the German times for the relatives of all persons dying in the town to obtain a burial permit before disposing of the corpse. Though this is not compulsory, no burials have been caught taking place without permission, but it is known that many sick persons are conveyed outside the town for treatment by native medicines, and it is probable that a number of such persons die and are

[1] See Police Order of 6 Mar. 1894, reprinted in *Die Landes-Gesetzgebung des Deutsch-Ostafrikanischen Schutzgebietes*, pp. 273–6. See also Order concerning the burial of bodies of the natives in the town district of Dar-es-Salaam, 6 Oct. 1899, reprinted ibid., pp. 675–6; Circular Decree concerning the bubonic plague and the notification of deaths, 5 Mar. 1901, reprinted ibid., pp. 495–6; Notice of 19 July 1907, *Amtlicher Anzeiger für Deutsch-Ostafrika*, 20 July 1907; Order concerning the defence against the plague in Daressalam, 23 Oct. 1908, ibid., 24 Oct. 1908; Order concerning the burial of bodies of coloured persons in Tanga, 15 Apr. 1913, ibid., 28 May 1913; Order concerning the notification of deaths of coloured persons in the town district of Tanga, 20 May 1913, ibid., 20 Aug. 1913; Order of the Governor concerning the fight against the plague in Daressalam, 22 Aug. 1914, ibid., 26 Aug. 1914.

[2] See, for example, *Medical Report 1921*, p. 78; *1922*, p. 143.

[3] Ibid. *1921*, p. 82.

[4] Ibid., pp. 126–7.

buried without permits, which tends to reduce still further the value of the returns of deaths within the township.

The Principal Medical Officer in his report for 1922 spoke of 'the hope that the work of the Education Department will enable child welfare and maternity work to be taken up extensively in the future as in the Belgian Congo. A necessary preliminary is registration of births and deaths amongst all races in townships'.[1] Among the recommendations made in this report was 'Registration of births and deaths, in all classes, in all townships'.[2] The same recommendation was made in the *Medical Reports* for 1923, 1924, and 1925[3] but in no later report, the reason probably being that the Medical Department became discouraged by the negative attitude of the Administration. This attitude found its expression in the Administration's Reports to the League of Nations.

1921.[4] The vast amount of clerical work which would be thrown upon Political Officers and the difficulty of ensuring compliance with the provisions of the law render the application of the Registration of Births and Deaths Ordinance to Africans premature at present.

1922.[5] No statistics relating to native births and deaths are available as the application of compulsory registration would not be possible in the present state of tribal development.

The reports for 1923 and 1924[6] contained the same statement, but the report for 1924 added:

Legislation to make the registration of births and deaths compulsory in townships is under consideration.

It remained under consideration for three years more.

1925. 1926. 1927.[7] Legislation to make the registration of births and deaths compulsory in townships has not yet been framed, but it is intended that this shall be done in the near future.

No further report of the Administration contains any reference to this project, but there is some evidence that, at least in the 1920s, the Administration felt the need for some vital statistics of Natives. Referring to the recommendations of the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services, Dr. Shircore, the Governor wrote in January 1926:[8]

The recommendations are sound in themselves but the framework is very large and years must pass before even the largest details can be filled in. In the meantime we are faced with the fact, which is somewhat disturbing to my mind, that owing to the absence of vital statistics, which for many years it will be impossible to obtain generally with any degree of accuracy, we are unable to make any really valuable estimate of the success or otherwise of our efforts, and for this reason I am disposed to think that it would be exceedingly instructive if we could, in addition

[1] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 26. Referring to the fact that registration became compulsory for all non-native deaths on 1 Jan. 1923 (see section VI of this chapter) the Senior Sanitation Officer said: 'This is a small step in the right direction and should lead in time to the registration of all births and deaths throughout the Territory' (ibid., p. 102).

[2] Ibid., p. 27.

[3] Ibid. *1923*, p. 43; *1924*, p. 50; *1925*, p. 40. See also ibid. *1923*, pp. 60, 100; *1924*, pp. 142, 193; *1925*, p. 74.

[4] *Report on Tanganyika Territory 1921*, p. 8.

[5] Ibid. *1922*, p. 8.

[6] See ibid. *1923*, p. 94; *1924*, p. 74.

[7] Ibid. *1925*, p. 93; *1926*, p. 85; *1927*, p. 95.

[8] Ibid. *1925*, p. 36.

to our general programme as mapped out by the Director, endeavour to organize an intensive campaign in one particular area or amongst one particular tribe in order to obtain reliable information and statistics in regard to the physical progress or otherwise on a typical section of the native population. We have at present no real guidance on this vitally important matter and I do not see how we are to acquire it within a reasonable period if we pursue only a general programme of work, however sound that programme may be in itself. If this view commends itself I suggest that provision for such an intensive campaign should be made on the Estimates for 1927–28, or earlier if the state of the finances permits this to be done. Dr. Shircore and I have already discussed certain tribes that we have seen on our travels together amongst whom the experiment might be tried.

Later in the year he outlined in a minute the principles on which the investigations were to be conducted.

Money has been provided on next year's Estimates for an intensive campaign in the Kahama District, in order to obtain reliable information and statistics in regard to the physical progress or otherwise of a typical section of the native population. What we want to ascertain is whether there is any truth in the repeated statement that the natives are diminishing rather than increasing in numbers. It is impossible to institute a system for this purpose applicable to the whole Territory, and we are therefore carving off a portion of the country and applying our tests there, just as if we were dealing with a small dependency instead of a very large one.

It is well that we should have our organisation ready, and I should be obliged if the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services would take in hand now the draft of the instructions that he proposes to issue to the officer in charge of the medical and sanitary part of the campaign. We want to know the diseases which occur amongst the natives, and their causes (special attention being devoted to food-deficiency diseases), the death rate and the birth rate; also the infant mortality rate. These are the main points only; there are others which will occur to the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services.

The Medical Officer in charge and the Administrative Officer must, of course, work in the closest co-operation . . . .

It will be three, even five, years, before the Medical Officer can reach any very valuable conclusions, and in the meantime the Administrative Officer should particularly study the habits of the people as regards work in order that he may be able to write a report on the subject to accompany that of the Medical Officer . . . .

The work is one of the most important that can ever be done in Tropical Africa.[1]

Thereupon the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services sent on 28 January 1927 a 'Memorandum of Instructions to the Medical Officer in Charge, Maternity and Child Welfare and Health Investigation in the Kahama District'.[2] His instructions concerning statistics read as follows:

Having provided hospital, clinic and housing accommodation, laid in stocks of drugs and equipment, and placed your staff, the next step should be the collection of statistics of the population. A census of the village and tribal units of the whole Kahama district should be compiled. Records of emigration and immigration should be kept. Records of all births and deaths, the causes of death, the tribe of the deceased. If possible the number of women of child-bearing age; *i.e.*, between the years of 12–45, and the Fertility Rate should be ascertained. The greatest importance should be attached to the compilation of an accurate record of the date of birth and the date of death of infants and adults, male and female, in order that a thoroughly comprehensive comparative study of the Infant Mortality Rate, the Birth and Death Rate, in any locality or of any tribe may be contrasted with that of the whole Kahama or any other area. Your enquiry will extend into the causes

[1] *Medical Report 1927*, pp. 106–7. [2] Ibid., pp. 108–9.

of the decline of the Birth Rate, and the high Infant Mortality Rate—ante-natal, natal and post-natal, the latter more particularly in relation to the first month of life. . . .

The enumerations made in the Kahama District have been described in section I of this chapter. The birth and death statistics will be discussed in the latter part of this section; they were extremely meagre and were based almost entirely on registration records which had been kept in any case.[1] An attempt to obtain vital statistics for natives such as were used in this investigation was in fact embarked upon as early as 1923. The Native Authority Ordinance, 1923,[2] provided among other things:

6. Subject to the provisions of any law for the time being in force, the administrative officer may and, subject to the general or special directions of the administrative officer, any headman may make, alter, and revoke regulations, to be obeyed by natives resident or being within the area under his jurisdiction, and may give written or verbal orders to any individual native resident or being within the area aforesaid for all or any of the purposes following, viz:—

(*n*) requiring the death of any native dying within his jurisdiction to be reported to the headman or other authority.

A Government Notice of 11 July 1925[3] applied the same Ordinance to birth registration.

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by section 6 of the Native Authority Ordinance, 1923, the Governor has been pleased to sanction the undermentioned purpose as one for which regulations may be made and orders given in all Districts of the Territory in accordance with the said section:—

Requiring the birth of any native child within the jurisdiction of the authority making the regulation or giving the order to be reported to the headman or other authority.

The Native Authority Ordinance, 1923, was repealed by 'An Ordinance to prescribe the powers and duties of Native Authorities'[4] of 24 September 1926 which provided:

8. Subject to the provisions of any law for the time being in force, a native authority may, subject to the general or special directions of the native authority, if any, to whom he is subordinate, issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the area of his authority for all or any of the following purposes—

(*k*) requiring the birth or death of any native within his jurisdiction to be reported to him or such other person as he may direct.

[1] From a demographic standpoint this whole experiment was a failure, one reason being that 'owing to the financial crisis' it was ended prematurely (see *Medical Report 1930*, p. 6). Later on it was stated that the investigation was discontinued because 'in 1931 an unforeseen factor completely altered the normal life of the native, the spread of sleeping-sickness into the district' (*Report to the League of Nations 1931*, p. 80). But this is a mistake. As far back as 1929 ten of the eleven sultanates of the district were known to have infected tsetse fly, and the Medical Report for that year spoke of the great 'devastation wrought by the pestilence of trypanosomiasis' (*Medical Report 1929*, p. 147). In fact, the new cases of sleeping-sickness diagnosed in the Kahama District in 1927–31 numbered 7, 1,032, 2,243, 1,070, and 523 respectively (see *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1938*, p. 101).

[2] No. 25 of 1923 (24 Aug. 1923), 'An Ordinance to regulate Native Authority', reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1923*, pp. 204–11.

[3] No. 76, reprinted ibid. *1925*, Appendix, pp. 50–1.

[4] No. 18 of 1926, 'Native Authority Ordinance, 1926', reprinted ibid. *1926*, pp. 50–9. The Ordinance came into operation on 1 Feb. 1927; see Government Notice No. 8 of 15 Jan. 1927, reprinted ibid. *1927*, Appendix, p. 5.

The comments of the Administration on the effects of these provisions were as follows:

1925.[1] . . . notification of native births and deaths has been made compulsory in certain districts which are sufficiently advanced for this to be done. Statistics in respect of these districts will be available in 1926.

1926.[2] . . . notification of native births and deaths has been made compulsory in certain districts which are sufficiently advanced for this to be done. At present the statistics thus obtained cannot be regarded as accurate. There is no doubt that many births are not registered and the figures available are therefore of little value.

Since 1927 no Report to the League has mentioned the subject. The Medical Reports for some time were more explicit. In his report for the year 1925 the Deputy Director of Sanitary Services stated:[3]

The reporting of births and deaths is no new procedure, for monthly reports detailing deaths and births were submitted by the Akidas of Dar es Salaam and Tanga during the German regime. Statistics of births and deaths are supplied to us from Tabora and Tanga, but Dar es Salaam has been of little assistance.[4] Data relating to births is of extreme importance in relation to Maternity and Child Welfare Work, and the situation calls for action.

The Medical Officer of Health for Dar es Salaam himself stated:

Maternity and Child Welfare work has made some progress under Miss Allardes, whose energies are, however, directed more towards the child welfare than the maternity, owing to the lack of satisfactory notification of births. Authority to compel the notification of African births under the Native Authority Ordinance, 1923, was given by Government Notice in July, but these powers are not yet being satisfactorily exercised in this town.[5]

Even in Tabora and Tanga registration was inadequate. The Sanitation Officer, Tabora, reported:[6]

An effort has been made to collect births and deaths statistics. I think it might be considered that the number of deaths reported is fairly correct but difficulty appears to be experienced in obtaining birth statistics.

According to the Report on the Health of Tanga (District) for the same year the Akidas' returns for African births and deaths were unreliable, 'particularly the former'.[7]

Reports in subsequent years were hardly more favourable.

Dar es Salaam District. The Medical Reports state for Dar es Salaam Township:

1926.[8] Maternity and Child Welfare. The Sister-in-charge endeavours to visit all babies born in the district, but these visits are few owing to birth notification being still far too rare.

[1] *Report to the League of Nations 1925*, p. 93.

[2] Ibid. *1926*, p. 85. Literally the same, ibid. *1927*, p. 95. See also ibid. *1926*, p. 18; *1927*, p. 15: 'In a few districts the registration of native births and deaths has been made compulsory, but it is not possible to guarantee the accuracy of the statistics which have so far been obtained. There is no doubt that a large number of births are not registered owing to the traditional native reluctance to announce such events.'

[3] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 4.

[4] It would seem, however, that not all statistics were supplied to the Medical Department. The *Report to the League of Nations 1925*, p. 25, notes 'that in the Maswa district of the Mwanza province 5,443 births and 3,405 deaths were recorded in 1925 giving a return of 18·6 deaths and 29·5 births per thousand. In the Pangani district (excluding the Handeni district) 1,027 births were recorded as against 621 deaths.'

[5] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 41; see also ibid., p. 75.

[6] Ibid., p. 37.

[7] See ibid., pp. 54–5.

[8] Ibid. *1926*, p. 50.

1927.[1] The African . . . figures obtained are of insufficient value for record since notification of births is not yet enforced.

1929.[2] As permits are required for all burials the figures for deaths are believed to be reasonably correct.[3] The notification of . . . births are so unreliable as to make the figures for births . . . valueless.

The inadequacy of registration appears clearly from the following table showing the figures for native live-births notified at the Health Office and for native deaths registered at the Health Office for which burial permits were issued:[4]

	1921	*1922*	*1923*	*1924*	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*	*1928*	*1929*	*1931*
Births . . .	—	—	—	—	—	44	53	69	50	..
Deaths . . .	170	184	238	259	304	375	324	373	395	375
Birth-rate . .	..	..	..	..	..	..	1·8	3·0	2·1	..
Death-rate . .	..	14·9	..	..	13·2	12·0	10·8	16·0	16·6	..

Since 1931 no figures of registered native births and deaths have been published. 'The vital statistics of Dar es Salaam Township do not justify quotations at length. . . . The . . . African returns are at present of little value.'[5] Nor were any birth-rates given.[6] But death-rates were published for 1932–4. The report for 1932 stated: 'The African crude death rate was 17, a normal figure.'[7] Considering that the official death-rates for 1928, 1929, 1933, and 1934 were 16·0, 16·6, 17·2,[8] and 16·5[9] respectively, there was certainly nothing abnormal in the 1932 rate. But all these rates were so low that it seems most likely that, contrary to the opinion of the Medical Officer of Health, registration of deaths in Dar es Salaam Township has been very defective all the time.

The Medical Report for 1927 gave, apart from the figures for Dar es Salaam Township, an extract from the monthly reports of the African District Sanitary Inspectors in the remainder of the Dar es Salaam District.

The figures for births and deaths, however, appear to be useless for comparison: they merely indicate that a certain number of each was reported to the Inspector. The two areas showing a reasonable birth rate give a wide variation in the death rate:

	Birth Rate	*Death Rate*
Pugu . . .	36·3	30·8
Kisiju . . .	33·6	13·9

But for the whole of the 146 villages inspected the birth-rate was 14·3 and the death-rate 10·5.

[1] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 48. See also ibid., pp. 45, 51. [2] Ibid. *1929*, p. 50.

[3] This statement is the more surprising as among the 395 deaths registered in 1929 only 15 were infant deaths. In his report for 1922 the Medical Officer of Health had stated (p. 143): 'I do not regard the figure of 13 deaths of children as even approximately accurate. The African regards the death of a child as of relatively little importance and finds a quiet interment easier than a report to an official. In time, I believe, they may be persuaded to report a much larger proportion of their infant deaths.'

[4] See ibid. *1922*, p. 143; *1924*, p. 165; *1925*, p. 42; *1927*, p. 47; *1928*, p. 54; *1929*, p. 50; *1931*, p. 22. [5] Ibid. *1934*, p. 32.

[6] See ibid. *1933*, p. 20: 'The proportion of African births notified is too small to admit of a rate being based on these returns.'

[7] Ibid. *1932*, p. 23. [8] See ibid. *1933*, p. 20. [9] See ibid. *1934*, p. 32.

It is hoped, however, that greater accuracy will be obtained in the compilation of these figures as time goes on, while it must be borne in mind that the Inspector's returns are not his most important duty.[1]

This hope was not fulfilled. The results for 1928 and 1929 were as follows:[2]

	Birth-rate		*Death-rate*	
	1928	*1929*	*1928*	*1929*
Pugu . .	9·6	4·7	8·5	2·4
Kisiju . .	55·7	21·1	27·1	14·4
All inspections .	14·8	7·7	11·0	5·4

No figures seem to have been published for more recent years.

Tanga District. In Tanga District the situation has even deteriorated. The reports for 1924 and 1925 had published the following data which they rightly considered as unreliable:[3]

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1921	582[1]	928[1]	11·6	18·8
1922	965	1,335	11·1	15·4
1923	1,047	1,274	12·1	14·7
1924	963	1,144	11·2	13·3
1925	893	948	10·3	10·9

[1] 7 months only.

But the figures for the following years were much lower still.

1927.[4] The African births reported for town and district are 509, and the deaths 460, which would give a birth rate and death rate of approximately 5 per 1,000. This is obviously absurd. The real reason for the low figure is the failure of the Jumbes to make even approximately accurate returns.

1928.[5] The African births and deaths notified by jumbes for town and district are 599 and 753 as compared with 509 and 460 last year. No reliance whatever can be placed on any of these figures as the returns omit large and varying quantities of both births and deaths. I believe both birth rate and death rate to be considerably in excess of those given by the above figures and have found no corroborative evidence to suggest that the death rate is above the birth rate.

1934.[6] In Tanga township . . . 281 African deaths were notified during the year. . . . The . . . African birth rates are too unreliable to justify quotation.

Tabora Province. Birth and death registration in Tabora Township has been considered complete.

1927.[7] Notification of births and deaths in the Township is compulsory, and therefore the statistics may be taken as fairly reliable.

It may be true that the death figures published for Tabora Township (1926–31: 277, 264, 266, 244, 308, and 256 respectively)[8] were

[1] Ibid. *1927*, p. 61.
[2] See ibid. *1928*, p. 53; *1929*, p. 58.
[3] See ibid. *1924*, p. 178; *1925*, p. 55. See also ibid. *1923*, pp. 100–1.
[4] Ibid. *1927*, p. 72.
[5] Ibid. *1928*, p. 64. See also ibid. *1929*, p. 100 (births 478, deaths 644).
[6] Ibid. *1934*, p. 34.
[7] Ibid. *1927*, p. 87.
[8] See ibid. *1927*, pp. 86–7; *1928*, p. 76; *1929*, p. 91; *1931*, p. 24.

complete,[1] but the available birth figures (1926–9: 214, 126, 89, and 112 respectively) inspire little confidence.

Most of the data given for the remainder of Tabora Province are utterly incomplete.[2] But the figures published in the reports on the special investigations carried on in Kahama District deserve some attention. The total number of births recorded increased from 1,855 in 1927 to 2,243 in 1928 and 2,550 in 1929. The corresponding figures of deaths were 1,554, 1,987, and 2,037 respectively. The 1928 report made the following comment:

> Births and deaths are now registered within a short period of their occurrence to the clerks of the chiefs, and these figures are reported monthly.[3]
>
> The general increase in figures of both births and deaths may and probably do mean little more than improvement in registration, reports of either being more consistently brought in than formerly. The adventitious influence of the sleeping sickness epidemic is also to be borne in mind.
>
> There are in excess of the total deaths tabulated 204, which have occurred in the various hospitals, clinics and welfare centres, unaccounted for. In some few instances these have possibly been registered by friends of deceased, and in others not. Forty-four of these deaths were among males, and 67 females, making a total of 111. Ninety-three deaths from sleeping sickness have not been accounted for in relation to sex. In this connection, arrangements are being made that all deaths taking place in hospitals, etc., will also be registered in the chief's books.[4]

The 1929 report said with regard to the birth and death figures:

> These figures are still not as reliable as they might be, but this is only the second year since the regulation as to registration and notification has been in force, and in the absence of a larger and better-organised executive, the onus of reporting these domestic occurrences rests in the first place upon the persons principally concerned and in lesser degree on the wanangwa. In outlying bush villages and even in some of the larger ones, the duty is undoubtedly neglected at times.[5]
>
> It is observed that births have steadily increased since 1927, so have deaths in both age groups, except those 'under a year' in 1929. We are inclined to ascribe this to a greater attention to the duty of registration, though in regard to the increase in the number of deaths among people over a year of age, there is little doubt that sleeping sickness is a powerful factor.[6]

Table 12 in which the results are summarized indicates that registration of births and deaths was quite defective in some sultanates in 1927 and that conditions in Usumbwa did not improve in 1928 and 1929. For the remainder of the District the 1929 birth figures (yielding a birth-rate of 38) seem plausible. The death figure for 'Kahama and Township' for 1928 is obviously an understatement, but this may have been due to the omission of deaths occurring in institutions. In the whole District, excluding Kahama and Usumbwa, the number of registered deaths was 1,227 in 1928 and 1,192 in 1929, the death-rates being 31 and 30 respectively. These rates are acceptable but do not support the opinion of the Medical Officer that 'in regard to the increase in the number of deaths

[1] The official death-rates were 1927, 19; 1928, 29·5; 1929, 27·1; 1931, 32·4.
[2] See *Medical Report 1927*, pp. 88–9; *1928*, p. 76; *1929*, p. 92.
[3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 110.
[4] Ibid., p. 111.
[5] Ibid. *1929*, p. 146.
[6] Ibid., p. 148.

among people over a year of age there is little doubt that sleeping sickness is a powerful factor'.[1]

TABLE 12. *Recorded Births and Deaths in Kahama District, 1927–9*[1]

Sultanate	Mean population	Births			Deaths			Birth-rate			Death-rate		
		1927	1928	1929	1927	1928	1929	1927	1928	1929	1927	1928	1929
Kahama[2] .	22,973	574	711	968	372	425	585	25	31	42	16	18	25
Usumbwa .	17,526	207	214	190	276	335	260	12	12	11	16	19	15
Ngogwa .	7,241	226	243	259	216	272	220	31	34	36	30	38	30
Ukamba .	3,651	120	154	142	103	109	140	33	42	39	28	30	38
Mbogwe .	5,716	173	128	163	112	135	91	30	22	29	20	24	16
Uyogo .	8,040	199	309	296	138	246	339	25	38	37	17	31	42
Msalala .	3,250	104	111	153	67	96	90	32	34	47	21	30	28
Busangi .	5,167	125	212	197	111	153	149	24	41	38	21	30	29
Bulungwa .	4,163	65	95	141	63	109	90	16	23	34	15	26	22
Ungoni .	1,237	30	49	28	51	42	53	24	40	23	41	34	43
Bugomba .	966	32	17	13	45	65	20	33	18	13	47	67	21
Total .	79,930	1,855	2,243	2,550	1,554	1,987	2,037	23	28	32	19	25	25

[1] *For births and deaths see Medical Report 1929, p. 151. I have entered as mean population the average of* the totals ascertained at the general counts of 1928 and 1929 with the exception of Ungoni where I took the average of the results of the special counts of 1928 and 1929.

[2] Including Township.

Lake Province. The Medical Report for 1929 contains the following data for Mwanza Township (4,322 inhabitants):[2]

Year	Births	Birth-rate	Infant deaths
1927	11	2·5	..
1928	21	4·9	..
1929	79	18·3	12

The greatest difficulty is being experienced in getting the native population (mostly Wasukuma) to notify births and deaths under a year, although arrangements have been made with the Local Native Authority to have this done monthly. Such figures as are quoted here are based on data obtained from the Maternity and Child Welfare Clinic and those which we have been able to get from the Native Authority, but they do not represent a true return of all the births and infant-deaths occurring in the Township. There are no figures available for 1927 and 1928.

No data have been published for subsequent years, but the reports for 1932, 1933, and 1935 contain brief comments:[3]

1932. The native figures are not sufficiently reliable for acceptance but improvement is shown.

1933. The African death rate for the town was 40. The birth rate is not recorded as only a small proportion of the births are notified.

1935. The African infant mortality rate would be one thousand but as African births are not notified or registered no rate can be given.

In the Bukoba District of Lake Province registration seems to have been much more complete, at least in 1935.

[1] The numbers of deaths of people over a year of age registered in the District in 1928 and 1929 were 1,328 and 1,379 respectively, and, omitting Kahama where the records of 1928 and 1929 are not comparable, 1,096 and 1,034 respectively.

[2] See ibid., p. 81.

[3] Ibid. *1932*, p. 25; *1933*, p. 22; *1935*, p. 47.

Records of births and deaths of Africans which merit comment are furnished from eight chiefdoms in the district; and though it is not claimed that these are accurate they appear to form a good basis on which to found an investigation into African vital records. They represent the notifications received by the native authorities and relate to a population of 277,201 persons numbered at the 1931 census. The following rates have been calculated from the figures supplied in the medical officer's report and are given for what they are worth:—

Ratio of females to males	1·02 to 1
Ratio of male births to female	1·2 to 1
Births per 1,000 of population	31
For each female child death (age not stated) there die	1·2 males
Deaths per 1,000 of population	26
Stillbirths recorded	737

One may draw two conclusions among others from these figures: either (*a*) the figures have a reasonable degree of accuracy or (*b*) the African clerks who keep the registers of births and deaths for the native authorities have a knowledge of European vital statistics and a mathematical ability above the average.[1]

It is possible indeed that these figures have a reasonable degree of accuracy (although the ratio of male to female births seems incredibly high). No data seem to have been published for other years.

To judge from the Medical Reports birth and death registration has been introduced only in a few sections of the Territory and has been constantly enforced hardly anywhere. It should be noted, however, that some Native Authorities imposed penalties for neglecting to report births and deaths. The number of such offences tried by native courts is given as follows:[2]

1930	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*	*1944*
79	455	72	72	48	59	40	29	107	32	59	45	25	33	33

The need for more comprehensive vital statistics has been expressed in recent years in various quarters. The Director of Medical Services in a Memorandum dated 31 March 1942 said:

Compulsory registration of births and deaths should be introduced immediately after the war, the Native Authorities being made responsible for the records outside the townships. Only by making a start—far too long delayed—can we hope to have reasonably accurate 'human book-keeping', by which we may measure the success of our expenditure on social services in some fifty years' time.[3]

Two years later, the Post-War Planning Committee pointed out that a 'limiting factor in the formulation of a fully co-ordinated plan has been the lack of statistics in practically all the basic fields of endeavour'.[4] This problem was discussed in the Legislative Council on 28 September 1944.

The honourable J. H. S. Tranter asked:—

Does Government consider that in any post-war planning, whether in the desirable form of social services, the raising of the standard of living amongst Africans or the economic harnessing of the labour potential to the wealth potential of the Territory,

[1] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 49.

[2] See *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1930*, p. 90; *1931*, p. 90; *1932*, p. 76; *1933*, p. 84; *1934*, p. 91; *1935*, p. 118; *1936*, p. 97; *1937*, p. 113; *1938*, p. 129; *1939*, p. 116; *1940*, p. 87; *1941*, p. 101; *1942*, p. 121; *1943*, p. 120; *1944*, p. 120.

[3] *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals* (1944), p. 27.

[4] Ibid., p. 2.

it can efficiently carry out its projects without a full knowledge of vital human statistics?

The honourable the Administrative Secretary replied:—

Present records of vital statistics are admittedly very incomplete and improvement in this connection is most desirable but it would not be practicable to delay the consideration of post-war plans until full statistical information could be collected.[1]

While official efforts to register current births and deaths have met with little success so far, a valuable private investigation based on the questioning of over 2,300 women in the Kiberege Division was made in recent years. The authors, the Administrative Officer Mr. Culwick and Mrs. Culwick, describe their methods as follows:

The collection and interpretation of vital statistics in a primitive community present their own special difficulties, and in the circumstances at present prevailing methods both of collection and presentation necessarily differ widely from the practice of the civilized world. Only those who actually took part, as did one of the writers, in an attempt some years ago to record vital statistics in the orthodox manner in a semi-nomadic cattle tribe can realize quite how farcical were the returns sent in. Figures were demanded, and figures had to be produced. That is all one can say for them.[2]

... the available records are not of much, if any, assistance in determining population trends in this area, and it was for this reason that we decided to start afresh and approach the problem on entirely different lines. The population as a whole being a closed book to us, we decided to see what we could learn from samples of it.

One of us collected the life-histories of over 2,300 women, about 13 per cent. of the total adult female population as given in the 1931 Census. The women varied from 15 or 16 years old to old age. They were drawn from all parts of the area concerned and represent a large random sample of the adult female population of the Ulanga Valley, so that we are justified in regarding the results obtained from their study as typical of the area as a whole.

No difficulty was experienced in obtaining information, for the women were not reluctant to talk. This was due to the fact that we were no strangers to them, having lived in the district for four years before we began this enquiry, and circumstances had in various ways conspired to create an atmosphere of trust and goodwill between the peasants and ourselves. Thus the primary stumbling-block of shyness and suspicion of strangers in a peasant community had already been removed.

After we decided to attempt this investigation, the ground was very carefully prepared by discussion and small 'trial runs' in various villages a good many months before the main task was undertaken, so that the idea had time to sink in gradually and people were not startled into saying the first thing that entered their heads. A bottle of tobacco snuff also played an invaluable part in the proceedings, and a friendly welcoming atmosphere prevailed. Cross-enquiries were made from time to time to check up on information received, with satisfactory results, and when in certain instances it was thought for any reason that things had not gone well the history in question was scrapped. The enquirer always worked with the help of prominent local women, who already knew enough of the affairs of most people in the village to set out in the right way to get the facts from even the shyest girl or old woman, and groups of relatives would check one another's statements.

The data obtained were as follows:

1. *Age of the women.* This could not, in the nature of things, be discovered exactly, but it was possible to divide the women into age-grades with some degree of accuracy.

[1] Legislative Council, *18th Session*, p. 165. The Administrative Secretary said, furthermore: 'The question of the development of statistical services is under examination but Government is not at present in a position to say how far it will be found possible to provide for such "human statistics" as the honourable member has in mind' (ibid., pp. 165–6).

[2] Culwick and Culwick, pp. 365–6.

The grades were: under 20, 20 to 30, 30 to 50 (or more strictly, 30 to the change of life), and old, that is, past the change.

2. *Their marriages*—polygamous or monogamous—and the children born in each. An attempt was made to ascertain the number of still-births and miscarriages, but it failed owing to the unreliability and vagueness of many of the women on this point. It also proved quite impossible to discover the approximate age of the husband at the time of marrying the wife in question, save in occasional cases where he was exceptionally young or exceptionally old. Similarly, and not unexpectedly, it proved impossible to gain any satisfactory idea of the duration of a marriage unless it happened to be very short. In the case of childless women in polygamous households, it was always noted down whether or not any of the co-wives had had children. After the first few hundred cases, time being short, special enquiry into the woman's age at marriage was dropped, because the answers in the earlier cases had shown conclusively that none, save the one or two who admitted without embarrassment a life of promiscuous intercourse, had remained unmarried for more than a few months after reaching puberty, say at most a year, and the majority were having intercourse of some kind with their husbands before puberty, though the social negotiations of the marriage were, of course, as yet incomplete and the girls were in most cases still living in their parents' house.

3. *Their children*—the order of birth (including as far as possible still-births and miscarriages), the present age of surviving children and the age at death of those who had died. Here again exact ages were impossible to obtain so a system of age-grades was employed, namely, from birth to (roughly) six months, from six months to weaning, from weaning to the age of six or seven years (when the children begin to help their parents in domestic tasks), from seven to puberty, and adult. In calculating the number of survivors, those who died after entering adult life are reckoned as surviving. Whatever slight difference there may be in the age at which the sexes respectively reach puberty has of necessity been disregarded, there being no data on which to base a correction.

The reasons for making the first grade six months and not a year are as follows. Weaning takes place normally at about two and a half years, but it may be as early as eighteen months if another pregnancy intervenes, and in the case of those children who died before weaning the following classification was attempted: died before able to sit about independently or crawl, died at the crawling stage, died after beginning to walk. Observation of the development of native babies whose birth dates were known justified us in regarding the first two of these grades as together roughly representing the first year, and it was therefore hoped that a figure for infant mortality in the usual sense (first year) would be obtained. This hope was, however, dashed, for the mothers proved too vague on the subject of whether a baby who died, perhaps, years ago had been toddling or only crawling. Most of them were quite definite about those who died while still babies in arms, because the first break away from the mother to the comparative independence of sitting and crawling around in the yard with the other children was the sort of landmark which made a considerable difference to the mother herself; though there were a fair number of obviously doubtful cases, either because the child died when it was on the border-line between the two grades and the mother did not quite know where to class it, or because she herself was old and hazy in memory. The next clear landmark from the mother's own point of view was weaning, and between these two points there proved to be nothing sufficiently definite for most of them to catch hold of. We are therefore able to produce a fairly reliable figure for infant mortality in, approximately, the first six months, and for the mortality of unweaned children as a whole, but that of the first year eludes us.[1]

I shall discuss some results of this investigation in section VII of this chapter.

[1] Culwick and Culwick, pp. 368–71.

VI. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration

Registration of white births and deaths was regulated in German East Africa by the law of 4 May 1870 concerning marriage and civil registration of German subjects abroad. Prior to 1912 no special provision was made for the registration of births or deaths of non-native coloured persons, but most of the orders and decrees concerning notification of deaths of natives[1] applied likewise to coloured non-natives. Compulsory notification of all births and deaths of non-native coloured persons was introduced on 1 January 1913 by an Order of 10 October 1912[2] which stipulated that births and deaths should be notified within one month after the event to the local authority.

After the British occupation of German East Africa north of the Central Railway in 1916 compulsory birth and death registration for Europeans and Americans was proclaimed in the so-called 'Civil Area' under Martial Law on 28 August 1917.[3] It was extended to the whole occupied territory by a Proclamation of 21 February 1919.[4] In the following year 'An Ordinance to make provision for the Registration of Births and Deaths' was enacted by the Governor of the Tanganyika Territory.[5] It came into force on 1 April 1921,[6] was amended in 1922 by an Ordinance[7] which made death registration compulsory for all non-natives, and has been amended twice since.[8]

In accordance with section 19 of the Ordinance the Governor made Rules on 23 February 1921.[9] These Rules were revoked and replaced on 24 October 1922 by the 'Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 1922'.[10] These new Rules have been amended five times,[11] and the main provisions as they stand to-day are as follows:

1. These rules may be cited as the Registration of Births and Deaths Rules, 1922.

[1] See p. 363 above.

[2] See *Amtlicher Anzeiger für Deutsch-Ostafrika*, 12 Oct. 1912, pp. 190–1.

[3] Proclamation No. 15 of 1917, *German East Africa Proclamations, &c. 1916–20.*

[4] See Proclamation No. 3 of 1919, ibid.

[5] See No. 12 of 1920 (15 Dec.), 'Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1920', reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, Proclamations, etc., 1920*, pp. 166–70.

[6] See Government Notice No. 64 of 24 Mar. 1921, reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1921*, p. 307.

[7] Ordinance No. 29 of 1922 (24 Oct.), 'Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1922', reprinted ibid. *1922*, pp. 160–2. This Ordinance repealed the Proclamation of 1917. It came into force on 1 Jan. 1923 by Proclamation No. 7 of 1922 (2 Dec.), ibid., Appendix, p. 132.

[8] See Ordinances No. 20 of 1926 (20 Dec.), 'Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1926', reprinted ibid. *1926*, p. 61; No. 19 of 1943 (15 Dec.), 'An Ordinance to amend the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance so as to make provision for the appointment of Assistant Registrars-General of Births and Deaths and for the issue by Medical Practitioners of Certificates of the cause of death', reprinted ibid. *1943*, pp. 53–4. The Ordinance as it stood after the enactment of No. 20 of 1926 is reprinted in *The Laws of the Tanganyika Territory 1928*, vol. ii, pp. 805–10 (cap. 91).

[9] See Government Notice No. 47, reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1921*, pp. 293–5.

[10] See Government Notice No. 224, ibid. *1922*, Appendix, pp. 115–17.

[11] See Government Notices No. 263 of 1922 (2 Dec.), ibid., Appendix, p. 132; No. 122 of 1924 (18 July), ibid. *1924*, Appendix, pp. 54–5; No. 75 of 1927 (17 May), ibid. *1927*, Appendix,

2. Births and deaths may be registered during office hours at the office of the district registrar of the district in which the birth or death took place.

3. (1) Any person, whose duty it is to register a birth or death, may, instead of attending personally, apply to the district registrar of the district in writing to register the birth or death in manner hereby provided in the following cases:—

(*a*) if resident more than fifteen miles from the district registrar's office, or

(*b*) if unable through ill-health to attend personally.

(2) The district registrar, on receiving such application, if satisfied that personal attendance should be excused, shall send to the applicant the appropriate form which the applicant shall fill up, sign, and return to the district registrar. The District Registrar shall, on receipt of such form, copy the particulars contained therein into the register and shall forward the form to the Registrar General as an annexure to the quarterly return rendered under section 18 of the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance. The entry of the particulars into the register shall be deemed to be the registration of such birth or death.

4. The registers in the custody of a district registrar and the registers, copies of registers, returns, and indexes in the custody of the Registrar General may be inspected, on payment of the prescribed fee, during office hours.

5. Any birth or death occurring on board any ship while within the territorial waters of the Territory shall be registered by the person whose duty it is to register it at the nearest district registrar's office to the port in which the ship is lying or to the next port of call.

9. The Registrar-General of Births and Deaths shall be the Registrar of Births and Deaths for the Uzaramo District.

The main provisions ensuring birth and death registration as they stand to-day are as follows:

Registration of Births and Deaths

22. The registration of the birth of a child shall be compulsory if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent, or, in the case of an illegitimate child not recognized by its father, if the mother is of European or American origin or descent.

23. (1) The registration of the death after the 1st January, 1923, of every non-native shall be compulsory.

(2) In this section the expression 'non-native' means a person who is neither a member of an African race nor a Swahili nor a Somali.

In case of a birth (1) the father and mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred, each person present at the birth, and the person having charge of the child shall register the birth within three months or be liable to a fine not exceeding Shs. 200 or to one month's imprisonment or to both.

In case of a death (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) any inmate of the house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried shall register the death within one month or be liable to a fine not exceeding Shs. 200 or to one month's imprisonment or to both.

p. 82; No. 97 of 1939 (27 June), ibid. *1939*, Appendix, p. 76; and No. 21 of 1942 (15 Jan.), ibid. *1942*, Appendix, p. 18. The Rules as they stood after publication of the Government Notice of 17 May 1927 are reprinted in *The Laws of the Tanganyika Territory in Force 1928*, vol. iii, pp. 455–7.

Headings of Registration Forms

Birth (Form A): No. of entry; Where born; Name, if any; Sex; Name and surname of father; Father's occupation and residence; Father's nationality; Name and maiden name of mother; Mother's occupation and residence; Mother's nationality; Signature, description, and residence of informant; Date of birth; Date of registration; Signature of registering officer; Baptismal name if added or altered after registration of birth.

Death (Form B): No. of entry; Name and surname of deceased; Age; Sex; Residence; Occupation; Nationality; Date of death; Place of death; Cause of death; Signature, description and residence of informant; Date of registration; Signature of registering officer.

Registration of births of non-natives, except Europeans and Americans, is optional and the district registrar shall register every such birth occurring within his district whereof the prescribed particulars are reported to him.

The Registrar-General of Births and Deaths and the District Registrars receive no compensation for their services as such.[1] Registration of births and deaths is free of charge. But fees are to be paid for the registration of a birth or death after six months from the date of such event where the registration is not compulsory[2] (Shs. 10), for the inspection of any register, copy of a register, return, or index (Shs. 2 for each year inspected), for a certified copy of any entry (Shs. 5), and for the registration of the name

[1] The Governor, on 29 Jan. 1921, appointed 'the person holding the office of Chief Secretary to the Government to be the Registrar General of Births and Deaths for the Tanganyika Territory' (see Government Notice No. 39, reprinted in Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1921*, p. 292). But on 2 Dec. 1922 he appointed 'the Administrator General to be Registrar General of Births and Deaths, instead of the Chief Secretary, from the first day of January, 1923' (see Government Notice No. 263, ibid. *1922*, Appendix, p. 132). Finally, on 27 June 1939, he appointed 'the person holding the post of Registrar-General to be Registrar-General of Births and Deaths' (see Government Notice No. 96, ibid. *1939*, Appendix, p. 76).

On 29 Dec. 1943 the Governor appointed every Assistant Registrar-General and every Assistant Registrar to be an Assistant Registrar-General of Births and Deaths (see Government Notice No. 8, ibid. *1944*, Appendix, p. 6).

Ordinance No. 29 of 1922 provided that 'each administrative officer in charge of a district shall be the district registrar of that district'. This caused an 'unnecessary complication' in Dar es Salaam as there the work had 'to be divided between the District Office and that of the Registrar General' (see the statement of the Attorney General at the Second Reading of the 1926 Births and Deaths Registration Bill, 15 Dec. 1926, *Proceedings of the Legislative Council 1926–7*, p. 69). Ordinance No. 20 of 1926 therefore substituted the following wording: 'The district registrar for a district shall be the Administrative Officer in charge of that district or such other person as the Governor may appoint by notice in the *Gazette*.' Thereupon, the Governor, on 17 May 1927, appointed 'the Registrar General of Births and Deaths to be the Registrar of Births and Deaths for the Dar es Salaam District' (see Government Notice No. 75, Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, &c. 1927*, Appendix, p. 82). Elsewhere the administrative officer in charge of a district continued to be the district registrar (see also *Handbook of Tanganyika 1930*, p. 390). When at the beginning of 1942 Dar es Salaam town and the Temeke areas were united to form the Uzaramo District (see *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, p. 20), the Registrar-General of Births and Deaths was appointed to be the Registrar of Births and Deaths of the Uzaramo District.

[2] The Ordinance provides that 'a district registrar shall not register any birth or death after six months from the date of the birth or death except upon payment of the prescribed fee', and the Rules made in 1921 fixed this fee at Fls. 5. But the Rules made in 1922 and still in force to-day say that a fee shall be chargeable only where the registration is not compulsory.

or alteration in the name of any child whose birth has been previously registered (Shs. 10). All fees are paid into the Public Treasury.[1]

Registration of European births and deaths was apparently not complete in the first years of British administration. The Medical Report for 1922 stated: 'The deaths returns of unofficial Europeans are probably incomplete, 30 are known to have died during the year.'[2] Registration of Asiatic deaths has been incomplete throughout. According to the Medical Report for 1925 the figure given for registration of Asiatic deaths by the District Registrar of Dar es Salaam was 97 while the Asiatic deaths 'registered at Health Office for which burial permits were issued' numbered 124.[3] The official death-rates of Asiatics in Dar es Salaam for 1933 and 1934 were 10·1 and 13·8 respectively;[4] they are suspiciously low. Outside Dar es Salaam Township registration of Asiatic deaths seems to have been still more defective.[5]

VII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. The available birth records have been discussed in Section V of this chapter. They are too unreliable to permit the drawing of conclusions concerning fertility. In so far as official reports deal with fertility they also give opinions rather than facts. When the coast districts in 1921 showed a decrease in the total population as compared with the last German count and a lower proportion of children among the total population than in the inland districts, the Assistant Secretary stated:[6]

> Venereal diseases increased greatly during the war with a resultant fall in the birth rate and increase in infant mortality. This had a greater effect among the tribes of the coast districts whose manners and morals are more lax than those of the more primitive tribes of the interior.

The Senior Sanitation Officer said that there was no evidence of an increase in venereal disease,[7] and the Medical Officer of Health for Dar es Salaam attributed the low birth-rate which, he thought, prevailed in the town to other reasons:

> From what one knows of the town and its inhabitants, it would appear that the native birth rate is very low indeed, while the infant mortality rate is probably correspondingly high. The low birth rate may be ascribed to three main causes, viz., the unwillingness of the women to have children, since child bearing prevents their enjoying the pleasures of the town; the large number of natives who live together for a time but do not marry, and the practice of abortion, at which, one is told, the native woman is an expert. Probably also the fact of so many of the men having hydroceles and enlarged testes may have some influence on their procreative powers. It is not considered, from an inspection of such natives as have been examined medically for employment, that a large number suffer from gonorrhoea, which would account for sterility in either sex.

[1] See *Blue Book 1933*, p. 1.
[2] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 40.
[3] See ibid. *1925*, p. 42.
[4] See ibid. *1933*, p. 20; *1934*, p. 32. No death figures have been published for more recent years.
[5] See, for example, for Tanga District ibid. *1928*, p. 64.
[6] *Report on the Native Census 1931*, p. 1.
[7] See p. 326 above.

But the question is one of importance from an economic point of view and one which is worthy of consideration with a view to deciding what steps may be taken to raise the birth rate and diminish the loss of infant life. The native woman in the bush can still produce and rear a family: why should not the town woman be made to do so?[1]

The 1922 Report to the League of Nations stated again that 'the birth-rate at the coast is low'.

The sterility of the Swahili women is due to immorality and, to some extent probably, in-breeding; in some small villages it was found that almost every Swahili inhabitant was in some degree related to his neighbours.[2]

In connexion with the special investigations carried out in the Kahama District inquiries concerning fertility were made in 1928 among over a thousand women from 18 to 65 years.

Observations on these lines at the Uyogo Welfare Centre are taken as being the most complete and as typical of the district.

Four hundred and fifty women were questioned and histories taken. The average age of these women was 39·8 years. The average number of times that they were married (legally) is once per person, though many admit marriages of convenience on two and three occasions in their life-time. Marriage is, however, a loose contract with them. The average period of legal married life works out at 13·7 years. The number of children born to each person is 2·5, represented by a range between no children and twelve. Eighty-three of those questioned were childless, and many of these give a history of venereal disease or yaws. A percentage of 18·6 were barren. Abortions and miscarriages equal 0·37 per woman, or 37 per cent.[3]

Since many of these women had not passed the child-bearing age the low 'number of children born to each person' and the high proportion of 'childless' women are not conclusive. The number of (accidental and induced) abortions and miscarriages is not high.[4]

Three years later the Provincial Commissioner of the Northern Province said of the Wambugwe in the Mbulu District who 'live in one of the most inhospitable areas in Tanganyika, hot and arid in the dry season and flooded and mosquito-infested in the rains':

Venereal disease is everywhere rife and the population is declining steadily. Their Sub-Chief Mjengi wrote the other day:—

> 'Formerly there were 12,000 men here who paid tax, now there are but 8,000: for our women no longer bear children. I know well that the Government helps us greatly with every sort of medicine, but medicine alone cannot save our tribe, for people are ruined in health by the bad customs of this land.'

He adds that he and his elders are in great distress over the whole matter and wish to prohibit these evil practices of former days.[5]

This statement, of course, applies only to a small tribe, but it seems to me of more value than the sweeping statement published at the same time in the *Report on the Native Census:* 'The fecundity of African women is well known.'

Finally, there is the investigation made by Mr. and Mrs. Culwick in the

[1] *Medical Report 1921*, pp. 126–7.
[2] *Report on Tanganyika Territory 1922*, p. 8.
[3] *Medical Report 1928*, pp. 114–15.
[4] See also ibid., pp. 134–5.
[5] *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1931*, p. 68.

Kiberege Division. The results concerning fertility may be summarized as follows:[1]

Live-born to 1,000 women									
Over 50 years									
I				*II*					
Kiberege	*Mofu*	*Ifakara*	*Lupiro*	*Malinyi*	*Utengule*	*Total*	*30–50 years*	*20–30 years*	*Under 20 years*
2,640	2,680	2,780	3,210	3,840	4,150	3,130	2,490	1,990	920

Number of children per woman over 50 years, per cent.															
I								*II*							
0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7 and more*	*0*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7 and more*
11	24	12	19	14	9	6	5	7	9	12	21	14	13	11	13

Number of children per woman 30–50 years, per cent.								*Number of children per woman 20–30 years, per cent.*							
0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*0*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*
20	18	18	16	11	7	6	2	18	22	28	17	9	4	2	0

The authors point out that in Malinyi and Utengule the proportion of women having passed child-bearing age who had borne no child, one child, two children, &c., shows 'a perfectly normal distribution', while in the other group of places 'an unduly large proportion of these women seems to have become infertile after the birth of the first child, which for many of those in this age-grade would be roughly thirty years ago'.

This takes us back to the great Maji-Maji Rebellion of 1905–6 and the terrible famine which followed it. The people at Malinyi and Utengule remained loyal to the Germans and were thus unaffected, but those at Kiberege, Mofu, Ifakara and Lupiro were all involved in the rising, suffering as a result the destruction of their crops and the confiscation or destruction of their food reserves. In this connexion it should be noted that an old-established irrigation system at Lupiro enables the people there to grow crops at any time of the year, a fact which probably greatly mitigated the severity of the famine in that locality and may in part account for a fertility rate high in comparison with the other rebel groups.[2]

It will be seen that the curve for the 30–50 grade starts at 20 per cent. for childless women and slowly falls away to 2 per cent. for women who have borne seven children. The curve for women now aged 20–30 years is, however, of a totally different type, rising to a well-marked peak of 28 per cent. for those who have had two children.

It will be appreciated that the former curve is typical of an infertile population, especially when it is remembered that nearly all those whose life-histories it summarizes have been married for periods ranging from 15 to 35 years. The curve for the 20–30 grade is, on the other hand, perfectly normal and indicates a far more healthy state of affairs. The majority of the women concerned have been married for periods of only 5 to 15 years, and we may expect that as time goes on the peak of their curve will travel to the right and the number of barren women and those

[1] See Culwick and Culwick, pp. 371-2, 374, 376. [2] Ibid., pp. 373–5.

with one child only will decrease, with corresponding increases in the percentage of women with a greater number of children.[1]

We may therefore conclude that there has been a considerable increase in fertility during the last fifteen years, a conclusion which is further supported by the fact that the youngest mothers of all, that is those under 20 years of age, who have been married for periods ranging from a few weeks to five years, have already produced 920 children per 1,000 women.[2]

The authors think that 'we seem to have no grounds for hoping' that the women now aged 30–50 years 'will produce any more children than have those who are now over 50 years old',[3] but that 'on their present showing 3,600 does not seem an unreasonably high figure to hope'[4] from the women now aged 20 to 30 years as compared with the 3,130 children born to those who are past child-bearing age. However, it should not be overlooked that even 3,600 would indicate a rather low fertility.

Information concerning the spread of venereal diseases is utterly inadequate.

. . . the existing organization can only deal with these diseases on a localized and individual basis; it does not admit of the extension of services which is required to tackle the problem efficiently.[5]

In some areas conditions are very bad.

In the Lake Province, there is a specially heavy incidence of venereal disease in Bukoba . . .[6]

Investigations carried out in Dodoma Township revealed an appalling state of affairs. Gonorrhoea is so widespread amongst prostitutes that until accommodation for in-patients has been increased at the Government Hospital the Medical Department is unable to tackle the problem although cases of syphilis are being treated.[7]

. . . the Nyakyusa Chiefs . . . are spontaneously exercised at what they consider to be an increase of recent years in the incidence of venereal disease, and have advanced the most drastic proposals for the compulsory treatment of these diseases . . . .[8]

The prospects for the immediate future are not good.

The Territory has to face a serious spread of these diseases in the rural areas on the return of the men-folk from the army . . . .[9]

General Mortality. In the first years of British administration mortality was doubtless high owing to influenza and famine. But for the last twenty-five years neither the scanty available figures (see Section V) nor the scanty comments in the Medical Reports convey any picture of mortality as a whole. I shall therefore confine myself to dealing here briefly with the extent of medical care, the incidence of some important diseases, and the general state of health.

The East Africa Commission, in 1925, was particularly emphatic as to the inadequacy of the medical care provided by the Administration for the natives.

[1] See also ibid., p. 38: 'For a young age-grade the figure of 19 per cent. childless women is not high. There is a good peak for women with two children which will probably move along towards the large family end of the curve. The figure for women with three children is already higher than that for the age-grade 30–50, while 8 per cent. have had four children.'

[2] Ibid., p. 376. [3] Ibid., p. 37. [4] Ibid., pp. 38–9.

[5] *Report of Central Development Committee*, p. 135. [6] Ibid., p. 136. See also ibid., p. 148.

[7] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 6. [8] Ibid., p. 75.

[9] *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 36.

For years the medical staffs appointed to the East African territories were regarded by the authorities—and regarded themselves—as responsible mainly for the health of the European officials, the health of the natives being left in the main to the care of the missionaries. In recent years, however, increasing efforts have been made, within the financial resources of the various territories, to look after the health of the native population. But much still remains to be done. The Principal Medical Officer of the Tanganyika Territory estimates that less than a twenty-fifth of the population is within the sphere of medical influence.[1]

There can be no doubt that the economy in medical personnel which the Government of the Tanganyika Territory has been compelled to observe for financial reasons has had the result that important native areas have been neglected or inadequately supervised.[2]

The shortage of staff is particularly noticeable in the most populous north-western districts.[3] Apart altogether from the incidence of such tropical diseases as sleeping-sickness, malaria, yaws, and elephantiasis, venereal disease is a serious problem. This accounts in part for the terribly high rate of infant mortality throughout the greater part of Tanganyika Territory.[4]

Medical care for natives improved considerably in the latter half of the 1920s.[5] But it deteriorated again in the 1930s. The Central Development Committee, appointed in December 1938, reported:

Since the 1932 depression all branches of the Medical Department have been reduced, the preventive and special services having been cut down most heavily.[6]

The Director of Medical Services wrote:

The expansion and reduction of the medical services of the Territory since 1919 have been closely related to the periods of prosperity and of temporary financial

[1] *Report*, p. 53. See also in this connexion the statement of the Principal Medical Officer (Tanganyika Territory, *Medical Report 1922*, p. 25): 'The prime duties of the department are to afford medical attention to Government employees and their families and to provide means for the prevention and suppression of serious infectious disease; the latter involves responsibilities to neighbouring countries as well as to the inhabitants of the Territory.'

[2] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 59.

[3] See in this connexion the statement of a member of the Commission: 'But even where the natives [in East Africa] are within reach of medical attention, some of it is of such a nature that it is doubtful if it is not worse than none at all. Some of the native hospitals we visited were such as to discourage natives with any sense of decency from remaining in them. At Bukoba, in one of the most populous districts of Tanganyika, there was a so-called hospital in charge of an Indian sub-assistant surgeon. The accommodation consisted of a number of dark, badly-ventilated huts with only a single entrance, containing three or four times the proper number of patients. Some of the patients had beds, but the greater number slept on the floor. Men, women, and children were huddled together, suffering from every kind of disease. Some were provided with blankets, but many had none. On entry a noisome stench offended the nostrils. The Indian, himself only partially qualified, was carrying on without adequate assistance. He was responsible for major and minor operations, and had to superintend dressings.' (Church, *East Africa*, p. 131.)

[4] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 119.

[5] There is ample evidence that the Administration no longer maintained the attitude expressed in the *Medical Report* for 1922. It may suffice to quote a statement made by the Governor on 11 Jan. 1928 in his address to the Legislative Council (*Proceedings 1928*, Part I, p. 9):

'The Mandate provides that the Mandatory "shall undertake to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress" of the inhabitants of the Territory.

'Now, the Mandatory having accepted this trust, there are as it seems to me, but three courses which it can adopt.

'It can honour its obligations in letter and in spirit; it can pretend to do so without any real intention of doing so and without in fact doing so; or it can, quite cynically and openly, ignore its obligations and dishonour the trust it has undertaken. . . .

'I am postulating now that we propose to do everything in our power to honour the trust reposed in us by the Mandate.'

[6] *Report*, p. 137.

difficulty through which it has passed. Great expansion took place up to 1930, after which a period of heavy retrenchment set in and recurrent medical provision has only recently exceeded the amount voted in 1928.[1]

Here I will refer to the particular need for reinforcing the public health division of the Medical Department. This branch of our work was greatly curtailed in the depression of 1931 and afterwards; and since I took the reins in 1935 I have felt it necessary to devote a greater share of my attention to the curative side of our work than to the preventive side in which I had served my apprenticeship. While reasonable sanitary services have been built up in the towns (though maintenance has fallen as a result of depletion of health staff for the Forces during the war), little has been accomplished in the rural areas for lack of supervision and drive.[2]

The staff was indeed reduced still further after the outbreak of the war although the medical officers had to assume additional duties and although some alien private practitioners were interned or removed from the country.

1939. The examination of large numbers of recruits resulted in a reduction of the attention given to the civil population by Government staff at some centres as did the internment of a number of German doctors on the outbreak of war . . . .

With eleven of the medical staff and five others absent with the Forces, supervision of the medical and health work of the Territory could not be maintained at its former standard. Sickness among the staff also took a heavy toll, including two deaths and two invalidings.[3]

1940. The activities of the Medical Department have been affected in two main directions by the war: secondment of additional staff for service with the Forces and additional duties resulting from the recruitment of large numbers of Africans for military service. At the end of 1940 there were fifteen doctors, eleven other Europeans, one Asian and eighty-six members of the African technical staff on active service, as well as sixty-eight other Africans.

The examination of recruits and the treatment of those who could be made fit for military service, in addition to the medical care of concentrated enemy aliens further limited the facilities available to the general public.[4]

Political reasons necessitated the withdrawal of certain doctors who had been allowed to remain at work with the German Lutheran Missions and Government had to provide facilities for the native population at the important mission hospitals at Bumbuli in the Usambaras and Ndolage in Bukoba. Some assistance by missionary doctors has been provided and more is expected from the Augustana Lutheran Mission in the United States of America, but meantime Government has provided help with finance and staff.[5]

[1] *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 40.

[2] Ibid., p. 26. See also, for example, concerning the Lake Province: 'The only local health representative outside the towns is the African Medical Auxiliary who staffs the dispensary belonging to the Rural Medical Service. . . . He is our best, our only key to the promising door that is now looming into view. If, however, he is to serve us, the central advisers on health matters, we must have the means for ensuring his continuous education, stimulation and support.' (Statement by the Senior Medical Officer, *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 35.)

[3] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 1.

[4] The number of confinements admitted to the 12 clinics dropped from 4,927 in 1938 to 3,516 in 1939, and to 3,173 in 1940.

[5] Ibid. *1940*, p. 1. Concerning the restriction of missionary medical services see also *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 29; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, pp. 58–9, 64. See furthermore, ibid. *1942*, p. 66: 'At one Benedictine hospital on the shores of Lake Nyasa, in-patients averaged over 200 in a quarter with an aggregate of 3,000 patient-days and out-patients were about 3,500 a quarter, receiving between them some 12,000 treatments of different kinds. Unfortunately this hospital is one which had to be closed owing to the removal of the German sisters from some areas of the province. No other assistance is available close at hand and it is sad to see such a useful hospital closed to the needs of the Africans.'

While the disappearance of the alien missionary doctors 'has been a sad blow to the African

1942. It is regrettable, but true, that the expansion of work in many of the branches of the department's activities without corresponding increase of supervisory staff, leads to less satisfactory quality of work; patients cannot all in such circumstances receive that careful attention which we should like to give them. Better supervision of subordinate personnel throughout the department is our greatest need.

Dental Treatment.—The professional and clerical demands have been heavy and have thrown a severe strain on the small staff which has not been increased since 1929.[1]

1943. It may be useful to record that the European and Sewa Haji hospitals date from the nineties, and the site of the latter, erected in 1893, has long been recognized as unsuitable for a hospital. Designs were prepared so long ago as 1929 for a new hospital on another site, and only the shortage of money had prevented us from going ahead with the plan for this new hospital before the outbreak of war. The magnitude of the work has precluded our doing so since war began.

Many of the hospital buildings in the Territory have become inadequate for the numbers of patients they are required to serve, and a heavy additional programme of new buildings and extensions must be faced as soon as conditions permit if the 'minimum level of State medical services' envisaged by the Central Development Committee in 1940 is to be attained.[2]

The Senior Dental Surgeon has again drawn attention to the lack of facilities for the African population.[3]

1944. As for staff, I will deal first with medical staff, that is doctors. Our establishment in the 1944 estimates was sixty-eight doctors altogether, including those on administrative and laboratory work. Those actually functioning in the Territory, including those who happen to be out of it on leave at the moment, are fifty-four (a difference of fourteen) of whom seven are temporary officers, not all of course of British nationality, training or anything else. There are still five of our doctors with the Forces, and there are three important stations in the Territory which had doctors before the war who still have not got a doctor. In addition to these three important centres, there are three other districts entirely without a doctor, and five divisions

for of all that missions do for him it can surely be said that it is their medical work which he most appreciates' (ibid.), the elimination of the alien private practitioners affected mostly the non-official European community. The position of Tanganyika as a Mandated Territory was in this respect peculiar. Persons holding only foreign qualifications had equal opportunities with those holding British qualifications to practise for reward. The Director of Medical Services reported: 'From my examination of the records, only three British European practitioners have endeavoured since 1920 to start private practice in the Territory and none of them is still here. Since the admission of foreign qualifications to the medical register in 1931 it has been impossible for them to compete for the comparatively small amount of European practice with the numerous foreigners, mainly German, who registered between 1931 and 1939 and who were prepared to live on a smaller income than their British colleagues of good standing.' (*Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, pp. 41–2.) On 15 Dec. 1944 he said in the Legislative Council: '. . . there is not one single British-European doctor earning his living from private practice in the whole of this Territory. Now, Sir, when one considers that and then considers an adjoining territory which is well supplied with private medical practitioners of British qualifications and registration, one realizes that the whole community is the loser by such requirement, dictated purely on political grounds and arising from the mandatory status of this Territory.' (*19th Session*, p. 123.) He recommended the payment of subsidies of £500 per annum for three years to 12 British practitioners (see *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 42).

[1] *Medical Report 1942*, p. 2. The position was the more difficult as before the war a considerable part of the work had been done by alien dentists. 'By 1939 seven foreign dentists had established themselves in the more populous areas, but since the outbreak of war almost all the load of work for the remaining unofficial population has fallen upon the two Government dental surgeons, for whom there is only one mechanic' (*Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, p. 43).

[2] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 2.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

—by division I mean an administrative division of a district such as North Mara, Bugufi and places of that sort—which have no qualified doctor.[1]

Major Orde Browne, in describing conditions of labour which he recently found on sisal estates, says, 'sanitation was in many cases practically non-existent, and medical arrangements were quite inadequate'.[2]

The question of hospital accommodation and medical staff does however need immediate attention. Hitherto there has been a general tendency to regard the provision of all such requirements as being the responsibility of the industry. While no doubt large estates, or small estates in groups, may reasonably be called upon to maintain a medical officer for their work, and to provide simple hospital accommodation, it is clearly impossible to rely upon such a system to provide really adequate resources; efficiency and economy both demand a considerable measure of centralisation. . . . There is at present an arrangement whereby serious cases are supposed to be sent from plantations to the neighbouring Government hospital, but the accommodation in the latter is often inadequate even for the needs of the local population; in more than one instance, I found the Government hospital overcrowded, with patients lying on extemporised beds on the floor, the medical officer in charge having been compelled to notify the estates that he could accept no more patients.[3]

As regards sleeping-sickness the Medical Report for 1940 stated:

During the decade prior to 1937 the severe outbreaks of sleeping sickness, mainly in the Western Province were brought under control by measures of active treatment and concentration of population, and the incidence was reduced to three hundred cases in 1937. Since then there has been a steady rise and during 1940, nine hundred and forty-three cases with two hundred and five deaths were notified. Extension of the disease has taken place into the Ulanga District of the Eastern Province and in Ukerewe in Mwanza where clearing measures were undertaken, and to a less extent in the Mkalama area of the Central Province. Concentration of some scattered villages in infected bush was carried out in the Kahama District . . . .[4]

The Medical Report for 1943 said:

The incidence of sleeping sickness (four hundred and thirty-nine new cases) was low. From the evidence obtained at the Research Laboratory at Tinde it would seem as if the disease was at or near the trough of a cycle of infectivity. An increase in the number of cases must be expected in the next two or three years with a possible epidemic spread into new areas at the peak of the cycle of infectivity.[5]

In 1944 the notifications were indeed again more numerous. The Commissioner of the Western Province stated:

New cases of sleeping sickness reported to the dispensaries numbered 410, rather more than half of the number in the Territory. There were 148 deaths from the disease; these included cases from previous years. The number of new cases was greater than in recent years, due possibly to an increase in tsetse fly and their advance into the settlements. Another possible cause is the temporary removal of the Sleeping Sickness Surveyors from the province; their task was to supervise the settlements and see that clearings and cultivation were maintained; the Administrative Officers have not the time to give sufficient attention to this and the work has been somewhat neglected.[6]

[1] Director of Medical Services, 15 Dec. 1944, Legislative Council, *19th Session*, p. 122. He had already stated on 28 Sept. that 'only one Medical Officer is now allocated to the Southern Province' (*18th Session*, p. 168). [2] Orde Browne (1946), p. 52. [3] Ibid., pp. 53–4.

[4] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 5. The actual new cases were, of course, much more numerous than the notified cases. See *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 17.

[5] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 7. [6] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 106.

As regards malaria the Central Development Committee, in 1940, apparently did not consider the position to be any longer very serious, so far as the native population was concerned.[1] But subsequent events caused alarm.

1942. An epidemic of fatal malaria occurred in the Western Usambara Mountains into which it has been steadily infiltrating from the Pangani Valley.[2]

The malarial incidence in Dar es Salaam has been much higher than one would wish to see and the Medical Officer of Health considers that this is probably due to two factors: (*a*) the large influx of non-immunes into the Territory through the capital (military, refugees, etc.) and (*b*) the fact that the European private practitioners are now restricted to Government staff with the result that more cases are notified. Drainage works have been extended in the vicinity of the township but have not as yet been able to reduce the malarial incidence as most of them were constructed at the end of the long rains in 1942.[3]

The year has been a bad one for malaria, and I am persuaded that far more intensive measures against mosquito-borne disease are called for in many urban areas and stations. I am sure that the heavy wastage in human life and undermining of health attributable to malarial infection is by no means generally appreciated.[4]

1943. Malaria caused more illness and loss of time among all sections of the population than usual, and was the chief incapacitating disease of government employees in the Lake Province; an increased incidence in all races was noted in the Southern Province, and malaria accounted for a large increase of non-native patients at Tanga hospital, many of whom were from the services. It is the main cause of sickness in in-patients in the Northern Province, and heads the list of major diseases in both in-patients and out-patients in Tanga.

The disease was particularly prevalent in Dar es Salaam where it provides the most urgent public health problem. The expansion of the town and the occupation by non-immune persons of some of the areas outside the range of former malaria control has shown the need for permanent control measures outside the present boundaries and it has become necessary to resume and extend the programme of anti-malarial works which was interrupted by the war. . . .

The increased incidence of malaria in Arusha and other highland areas, notably the Usambara villages, is disquieting, but is an East African problem not confined to Tanganyika.[5]

Very little is known about the incidence of leprosy.

The latest available figures show that there were 4,222 persons in the Territory who were known to be suffering from leprosy, but it is safe to assume that very large numbers of persons infected with this disease remain undiagnosed and unnotified.[6]

Cerebrospinal meningitis seems to be far spread.

1939. Cerebro-spinal meningitis was reported from all provinces and a serious epidemic occurred in the Western Province (one thousand five hundred and seventy-two cases with one hundred and eleven deaths), two thousand one hundred and eighty-three cases with two hundred and thirty-seven deaths were notified in all, ten times the number in 1938. The sulphanilamide drugs proved their value in reducing mortality.[7]

[1] See *Report*, pp. 150–2.

[2] *Medical Report 1942*, p. 6.

[3] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, p. 22.

[4] Governor Jackson, 9 Dec. 1942, Legislative Council, *17th Session*, p. 8.

[5] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 8.

[6] Director of Medical Services, 6 Dec. 1943, Legislative Council, *18th Session*, p. 39.

[7] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 3. See also Report of Commissioner of Western Province: 'There can be little doubt that the people in the famine areas suffered from physical debility as a result of food shortage, a condition contributing to the rapid spread of cerebro-spinal meningitis, which

1940. One thousand one hundred and nine cases of cerebro-spinal fever were recorded with two hundred and sixty deaths, a mortality rate among known cases of twenty-three per cent. The cases were more evenly distributed over the Territory than in 1939 and therefore less easy to control by active treatment with sulphanilamide drugs than in the case of a localized epidemic. There was a recurrence in Nzega where four hundred and two cases with sixty-nine deaths were reported. Many mild cases occur without notification.[1]

1941. The incidence of cerebro-spinal meningitis was high and widely distributed, no province having escaped. Two thousand seven hundred and forty-nine cases were notified, more than double the total number in 1940, with a mortality of twenty per cent. One thousand and five hundred cases occurred in the Western Province with a twelve per cent mortality.[2]

1942.[3] The incidence of cerebro-spinal meningitis has been high and widely distributed during 1942, no province having escaped: 11,687 cases with 1,719 deaths have occurred, more than four times the number in 1941. The death rate for reported cases is 14·7. The Lake Province was most seriously affected; in it more than half (6,660) of the total cases occurred.[4] Other provinces most seriously affected, in order, were Western,[5] Eastern,[6] Southern[7] and Central.[8]

1943.[9] Cerebro-spinal meningitis showed a lower incidence, 8,800 cases with 1,395 deaths, than in 1942 (11,687/1,719) but the death rate for reported cases was 15·8 (14·7) per cent. The disease interfered seriously with recruiting especially in the Lake Province (3,779/586)[10] . . . . In the treeless areas of Maswa outbreaks mounted rapidly. In the Western Province (2,279/412) the disease reached Ufipa for the first time; the general mortality rate was eighteen per cent.[11] Except in the Southern Province (1,118/146)[12] the incidence did not exceed 660 cases in any other province.[13]

To judge from the Reports of the Provincial Commissioners the incidence of this disease was much smaller in 1944.[14]

There is a consensus of opinion that the physique and the general health of the native population of the Territory are poor. The Director of Medical Services in a Memorandum dated 25 October 1938 said:

We have good reason to believe that the physique and energy of the majority of our native population are below those to which they are capable of attaining, and

flared up in Usongo in September and spread rapidly to the neighbouring Chiefdom of Nyawa' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 100). See furthermore for other Provinces ibid., pp. 12, 26, and *Report of Labour Inspectorate 1939*, pp. 4–5.

[1] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 6. See also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, pp. 9, 17, 27, 44, 52, 73.

[2] *Medical Report 1941*, p. 8. The number of reported deaths was 183 in the Western Province but 270 in the Ulanga District (Eastern Province); see *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1941*, pp. 13, 81–2, 84–5. For other Provinces see ibid., pp. 6, 24, 36, 49, 61.

[3] *Medical Report 1942*, p. 7.

[4] See also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, pp. 33–4.

[5] See ibid., p. 104. [6] See ibid., p. 22.

[7] See ibid., p. 65: 'The number of cases reported was 673 among whom there were 212 deaths. This death rate would not have been so high if treatment had been within the reach of patients; but a large number of the cases were untreated and their first report was the report of death; for instance, in the Kilwa District out of one set of cases numbering 143 there were 128 deaths, only reported as a whole one month after their occurrence. Among treated cases the mortality rate was low; in one lot of 230 cases treated by the Ndanda Mission there were only 29 deaths.' See also ibid., p. 55.

[8] See ibid., p. 12. For Northern Province see ibid., p. 47; for Tanga Province ibid., pp. 83, 90.

[9] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 9. [10] See also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1943*, p. 39.

[11] See also ibid., p. 106. [12] See also ibid., p. 65.

[13] For Central Province see ibid., p. 14; for Eastern Province ibid., p. 21; for Northern Province ibid., p. 52; for Southern Highlands Province ibid., p. 67; for Tanga Province ibid., p. 89.

[14] See ibid. *1944*, pp. 11, 25, 51, 107.

our aim must be actively directed towards the improvement—necessarily over a long period of time—of the physical standard of these people for whose welfare we are responsible.[1]

It is the impression among those concerned with African labour—not so far as I am aware established on a statistical basis—that the output of work of the inhabitants of many parts of this country is a low one, measured by standards obtaining in other countries or areas where living conditions are more favourable: and since the output of work is an index of the energy available under stimulus, and energy is directly proportional to the food supply in a healthy individual, there is some justification for concluding that large numbers of our people are inadequately fed; in support of this we have our own clinical knowledge of the existence of actual and borderline cases of deficiency disease, and our experience of the improvement of physical condition which takes place among natives who are supplied with food which we consider in the present state of our knowledge to be adequate in all respects.

The vicious circle of inadequate food supply, low energy, low output, is thus apparent, and it must be attacked from every direction. . . .

Associated with this primary question of nutrition is the broad one of improving environmental conditions. It needs no special study of medicine to realize under what poor hygienic conditions the bulk of our people are living as a result of their low material and educational standards. The reduction of preventable disease and improvement of the people's health must go hand in hand with the treatment of individual sufferers and the improvement of economic conditions, education in the broad sense, housing, food and water supplies, and ordinary sanitation. Bad existing conditions under all these heads interact to retard the progress of our people.[2]

During the war the low physical standard revealed at the medical examination of military and labour recruits attracted particular attention.

1939. The poor nutritional state observed at the medical examination of recruits was a frequent cause of rejection.[3]

1940. The examination of large numbers of men for the Services has revealed a low standard of health and physique in most of the areas so far tapped for recruits; and Government is anxious to appoint a medical officer for labour duties, who will provide further information as to the conditions responsible for the low output of the Tanganyika labourer and guide us in devising practical measures for improving the situation.[4]

[1] *Memorandum on Medical Policy*, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4–5. As regards housing, see also, for example, *Report of Labour Inspectorate 1939*, pp. 8–9; *Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*, pp. 10, 26; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, pp. 27, 95. As to the influence of bad labour conditions on health see, for example, *Report of Labour Inspectorate 1939*, pp. 9–10; *Labour Department Report 1940*, p. 7; *Medical Report 1941*, p. 4; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, pp. 71, 95–6; Orde Browne (1946), pp. 52–3, 58, 60.

[3] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 3.

[4] Ibid. *1940*, p. 4. The Commissioner of Tanga Province reported: 'Examination of recruits for work of a military nature has emphasized the prevalence of bilharzia and ankylostomiasis throughout the province, the former disease predominating. Over seventy per cent of the candidates from the Korogwe District were found to be suffering from bilharzia.' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1940*, p. 65.) The Commissioner of the Western Province wrote: '. . . it has come as a shock to observe the high percentage of recruits rejected by the military medical authorities. It is true that the medical tests for the army are stringent, and that many of the recruits are not the best physical specimens that the tribes can produce but even so it is appalling to find such a high percentage of the population graded as C.3. The figures kept at Ufipa for the first three months after conscription show that more than one in three were medically rejected at the preliminary local examination. As a considerable number of those who pass the preliminary local medical examination are ultimately rejected by the medical officer at the Civil Depot, it is a conservative estimate to say that over fifty per cent of the men examined are rejected for military service of any nature. The proportion quoted for the Wafipa is in respect of a fairly healthy tribe. That for Uha is very much worse, only one in ten men called up being

1941. The accumulated information as to the medical condition of the Africans so examined . . . has shown what a large number of the population are of a low physical standard and how high is the incidence of bilharzia in certain areas.[1]

The present low standard, so clearly shown by the number of recruits rejected as unfit for service with the Forces on medical examination, accounts largely for the inefficiency and low output of our industrial employees . . . .[2]

1942. The examination of these large numbers of men has shown the very low standard of health obtaining in the African population in most areas, which is largely attributable to poor and irregular feeding, and to infestation with worms, especially bilharzia. The Senior Medical Officer of the Southern Province considers that much of the poor physique and low body weight would be improved if the population could get 'a square meal'.[3]

African recruits from rural parts of the Territory who received treatment during the year appear to be as diseased dentally as the town dweller.[4]

1943. Figures for the percentage of rejections at medical inspection for employment show that our population generally is exceedingly ill-nourished. In the Lindi depot alone thirty per cent of the labour examined was rejected; of those forty per cent were underweight as well as suffering from other diseases. Of six recruits examined, three would be fit for military service and of the three rejects only one would be fit for sisal estate work. In the Lake Province forty per cent of 13,912 were rejected for military or special service. Of a further 3,284, sixteen per cent were found unfit for sisal work. At Kigoma, a well known recruiting centre, out of 8,419, thirty-three per cent were rejected for civil labour.

One result of this is that the labourer cannot do his work when he reaches his place of employment, but he also soon succumbs to other troubles, such as ulcers; weeks or months of surgical treatment may be needed before the man is fit for work again. That means time lost, beds occupied in hospital, food wasted in an employment area and imposes a direct burden on the Territory.[5]

1944. Eastern Province. The greater proportion of sisal conscripts recruited in this province came from the Dar es Salaam area where some 2,000 were brought in but, as a result of medical examination, only 755 were accepted; this emphasized again the high proportion of men unfit for hard manual labour in the coastal area. Conscription activities in Bagamoyo District produced similar results as the high standard of physique for conscripts, even for sisal labour, precluded many of those available . . . .[6]

Western Province. Labourers recruited by labour agents for estate work numbered 5,431 men; the number of rejections on medical grounds being 26 per cent; sisal conscripts totalled 2,190; their rejection rate on medical grounds was higher at 41 per cent, for a higher standard of fitness is required from them. Military recruits passed fit by the doctors were as many as were required; the rejection rate in their case was 36 per cent.[7]

It was realized more and more that malnutrition was the main cause of the poor physique of so many recruits and the low output of labour.[8]

The seriousness of malnutrition in Tanganyika had also been emphasized

found to be fit for service.' (Ibid., p. 74.) On 9 Dec. 1940 Governor Young said in the Legislative Council: 'The great prevalence of bilharzia throughout the Territory . . . has been brought to light in connection with the medical examination of recruits. The prevention of this disease is a problem of urgency and magnitude.' (*15th Session*, p. 17.)

[1] *Medical Report 1941*, p. 1. See also ibid., pp. 7–8.

[2] Ibid., p. 4. [3] Ibid. *1942*, p. 1. [4] Ibid., p. 2.

[5] Ibid. *1943*, p. 4. See also Director of Medical Services, 13 Dec. 1943, Legislative Council, *18th Session*, pp. 97–8.

[6] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 24.

[7] Ibid., pp. 110–11.

[8] See, for example, Charron, *The Welfare of the African Labourer in Tanganyika*, p. 28; and Introductory Note by Dr. Scott, Director of Medical Services, ibid., pp. xi–xii.

shortly before the war by the Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire.

It is generally agreed that the majority of the population does not get enough meat and milk and that there is an annual period of food shortage between harvests. This periodic shortage of food, involving a recurrent annual drain on native resources, is a question even more serious than the occasional outbreaks of famine which have occurred in nearly all provinces during the past ten years, and which cost considerable sums in relief measures.[1]

Food shortages and famines which caused so much concern during the war had in fact been quite common also in peace time. Annual periods of food shortage seem to have prevailed with particular regularity in the Central Province.

1941. The year was a hard one for man and beast. Weather conditions were unfavourable and the failure of the rains in April and May resulted in a shortage of food in several areas. In three chiefdoms of the Dodoma District this food shortage attained the proportions of a famine . . . .[2]

While a combination of hard work, foresight and common sense enabled the District Commissioner and his assistants to prevent a recurrence of the disaster of 1919, when some thirty thousand people of this province are said to have lost their lives as a result of the famine that followed the last war, there can be no doubt that the Gogo are only now beginning to emerge from a gruelling ordeal. Their complete recovery will depend on the coming season.[3]

1942. At the end of the year, the position was grave in the extreme. It was apparent that the cumulative effect of two bad years had left the people in such poor shape to meet the strain of yet another year of hunger, that we could not hope to weather the storm without casualties. Moreover, the famine was not confined to Ugogo alone, but was far more widespread, involving (at the most recent computation) about one hundred and twenty thousand people, or nearly one-fifth of the inhabitants of the province. . . .

Conditions resulting from a lack of rain—and to some extent from improvidence—have been the same in Ugogo for more than half a century. Writing nearly seventy years ago from Zingeh (Zinge, some eight miles west of Dodoma) Stanley describes, '. . . a famine or scarcity of food at this season, and therefore we can only procure half-rations. The native store of grain is consumed during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October and November. By December, the planting month, there is but little grain left . . . . I weighed 180 pounds when I left Zanzibar, but under this diet I have been reduced to 134 pounds within thirty-eight days. The young Englishmen are in the same impoverished condition of body, and unless we reach some more flourishing country than famine-stricken Ugogo, we must soon become mere skeletons.'

Uncomfortable though Stanley's plight was, it seems fair to remark that if there was even 'but little grain left' in the month of December, the year 1875 could not have been a particularly bad one, viewed in the light of what has occurred more recently.[4]

1943. The year opened with famine in the Dodoma and Kondoa districts and finished with a worse famine in these districts. It had been hoped that the unfavourable weather conditions in 1941/42, the second bad season to follow the bumper season of 1939/40, would not be repeated in 1942/43, but this hope was not realized. . . .

[1] *First Report*, Part II (1939), p. 16. See also *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations* (1931), pp. 54–5; *Preliminary Survey of the Position in regard to Nutrition amongst the Natives of Tanganyika Territory* (1937), p. 4; Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes*, 37th Session (13 Dec. 1939), p. 39.

[2] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1941*, p. 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 2.

[4] Ibid. *1942*, pp. 1–2.

In the early part of the year, that is to say towards the end of the 1942/43 famine, there were difficulties in connection with the import of the required foodstuffs, difficulties outside the control of the provincial organization, with the result that 136 deaths from starvation were reported and there is little doubt that other unreported deaths occurred from the same cause. It should be noted, however, that, as at least 200,000 people were affected, the proportion of deaths to the total population involved was small.[1]

1944. Only those who have had the anxiety of combating famine in the Central Province can appreciate the blessing of a good harvest in 1944, when, for the first time since 1940, enough food was reaped to last throughout the year.

In the first few months of 1944 the famine in Dodoma and Kondoa was at its height, the meagre food reserves of many natives were utterly exhausted and they flocked to the famine stores for assistance. Fortunately the Administrative staff were well prepared, and adequate supplies had been made available in good time by Government.[2]

In recent years Medical Reports have also discussed diseases due to malnutrition.

1939. Scurvy and other deficiency diseases continued in the Lupa goldmining area; and other conditions attributed to avitaminosis were reported in smaller numbers from other provinces, but few classical deficiencies are seen by the medical staff. The mortality from nutritional diarrhoea at Morogoro has shown a satisfactory decrease since 1936, attributable to better feeding, earlier hospitalization and better treatment.[3]

1940. Scurvy, often associated with other forms of deficiency disease, continues to occur in the Lupa; and war conditions, by the reduction of staff, have prevented the giving of that degree of attention to improvement of the supply of fresh foodstuffs for the labour, especially for that employed by the small and penurious alluvial worker which it had been hoped would effect the removal of this reproach.[4]

1942. A small outbreak of beri-beri in the Usambara mountains (Tanga Province) was discovered towards the end of June. This disease is not unknown in the area and seems to coincide with the period just before the fresh crop of maize is ready;[5] the prohibition of the manufacture of native beer may also have had some bearing. Propaganda with regard to feeding was undertaken and the people were again

[1] Ibid. *1943*, p. 1.

[2] Ibid. *1944*, p. 1. It is very difficult rightly to appraise the various causes of these famines. The Administrative Secretary, on 13 Dec. 1943, said in the Legislative Council: 'As regards the particular case of the Central Province where the famine has been so severe, there may be justifiable criticism of the manner in which the position has been handled, but that does not alter the fact of course that it was very largely an Act of God' (*18th Meeting*, p. 106). But apart from weather conditions and measures of the central administration (which were much improved in 1944) there is still another important factor on which the Commissioner of the Province lays great stress. 'The cause of famine in Ugogo is generally attributed to the low average rainfall and its uneven distribution, but this contention does not receive the full support of all who have worked amongst these backward tribesmen and studied their agricultural methods. There were many who reaped adequate crops in 1943 despite a rainfall of about seven inches below the average—these were the good farmers who manured their land, planted early, replanted where seed failed, weeded promptly when weeding became necessary and planted an acreage adequate for the needs of the family. Village surveys carried out last year in two areas in Ugogo by the Senior Agricultural Officer showed that, whereas the average acreage per household in Mwanza is 3·37 acres and in Tabora 2·38, it is as low as 1·14 in Ugogo. The fact remains that a certain proportion of the tribe have become inured to regular annual food shortages.' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1944*, p. 2.)

For food shortages or famines in other Provinces see, for example, ibid. *1939*, pp. 26, 51, 97, 100; *1941*, pp. 16, 58, 68, 82; *1942*, pp. 45, 90; *1943*, p. 50; *1944*, pp. 13, 19–20, 37.

[3] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 3.

[4] Ibid. *1940*, p. 4.

[5] See also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1942*, p. 90.

allowed to brew beer. No further cases of avitaminosis were reported from the Lindi Police. To bad food conditions in 1941 and 1942 was attributed the large increase of ulcers treated at the medical units of the U.M.C.A. in the Masasi diocese.[1]

1943. In Dodoma ninety-six cases of starvation were admitted to hospital of whom forty died, principally from diarrhoea, oedema being a common sign.

The association of extensive tropical ulcers with malnutrition has been commented upon by many of the staff and there is no doubt that it must have its effect on the resistance of the body to infection of this kind.[2] This condition was particularly noted among farm labourers from famine areas employed in the Northern Province where special wards were erected at Moshi and Arusha to cope with them. The Surgical Specialist has commented on the number and severe type of ulcers now being admitted to the Sewa Haji hospital as compared with pre-war years.

No outbreaks of particular deficiency diseases were reported, but the general shortage of staple foodstuffs cannot fail to be having its effect on the general health of the people.[3]

Infant Mortality. In the first years of British administration the Medical Reports paid much attention to infant mortality.

1920.[4] We know practically nothing about the infantile mortality rate, beyond the fact that it is high; according to some figures supplied by the District Political Officer, Moshi, as high as 30 per cent. and this appalling figure is probably fairly accurate.

1921. There is not a shadow of doubt that the infantile mortality in the Territory according to our ideas, influenced as they are by the recent fall in England to somewhere round 80 per 1,000, is appallingly high. There is evidence to show that it stands at somewhere near 300 per thousand.[5]

Major Hon. C. Dundas, District Political Officer, Moshi, was so kind as to furnish the writer with a small statistical table, which is not without interest. He collected statistics from 34 chiefs, mainly of the Wa Chagga, who inhabit the Kilimanjaro area. These 34 chiefs had between them 285 women, *i.e.*, nearly 9 wives apiece. These 285 women had produced 707 children, *i.e.*, 2·45 children per woman. But, of the 707 children, only 405 survived to the limit of weaning (say 18 months to 2 years). Here then the infant mortality approximated 30 per cent. Now the Wa Chagga are a flourishing tribe. They have not been affected by serious pestilence nor by famine, and, as Major Dundas points out, these children had a naturally better chance of survival than those of less wealthy and less fortunately situated natives.

A further observation on infantile mortality has been made by Mr. Mitchell, Assistant Political Officer. From his figures, collected in the Ufipa District, it appears that the number of wives per man was 2·5, and the number of children born per wife was 3·42. Of these children only 48·2 per cent. survived, *i.e.*, grew up. Further confirmatory figures were obtained by this Officer from Kirando on Lake Tanganyika. Of 716 children, 287 died under 2 years of age and another 93 before the 10th year, *i.e.*, 53 per cent. do not grow up. In England, out of a standard million of both sexes born, 74·9 per cent. survive to the 10th year of life. That is to say, the death rate at Kirando in the first ten years of childhood is more than double that which obtains in England.

[1] *Medical Report 1942*, p. 4.

[2] Orde Browne (1946), in discussing labour conscription, said (p. 46): 'The medical aspect of the situation was unexpectedly complicated by the excessive occurrence of tropical ulcer; the extent to which this affliction wholly or partially disabled the workers represented a serious inroad on efficiency. The occurrence was on a scale quite unknown previously in Tanganyika; it appears to be undoubtedly connected with the severe famines of 1942/1943 which entailed a high degree of malnutrition and debility in the great majority of the inhabitants of Tanganyika.'

[3] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 5.

[4] Ibid. *1918–20*, p. 35.

[5] Ibid. *1921*, p. 81.

The Kirando example is not an isolated one. It is said that the Wabende are slowly being exterminated on account of the death rate in childhood.

An enquiry in regard to the probable causes of this mortality elicited the following suggestions:—

(1) The prevalence of syphilis among the parents. In the Ufipa part of the country a belief is entertained that if a sufferer from venereal disease can pass it on to someone else, a cure of the former will result. This horrible belief is not confined only to Central Africa.

(2) Prevalence of small-pox.

(3) Mal-feeding of infants.

(4) Chill and pneumonia.

As the women work in the shambas, the infant is taken out by the mother tied on to her back. Whilst at work the mother deposits the child on the ground and the infant is supposed to catch cold thereby.[1]

1922.[2] Infant mortality is undoubtedly high, but reliable figures are not obtainable. Efforts were made in some districts to get the necessary information, but the results vary widely. Tanga reported an infantile death-rate of 134 per 1,000,[3] while the table below was compiled by the Senior Commissioner of the Tabora district and is probably the most correct obtainable.

District	*Number of children born*	*Number died*	*Number still living*	*Mortality*
				%
N.W. Kahama	4,125	1,934	2,194	47
,, Runsewe	3,489	2,056	1,430	59
South Ugunda and Ngulu	447	295	152	66
*East Igalula	254	116	138	45
*Children of Sultan	41	19	22	46
*N.E. Shinyanga	520	271	249	52
*Ushietu	715	295	420	41
*Nyawa	177	92	85	51
	9,768	5,078	4,690	52

* Cattle Areas.

The districts are taken at random in the Tabora area.

In view of the tendency to attribute the high infantile mortality throughout tropical Africa to venereal disease, these figures are specially interesting, as the Senior Medical Officer of the district states in his report that he is of opinion that venereal disease is not common in his district. He bases this opinion on the examination of hundreds of recruits and labourers. Venereal disease in some districts, particularly in the Lake Victoria area, undoubtedly causes a very large number of abortions and still-births, but other factors must have a great influence on the infantile mortality throughout the Territory. The partial immunity against malaria, tick fever and other indigenous diseases acquired by native communities is possibly obtained at the cost of a considerable number of lives. In most districts there are periods during each year when food is scarce and the unsuitable diet which is all that is then available, combined with helminthic infections, results in severe intestinal disorders.

An unclothed infant exposed to sun, rain and wide variations of temperature when the mother is at work cultivating her garden, has little chance of escaping a serious

[1] Ibid., pp. 82–3. For Dar es Salaam see pp. 367–8 above.

[2] Ibid. *1922*, pp. 100–1.

[3] This rate was based on entirely inadequate data (Population 86,404, total deaths 1,335, total births 965, deaths under 1 year 130; all figures were obviously understated, particularly so the infant deaths).

attack of respiratory disease, while small-pox and other infectious diseases also take their toll. A campaign against venereal disease would probably result in a marked increase in the number of births, but the percentage of deaths can only be reduced by the spread of education, especially amongst the female population. Suitable diet, clothing and in the case of serious illness a visit to a Government or Missionary Hospital before the resources of the local witch-doctor have been exhausted, would have the greatest influence in reducing the present high infant mortality rate throughout the Territory.

1923.[1] The Infantile Mortality is unknown. . . . The Medical Officer, Bukoba, reports 5,085 births and 2,976 deaths in a selected part of the district; the Infantile Mortality for Bukoba thus amounts to 585·2 per 1,000. At Tanga, on the other hand, the figures obtained by the Medical Officer of Health yielded an Infantile Mortality rate of 91 per 1,000 . . . . It must be conceded that but little reliance can be placed on these estimates. The Infantile Mortality is certainly high; further investigation should be made into the subject.[2]

1928.[3] No reliable Infant Mortality Rate figures are available, but it is conceded generally that they are high.

The special investigations in the Kahama District were apt to confirm the opinion that infant mortality was high. The rates for 1927–9 were here 304, 294, and 258.[4] The decrease in 1929 was mainly due to incompleteness in the records of the Usumbwa Sultanate which showed only 38 infant deaths as compared with 96 in 1927 and 109 in 1928. Excluding this Sultanate the rates of the District in 1927–9 were 284, 271, and 263 respectively.

No official figures whatsoever seem to have been published in the 1930s; nor do the medical reports of that period contain an opinion on the level of infant mortality. But the investigation of Mr. and Mrs. Culwick throws some light on the mortality of the children of the women they questioned in the Kiberege Division. The main result was as follows:[5]

Age of women	*Deceased children per 1,000 live-born*				
	Under 6 months	*6 months to weaning*	*Weaning to 7 years*	*7 years to puberty*	*Total*
Under 20	272	—	—	—	—
20–30	250	126	—	—	—
30–50	271	113	94	50	528
Over 50	232	138	127	38	535

The authors reach the conclusion that 'the total wastage of child life before weaning' is 'approximately 38 per cent.'

. . . nothing in the figures indicates any improvement in the situation during the thirty odd years here represented, for the young mothers of 20–30 show a rate of 376 per 1,000 live births as against 384 and 370 for their elders. And it may well be added that for the youngest mothers of all (under 20), for whom nothing further than Grade I can be calculated, we have the high figure of 272. This is, however, perhaps hardly comparable with the figures given for the other grades of mothers, owing to

[1] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 40.

[2] See also ibid., p. 100, where the Senior Sanitation Officer says that the 1922 infant mortality rate for Tabora (520) 'is probably much nearer the correct figure' than the rate for the Tanga sub-districts (91).

[3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 104.

[4] See ibid. *1929*, p. 151.

[5] See Culwick and Culwick, p. 29.

the fact that in the case of these youngest women we are dealing almost entirely with first children, among whom mortality is considerably higher than among subsequent children. A count of the cards shows that of 1,000 first babies born 423 die before weaning, as against 354 per 1,000 for subsequent children, an increase of 19 per cent.[1]

So much for mortality before weaning. For the younger mothers it is impossible to carry our computations further, as the correction factor becomes too large; but taking the two senior grades of mothers we find that a further 11 per cent. of the children die after weaning and under 7 years, and about 4 per cent. more between 7 years and puberty. The figures of 528 and 535 per 1,000 live births for total child mortality may be regarded as the most reliable of all because, as is well known, apart from its distinctive physiological features, the attainment of puberty is a very prominent social landmark in the life of an African, clearly defined by rites and ceremonies, and no mother has the slightest hesitation in recalling whether a dead son or daughter had or had not passed beyond this important point.[2]

The Medical Report for 1941 said:

Some interesting figures have been recorded at Nzega clinic for the period 1935 to 1940. Nine hundred and eighty-three children born in the clinic were followed up and of these eight hundred and seventy-five were found to be alive on their first birthday while one hundred and eight had not survived to that date. The infant mortality rate of these clinic-born children was therefore one hundred and ten. In the Nzega area, for the same period, two thousand three hundred and sixty-six births were reported, including the clinic cases, and of these five hundred and seventy-four were stated to have died in their first year, giving an infant-mortality-rate for the general population, including the clinic patients, of two hundred and forty-three. This rate though not carrying the reliability of that for clinic-born infants is useful for comparison with it.

The Medical Officer, Bukoba, carried out a special inquiry into the cause of heavy child wastage, both pre- and post-natal, in the course of which he found that 26·3 per cent of one thousand three hundred and ninety-two consecutive ante-natal cases showed syphilitic infection serologically and that after statistical examination syphilis proved to be a contributing factor in the high death rates affecting pregnancy in Bukoba women.[3]

Finally, it may be mentioned that the Central Development Committee, in their report dated 1 May 1940, stated: 'Such figures as we possess seem to show that anything from one-quarter to one-half of the children born die within their first year of life.'[4] But it is unlikely that the figures they possessed permitted the drawing of any conclusions for the Territory as a whole.

Population Growth. In a Memorandum dated 5 May 1930 the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services suggested that in the period preceding the establishment of the German Protectorate (1885) the population had been decreasing, and that the situation did not change essentially in the following 35 years.

Until a comparatively recent date, coinciding with the German occupation, it might be taken that the several tribal groups were segregated by inter-tribal warfare, the stronger tribes thus occupied the more fertile country, the weaker were driven out into the low-lying unfruitful, unhealthy areas or remote mountain fastnesses, taking care to keep a wide neutral zone between; and in no way, either by cultivating extensively, or breeding large herds of cattle, to stimulate the cupidity

[1] Ibid., p. 30. [2] Ibid., p. 32. [3] *Medical Report 1941*, p. 2.
[4] *Report of the Central Development Committee*, p. 135.

of their more powerful neighbours. It is clear also that for centuries past, remedial medicine and hygiene existed in their most primitive form, and disease must have been rampant.

Witchcraft, pillage, and slave-trading were rife. In this manner to him that had was given, from him that had not was taken away that which he had. And therefore, over vast tracts of land an under-nourished, diseased population, subject to periodic famine, continued to live and probably decrease.

With the advent of the Germans, matters were somewhat improved, but the extensive punitive expeditions devastated several large areas, of which the inhabitants were practically decimated. Following upon these events came the Great War, which, apart from the casualties incident to warfare, brought about a very large number of deaths through disease, exposure and famine.[1]

The Germans themselves, as late as 1913, were doubtful whether, even in years of peace, the population was increasing.[2] It was certainly not greater in 1920 than in 1913, and for some time thereafter there was a fear of a population decline. 'If the population, as well as the rivers of this Territory, is to dry up as time goes on, posterity will be as fully occupied as the present generation in making both ends meet.'[3] When the Chairman of the Mandates Commission, on 1 August 1923, inquired if the population of the Territory was stationary or diminishing 'Mr. Ormsby-Gore replied that it was difficult to give any definite figures. One thing was certain, that unless syphilis was checked, a decrease was undoubtedly to be feared.'[4] The necessity of a population increase was urged in particular by the Principal Medical Officer:

> To the writer the future of this country seems to depend so greatly on increase of its scanty native population that the preservation of native life appears all important. Large tracts of country are now practically abandoned to tsetse fly and wild beasts for want of cultivators.[5]

At about the same time the East Africa Commission said that in all parts of East Africa except Uganda 'there seems some ground for believing that deaths still exceed births'.[6] When, therefore, the 'enumeration' of 1925 yielded a population of 4,319,000 as against 4,107,000 in 1921, the Administration in its next three annual reports to the League stated that 'it must not be assumed that there has been a general increase of population but rather that the enumeration in 1925 is more accurate than that of 1921'. But in the second half of the 1920s, when the Territory had recovered from the economic consequences of the War, the impression gradually gained ground that the population of the Territory was also on an upward grade. For some time, to be sure, the opinion still prevailed that this was not the case. In the Minute in which the Governor towards the end of 1926 outlined the programme for the investigations to be conducted in the Kahama District, he wrote: 'What we want to ascertain is whether there is any truth in the repeated statement that the natives are diminishing rather than increasing in numbers.' The results of these investigations were not conclusive, and the Medical Report for 1928 stated

[1] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 52–3.
[2] See *Die deutschen Schutzgebiete 1912/13*, pp. xii–xiii, 10.
[3] *Medical Report 1921*, p. 81.
[4] *Minutes*, 3rd Session, p. 144.
[5] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 41.
[6] *Report of the East Africa Commission* (1925), p. 54.

for the Territory as a whole: 'Infant and Maternal Mortality is high, and great extension of the system of welfare clinics must be undertaken before an appreciable increase of population may be anticipated.'[1] On the other hand, the representative of the mandatory Power, on 22 June 1928, said in the Mandates Commission that there was an increase of the population. 'The figure for the natives was estimated [in 1925] at 4,319,000, but according to the latest information, the figure was 4,423,000.'[2] However, two months before that another count had been made, according to which the native population numbered 4,740,706—15·4 per cent. more than in 1921 and 9·8 per cent. more than in 1925. A statement made by the Chief Secretary of the Territory in the Mandates Commission on 19 June 1930 showed that the Administration, while believing that the population was definitely larger than in 1921, thought that part of the apparent increase was due to more accurate enumeration.

M. Orts . . . wished to ask if this increase [between 1921 and 1928] was real or apparent, that was to say, was it not due to the fact that the Census of 1928 was more complete than previous ones?

Mr. Jardine replied that it was a fact that the statistics for 1928 were the most accurate that had yet been obtained and that this was largely due to the efficiency of the native administrations. He would say that the increase was both real and apparent.

M. Orts observed that in that case it was better for the Commission to reserve its conclusions to which these statements might give rise, until a later census had been taken which would make it possible to compare the figures on a sound basis.

Mr. Jardine agreed with M. Orts. He added that he had no wish to detract from the credit due to the Medical Department in connection with the increase of population. It had undoubtedly saved many thousands of lives, for example, by the treatment of natives for 'yaws'. In his opinion, the population was quite definitely on the increase, and to the Medical Department the credit for this largely belonged.[3]

But when a new count, made one year after this discussion, yielded a population of 5,022,640, the Secretary for Native Affairs who wrote the report on this 'census' declared that the increase of 22·3 per cent. in the figures since 1921 was all due to an actual increase in the population. He intimated even that the 1921 figure may have been an over-estimate, so that the actual increase was possibly larger still.

The report of the 1925 East African Commission states that 'there is no conclusive evidence that the population is increasing or decreasing in any part of East Africa'. Although, as stated above, it cannot be pretended that the figures now available are statistically accurate, despite the probable tendency to over-estimate in early enumerations the 1931 census shows an increase since 1921 of over 22 per cent., sufficient evidence to enable us to state with conviction that the population is steadily increasing. Combinations of circumstances, e.g. the slave trade, tribal wars and the prevalence of harmful practices such as infanticide, for long kept the density of the population of Africa far lower than that of other continents; and the first contact with European civilization, bringing with it, as it did, economic disturbance and new diseases, no doubt aggravated a tendency towards decline in population, which in Tanganyika was strengthened by the war of 1914–18. The fecundity of African women is well known, and it is to be expected that as soon as the many and various factors which have retarded the numerical growth of African peoples have been removed or at least diminished in effect, then the increase in the population

[1] *Medical Report 1928*, p. 8. [2] *Minutes*, 13th Session, p. 140. [3] Ibid., 18th Session, p. 42.

will be continuous. The increase in population revealed by the 1931 census is a tribute to the efforts which have been made in recent years to improve conditions of living and to eradicate disease and customs destructive to life. In addition to particular factors of this nature account must be taken of the general rise in the standard of living brought about by the development of communications and the increased facilities for the cultivation of economic crops and for employment for wages under good conditions.[1]

The Medical authorities, which three years before had said that 'great extension of the system of welfare clinics must be undertaken before an appreciable increase of population may be anticipated', now accepted the 'increase in density per square mile from 11·0 in 1921 to 13·7 in 1931' as a fact. While in earlier years they had urged the necessity of a population increase, they now said: 'Whether we are right in doing all we can to help this population to increase may be a matter of opinion . . . .'[2] And it is amusing to note that the only occasion on which doubt was expressed as to whether the population had actually increased by something like 22 per cent. in 1921–31 was when the representative of the mandatory Power, three years later, was anxious to assure the Mandates Commission that the Territory was not in danger of becoming over-populated.

M. Rappard, referring to the native census [of 1931] noted that the results were gratifying since they showed an increase of 6 per cent in five years and 22 per cent in ten years. Such an enormous increase in the last ten years was almost alarming, in that one might wonder, if the increase continued at this rate, whether the territory would be capable of sustaining its population. He supposed, however, that the increase was largely due to improved demographic methods.

Mr. Calder could assure M. Rappard that the native population was still very far from congestion point. The increase was, as M. Rappard supposed, partly due to improved statistical methods.[3]

In order to arrive at a sober judgement of the population increase between 1921 and 1931 it is necessary to treat separately the first four years and the remainder of the decade. In 1921–5 the people were still suffering from the consequences of the war. The East Africa Commission, in April 1925, stated:

It may be said that even yet the shadow of the Great War with its tremendous disturbances has not passed altogether from the territory. The country is only just beginning to recover from the economic effects of the disturbance, and 1924 was the first year in which both plantation and native production were able to make appreciable advances.[4]

The task of restoring the wreckage of war has now been largely completed, but in such matters as education, medical work, and scientific research the pre-war standard has not yet been reached.[5]

Moreover, as shown above, all official documents of the period expressed the opinion that the population was stagnant. It seems safe, therefore, to accept as correct the statement, made by the Administration in its annual reports for 1925, 1926, and 1927, that the population of the Territory was not larger in 1925 than in 1921.

[1] *Census of the Native Population 1931*, pp. 2–3.
[2] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 21.
[3] *Minutes*, 25th Session (8 June 1934), p. 119.
[4] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 113.
[5] Ibid., p. 127.

Between 1925 and 1931 the situation was more favourable. Economic conditions and medical care for the natives improved considerably. The impression that the population was increasing in this period was, therefore, probably correct. But how large was this increase? It is obvious that it cannot have amounted to 22 per cent. Such an enormous increase has never been observed in any country not subject to a vast immigration. Although an unusually high fertility is reported from nowhere, while a high infant mortality is reported from practically everywhere, the increase may have been large in many districts. But according to the report on the 1931 count and other official documents, some districts experienced a decrease owing to sleeping-sickness and other diseases. Since, moreover, the increase was probably slow prior to 1928 it seems safe to say that the population increase in the period 1925–31—and as there was apparently no increase in 1921–5, the whole increase in 1921–31—did not exceed, say, 8 per cent. and was probably smaller.[1]

For the years since 1931 all population figures are based on the numbers of taxpayers, and the official documents do not express an opinion about population increase. The last estimate, referring to 31 December 1944, indicates an increase of 414,000 or 8·3 per cent. since the count of 1931. It is possible that the actual increase was something like that, but, in spite of some immigration, it is unlikely to have been larger. Economic conditions on the whole were less favourable than in 1925–31, medical care had been restricted considerably during the crisis, and famines or at least serious food shortages were frequent.

VIII. Non-Native Births and Deaths Statistics

Births. Although registration of European births is compulsory, no data covering the whole Territory have been published since 1923,[2] and for recent years not even data for single districts have been made available.[3] Registration of Asiatic births is not compulsory, and the

[1] Mr. and Mrs. Culwick in their *Conclusion* (pp. 41–2) make the following interesting statement concerning the population trends up to 1931 in Tanganyika Territory:

'Now the Ulanga Valley is one of the most fertile parts of East Africa. Nevertheless it appears that for many years the nett reproduction rate has been a long way below unity, and we may well wonder whether in less-favoured districts the position is not as bad or even worse. True, a large part of the area in question suffered severely from the effects of the Maji-Maji Rebellion, but it was not alone in this, for the rising involved to a greater or less degree most of south-eastern Tanganyika, and on reading the German literature one realizes how much worse its consequences were in the drier areas than in the fertile Ulanga Valley. . . .

'One cannot help wondering whether in the case of certain tribes the increases shown in the Census do not merely reflect improved machinery of enumeration or, if such increases actually occurred, whether they are not chiefly or even wholly due to the prolongation of life in the senior age-grades and not, therefore, to a high nett reproduction rate. The small proportion of children to adults in some of the tribes listed in the Census as having increased lends weight to the latter hypothesis, while the gradual encroachment of the tsetse fly in certain areas is suggestive concerning the former.'

[2] The only data published are: birth-rate in 1921, 14·1 per 1,000 (see *Medical Report 1921*, p. 82); number of births in 1923, 35 (see ibid. *1923*, p. 39).

[3] Data for some districts have been published ibid. *1921*, p. 127; *1922*, pp. 134, 144; *1923*, pp. 65, 71, 81; *1924*, pp. 165, 178, 186; *1925*, pp. 42, 54, 70; *1927*, pp. 47, 51, 72, 85; *1928*, pp. 54, 64, 75, 87; *1929*, pp. 50, 52, 90; *1932*, pp. 23–4; *1933*, pp. 20–1; *1934*, p. 34.

scanty data available for some districts[1] (mainly Dar es Salaam) are of no value.

Deaths. The deaths statistics are more satisfactory. According to the records of the Registrar-General the number of deaths among the European Non-officials oscillated in 1921–38 between 22 and 79. The death-rate has been low throughout. According to the Medical Reports the mortality among European officials has likewise been favourable.[2]

TABLE 13. *Non-Native Deaths, Tanganyika Territory, 1919–38*[1]

	European non-officials	*European officials Number*			*Asiatic officials Number*		
Year	*Deaths*	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*[2]	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*
1919	..	..	..	6	..	..	1
1920	..	..	..	5[3]	..	..	9[3]
1921	22	559[4]	538[4]	5	796[4]	645[4]	9
1922	30	836	656	6	756[4]	664[4]	9
1923	25	800[5]	600[5]	6	1,000[5]	878[5]	9
1924	33	861	594	4	1,250[5]	1,011[5]	4
1925	35	855	618	6	1,427[5]	1,037[5]	11
1926	52	983	728	4	1,524[5]	1,171[5]	7
1927	35	1,038	756	5	1,591[5]	1,251[5]	17
1928	61	1,375	851	6	1,778[5]	1,354[5]	8
1929	48	1,547	942	7	1,838[5]	1,390[5]	12
1930	61	1,600	1,007	5	2,138[5]	1,558[5]	5
1931	72	1,567	988	4	2,127[5]	1,546[5]	10
1932	68	1,387	815	3	1,653[5]	1,166[5]	3
1933	53	1,132	727	8	1,336	970	2
1934	69	965	598	—	1,152	841	3
1935	79	947	587	7	1,143	834	6
1936	59	950	589	5	1,178	860	5
1937	59	986	611	1	1,225	898	1
1938	71	1,017	630	7	1,238	904	—

[1] See *Medical Report 1918–20*, p. 24; *1921*, p. 33; *1922*, p. 40; *1923*, pp. 27, 34, 39; *1924*, p. 24; *1925*, p. 13; *1926*, pp. 17, 20–1; *1927*, p. 19; *1928*, p. 21; *1929*, pp. 24, 27–8; *1930*, p. 12; *1931*, p. 13; *1932*, pp. 17, 19–20; *1933*, p. 14; *1934*, p. 26; *1935*, pp. 30, 32; *1936*, p. 43; *1937*, p. 37; *1938*, pp. 52, 54.

[2] Figures apparently exclude deaths occurring at sea or in the United Kingdom. The figures published in *Vital Statistics* (*1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1), which include those deaths, amounted in 1930–41 to 8, 7, 5, 10, 2, 11, 7, 4, 9, 6, 7, and 2 respectively.

[3] To 31 Oct.

[4] Incomplete figures.

[5] 'Approximately; accurate figures not available.'

Registration of Asiatic deaths became compulsory on 1 January 1923. But no data covering the whole Territory have ever been published and

[1] See *Medical Report 1923*, p. 65; *1924*, p. 165; *1925*, p. 42; *1927*, pp. 47, 51, 85; *1928*, pp. 54–5, 64, 75, 87; *1929*, pp. 50, 52, 91; *1932*, p. 25; *1933*, p. 20.

[2] It should be noted, however, that mental health deteriorated in the course of the second World War. 'The strong conviction is growing that the strain imposed by high pressure working, separation from close relatives, long delay in the receipt of mails and the extreme difficulty in some cases of securing a restful holiday in a different environment, are gradually having their insidious effect on the mental health of the non-native population, and the medical service is no exception.' (Ibid. *1942*, p. 1.)

the scanty figures published for some districts[1] have little value. The mortality figures for Asiatic officials have been so low in recent years that they inspire little confidence.[2]

[1] See *Medical Report 1921*, p. 128; *1922*, pp. 134, 143; *1923*, pp. 60, 65, 71; *1924*, pp. 165, 186; *1925*, pp. 42, 70; *1927*, pp. 47–8, 51, 85; *1928*, pp. 54–5, 64, 75, 87; *1929*, pp. 50–2, 91; *1931*, p. 22; *1932*, p. 25; *1933*, pp. 20–1; *1934*, pp. 32, 34.

[2] Even assuming that every Asiatic official was discharged in case of serious illness, it seems incredible that with an average strength of 900 there should have been only 1 death in 1937 and no death at all in 1938.

CHAPTER XI

NORTHERN RHODESIA[1]

I. CENSUS-TAKING

1. *Native Population*

No census has yet been taken of the native population.[2] The first estimates of the population by the British administration were 'obtained from the Native Tax returns'.[3] But in his report for 1926 the Secretary for Native Affairs says:[4]

The figures given are obtained from a Census taken by Native Commissioners in the course of their journeys among the villages in their Sub-districts and from reports of births, deaths[5] and removals. Where it has been impossible to visit all villages in any given Sub-district in the course of the year the factor obtained from those which have been visited is applied to the remainder and a fairly accurate result for the whole Sub-district is thus arrived at.

The 1928 Report upon Native Affairs states:[6]

The native population of the Territory is estimated on the basis of the ratio of increase (or decrease) over the last five years . . . . This system of estimating the population is an innovation, and cannot be used indefinitely, as it cannot reasonably be applied to those districts that attract immigrants from adjoining Territories.'

It is often impossible for a District Officer to carry out a complete check of the population throughout his district during the year, but in most districts it is possible to visit about two-thirds of the villages. It would therefore seem better to base the estimate of population on the result of the figures actually obtained in the villages visited.

Subsequent reports contain the following comments on the methods used:

1930.[7] It has not been possible for District Officers to visit more than an average of 60 per cent. of the villages in the Territory. In compiling statistics, District Commissioners have used new figures in respect of villages visited, but have usually repeated 1929 figures in respect of villages unvisited. The more correct method would have been to estimate an increase in unvisited areas proportionate to that found to exist in visited areas.

[1] Northern Rhodesia, which comprises the northern part of the territory formerly administered by the British South Africa Company, was subdivided in 1899–1900 into North-Western and North-Eastern Rhodesia. The two areas were amalgamated in 1911 under the designation of Northern Rhodesia, and the administration of the Company (subject to the exercise of certain powers of control by the Crown) continued until 1924, when the administration of the territory was assumed by the Crown.

[2] Nor is there any prospect that a native census will be taken in the near future. The Chief Secretary, on 21 June 1945, said in the Legislative Council: '. . . while the desirability of carrying out some form of enumeration as soon as possible is fully realised, it is not considered that a complete census of the Territory is practicable at present due to the acute shortage of staff. It is hoped, however, to carry out an enumeration in a simplified form of the European and Asiatic population in 1946.' (*Debates*, vol. 50, col. 21.)

[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1924–5*, p. 5; *1925–6*, p. 5.

[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1926*, p. 33.

[5] It seems most unlikely that there existed at that time any records of births or deaths; see p. 482 below.

[6] Ibid. *1928*, p. 5.

[7] Ibid. *1930*, p. 10.

1931.[1] . . . it is not possible to visit annually every village and count the people and reliance has to be placed to a certain extent on methods of estimation. In five districts every village was visited at least once, in one district no travelling was undertaken at all on account of the removal of the Government Station to a new site, sickness and consequent change of staff, in other districts about 60 per cent. of the villages were inspected.

The methods of estimating the population varied and the figures were arrived at in several ways. Some District Officers counted the inhabitants at the villages visited during the year and used last year's figures for the unvisited areas, while others applied to the unvisited villages the variation found in the visited areas. In one district the estimate was reached by the use of a formula for children of 1·33 children per adult female with a sex ratio of 100 male to 108 female children, and in another district the children were entered at the same figure as the previous year.

1932.[2] The population figures are based partly on enumeration and partly on estimate. The enumerated figures are obtained by counting the people in the villages visited when this is possible and then applying the variation proportionately to the unvisited areas. In one district the population was computed by counting the huts in the villages and calculating each hut to contain 2·5 persons; in another district the children were estimated at 1·33 per adult female.

1933.[3] . . . various methods of estimating the total population are in vogue in different districts. In one calculations have been based on a factor of 2·34 persons per hut, in another the estimated figures have been arrived at by taking twenty per thousand as the average increase in child population, and allowing for an adult death rate of 15 per thousand and a small increase due to immigration.

1934.[4] They [the statistics] are obtained for the most part by a process of calculation based on an actual count at one or two villages, but methods vary considerably . . . .

It seems, therefore, that the basis of the estimates became more and more uncertain. While according to the 1928 report about two-thirds of the villages were visited in most districts, and according to the 1930 report 'an average of 60 per cent. of the villages in the Territory', an actual count (which in 1931 was still made by some District Officers in all the villages visited) was made in 1934 only 'at one or two villages'. But the thoroughness of the earlier investigations may have been overstated. The District Officer of Ndola returned for 1929 the same number of men, women, boys, and girls as for 1928. Those figures were also identical in Lundazi, Mazabuka, and Solwezi for 1929 and 1930, in Balovale and Broken Hill for 1931 and 1932, in Isoka and Kasempa for 1933 and 1934.[5] It is difficult to see how, even if only a single village had been 'visited', the returns could possibly have been identical in two different years.

The Reports on Native Affairs themselves contain also comments on the results obtained through these estimates and on their accuracy. The 1930 report says that 'there is reason to suppose that figures submitted from many districts are underestimated' since the District Commissioners usually repeated the 1929 figures in respect of villages unvisited. It estimates that the actual increase in the year was about 45,000 or 3·4 per cent. instead of 32,612 or 2·5 per cent. as shown in the reports from the District Officers.[6] In 1931 the total number of adult females showed a decrease of 2,191.

[1] Ibid. *1931*, p. 12. [2] Ibid. *1932*, p. 14. [3] Ibid. *1933*, p. 16. [4] Ibid. *1934*, p. 12.
[5] See ibid. *1928*, Appendix B; *1929*, p. 29; *1930*, p. 36; *1931*, p. 47; *1932*, p. 43; *1933*, p. 48; *1934*, p. 41.
[6] See ibid. *1930*, p. 10.

This decrease is an obvious error which can be readily explained. From 1930, owing to the abolition of the taxation of plural wives, the names of women were omitted from the Tax Registers and statistics in respect of adult females became less reliable. There is not now the same necessity for an accurate check on the female population as formerly and many must have been absent when villages were visited. There are no grounds whatever for believing that adult females in the Territory are decreasing in number; all the evidence available is to the contrary.[1]

In some Districts (Broken Hill, Mpika, Namwala, Ndola) the apparent decrease in the number of adult females exceeded 10 per cent.

In 1932 the total number of adult females showed a further decrease of 2,894.

The decrease is not accounted for and is no doubt occasioned by an inaccurate estimate of the number of adult females in the villages. Since the practice of including women and children in tax registers was discontinued with the abolition of the taxation on plural wives there has been less necessity for an accurate enumeration of the women and the figures are now only an intelligent estimate. There is no reason to presume that the number of adult females in the Territory is decreasing.[2]

In this, as in the preceding and subsequent reports, the Department of Native Affairs accepted every figure which showed a population increase but usually doubted the accuracy of figures which indicated a decrease.

1932.[3] The net increase in population over 1931 is 10,470 or ·763 per cent., which is lower than last year when the increase was 3·1 per cent. Four provinces shew a decrease in population and for this no reason is suggested in the case of the Tanganyika and Kafue Provinces. The decline in the Batoka Province is explained by an error in the 1931 figures caused by a native clerk who had entered the names of a large number of taxpayers twice in the tax register and who was eventually transferred to a mental hospital.[4] The apparent drop in population in the Kasempa Province is occasioned by an over-estimate of the population in 1931 in respect of the Solwezi District.

Fourteen districts shew a decrease in the number of taxable males for which it is not easy to find the cause as there does not appear to be any appreciable increase in the number of persons exempted from tax. There is, however, a large number of natives in permanent employment at European centres, and of squatters on farms, and in spite of regulations prohibiting unauthorised persons from living on mining properties some do manage to remain thereon supported by their friends and relations in the hope of finding employment and it may be that many of these natives escape enumeration at their home districts. These people may pay tax in the district of their work and not be included in the tax register of the district where they are permanently domiciled and are not therefore included in the estimate of population of their home districts. Detribalised natives of this class are increasing and unless they are enumerated in the tax registers of the districts where they pay tax they may have some effect upon statistics.

1933.[5] It will be seen that the total population for 1933 is less by 11,492 than the figure shown for 1932. In the Awemba and Tanganyika Provinces increases varying

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, pp. 11–12. [2] Ibid. *1932*, p. 14. [3] Ibid.

[4] As a matter of fact the decrease in the Batoka Province (by 4,666) was due to a decrease in the Kalomo District (by 7,197) which cannot be attributed to a large overstatement of taxpayers in 1931, since the returns for 1931–3 were as follows:

Year	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Taxable*
1931	10,540	15,960	10,700	12,000	9,460
1932	10,435	12,249	9,592	9,727	9,217
1933	10,740	12,614	9,871	10,028	9,753

[5] Ibid. *1933*, p. 16.

from slight to normal are shown in four districts while four show decreases and one no change. The decreases are probably due to miscalculation of women and children in previous years, the ultimate deletion from the tax registers of the names of men long absent from their districts and, in the case of districts such as Chiengi, bordering on the Belgian Congo, to removals to and fro across the frontier.

In the East Luangwa Province slight increases are shown in all three districts. It is interesting to note that in the Petauke District the population, which in 1913 amounted to 35,000, stood last year at 72,069. The rate of increase indicated by these figures is very high, but this is a border district and there was considerable immigration in the first ten years of the period. . . .

The Kasempa Province shows a slight increase in two districts with a decrease of 2,000 or 8·34 per cent. in the Mwinilunga District, which is attributed by the officer in charge of the district to emigration on account of the high rate of tax imposed as compared with that levied by neighbouring states, 3*s*. in Angola and 5*s*. in the Belgian Congo, to be reduced as from the beginning of 1934 to 3*s*. In these circumstances it is clear that emigration from this area will continue. . . . In the Batoka Province the outstanding feature is a decrease shown of 12,286, due to the fact that the population of one district was inaccurately estimated in 1932, owing to the curtailment of district travelling on account of shortage of staff, and that in a second district natives from other areas temporarily resident for purposes of work, etc., were incorrectly included in the total. During 1933 a head count was made of the great portion of the area covered by the inaccurate figures of the previous year, and it may be assumed that the numbers now shown are reasonably accurate. . . .

Too much reliance cannot be placed on figures of population arrived at under the present system of estimation, as was remarked last year. There is probably a considerable number of detribalised men who have escaped enumeration in their home districts, having been absent for many years. There is also the fact that a count is no longer made of women and children, and that various methods of estimating the total population are in vogue in different districts. . . .

It is impossible owing to the varying conditions obtaining in different portions of the Territory to lay down any hard and fast rule for the estimation of population figures, and the results arrived at must therefore remain at best a matter of speculation, in so far as concerns those relating to the total population as distinct from taxable males.[1]

1934.[2] The total shows a decrease of 4,788 as compared with the figures for 1933, but too close reliance cannot be placed on the accuracy of the statistics given. . . .

The only province which shows a decrease is Barotse, which has a drop of some 20,300. All other provinces show increases of varying magnitude, none of them outstanding. The district in Barotse mainly responsible for the reduced figures is Kalabo, where a decrease of 17,652 is recorded. It is stated that some 6,000 adults have returned to Portuguese West Africa and that about 2,500 have removed to other districts during the past year or two. The balance appears to be due to a closer estimate having been made of the population than has been the case in previous years. In the Lundazi District an increase of 3,071 is attributed to immigration from Nyasaland . . . . In the Central Province it is estimated that in addition

[1] At the discussion of the 'Native Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 1935' in the Legislative Council, on 3 May 1935, the Member for the Eastern Electoral Area called attention to the fact that the percentage of taxable males among the total population was apparently very low. The Provincial Commissioner for the Southern Province replied: 'It must be remembered that taxpayers are counted very accurately every year, their names are entered in books and records are kept of them, but in the case of population it is almost impossible to give a really accurate estimate of what the increase or decrease of the population has been in any particular area. . . . It is doubtful whether, with the staff at our disposal, we could improve on the present method, but it must be remembered that that method is not as good as it should be and the population count is purely an estimate, and therefore it is not really reasonable to compare the actual count of taxpayers with an estimate—and a vague estimate it must be—of the total population.' (See *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxiv, pp. 35–6.)

[2] *Report upon Native Affairs 1934*, p. 12.

to the village population there are between 45,000 and 50,000 natives living or visiting in urban areas.

Some of these comments are by no means convincing. I shall give as an illustration two examples chosen from the 1934 report.[1] The population decrease in the Kalabo District from 81,135 in 1933 to 63,483 in 1934 is explained (1) by the return of some 6,000 adults to Portuguese West Africa and the removal of 2,500 to other districts in 1933 and 1934, and (2) by a closer estimate of the population. It should be expected, therefore, that the decline was particularly large for adult males. In fact, however, the men decreased only by 3,746, the women by 4,603, and the children by 9,303.

Year	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
1933	20,912	25,200	17,802	17,221	81,135
1934	17,166	20,597	13,038	12,682	63,483

Since the number of children returned in 1928–34 was 35,130, 35,675, 36,098, 33,619, 34,260, 35,023, and 25,720 respectively, it would seem that the main reason for the apparent decrease in population was a gross overstatement of the number of children in each of the years 1928–33.

The increase of 3,071 in the Lundazi District 'is attributed to immigration from Nyasaland'. It should be expected, therefore, that the increase was particularly large for adult males. In fact, however, the number of men decreased.

Year	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
1933	10,133	14,102	9,649	8,987
1934	9,843	15,005	10,824	10,260

Since at the same time the number of taxable men decreased from 8,364 to 7,811, it is evident that the apparent population increase was not due to immigration but to an understatement in 1933 of the number of women and particularly of children.

In view of the emphasis which the reports lay on the omissions of adult females it is of interest to compare the trend in the official figures for adult males, adult females, and children.[2]

Year	*Adult males*	*Adult females*	*Children*	*Adult males 1929 = 100*	*Adult females 1929 = 100*	*Children 1929 = 100*
1924	299,731	384,593	422,210	89·6	86·5	81·3
1925	304,434	392,819	443,389	91·1	88·3	85·3
1926	312,802	412,137	474,124	93·6	92·7	91·3
1927	320,272	420,832	496,382	95·8	94·6	95·5
1928	326,714	428,607	506,651	97·7	96·4	97·5
1929	334,355	444,780	519,516	100·0	100·0	100·0
1930	345,517	448,493	537,219	103·3	100·8	103·4
1931	369,882	446,302	556,051	110·6	100·3	107·0
1932	374,572	445,408	562,725	112·0	100·1	108·3
1933	372,129	438,701	560,383	111·3	98·6	107·9
1934	368,829	436,292	561,304	110·3	98·1	108·0

[1] For the unsatisfactory explanation of the population movements in the Batoka Province 1930–2 see p. 404 above. [2] See *Blue Book 1924*, Section O, p. 3, to *1934*, Section O, p. 3.

That the number of children since 1930 increased apparently less than the number of adult males may be due to the fact that the number of children was sometimes estimated in proportion to the (decreasing) figure for adult females. It should also be borne in mind that the figure for adult males, quite apart from other reasons, was inaccurate because it included a large number of absentees—in 1931 over 10 per cent.—which number, of course, was always uncertain.

For a long time—in fact, as long as the estimates showed a population increase for the Territory—the administration believed them to be fairly accurate,[1] and did not even challenge the accuracy of earlier estimates when the apparent increase was incredibly large. Thus, when in 1929 the official estimates showed an apparent population increase of 56 per cent. since 1911 and of 38 per cent. since 1919, the Report upon Native Affairs naïvely stated: 'It is interesting to note that the average increase over a period of eighteen years has been 26,327 per annum, while over the period of ten years the average increase has been at the rate of 36,020 per annum.'[2] But when the figures for 1933 and 1934 showed a population decrease it was decided to abolish the practice of annual estimates of the native population of the Territory. So great was the distrust of the figures hitherto given that the Medical Report for 1935, after having shown that the official estimates for 1930–4 had been 1,331,231, 1,372,235, 1,382,705, 1,371,213, and 1,366,425 respectively, dismissed all these figures by stating: 'Beyond saying that the native population is at present about a million and a quarter, no estimate worth quoting is obtainable.'[3]

Since 1934 the situation has been quite chaotic. The Provincial Commissioners in their reports either

(1) did not mention the subject at all, or

(2) said merely that 'it is singularly difficult to express any reliable view on the state of the population in the native districts without any count or estimate having been made or submitted',[4] or

(3) said that 'there is no reason to suppose that there has been any abnormal increase or decrease',[5] or

(4) made a guess of no value whatsoever,[6] or

(5) showed the population only for a section of their Province (for example, the mining centres), or

(6) gave an estimate of the total population of their Province as in 1934 and earlier years.

[1] See, for example, *Colonial Reports 1924–5*, p. 5; *1925–6*, p. 5.

[2] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 8.

[3] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 8.

[4] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 15. See also ibid. *1938*, p. 32.

[5] Ibid. *1935*, p. 30. See also ibid., pp. 14, 50; *1936*, pp. 30, 45; *1937*, p. 13.

[6] See, for example, ibid. *1935*, p. 68: 'The total native population of the [Eastern] Province as given in last year's report was 242,662. The number of emigrants may be said to balance the number of immigrants so that if we may presume that the District Commissioner, Fort Jameson, is correct in estimating the natural increase over deaths at three per cent. per annum of the adult female population, by adding the figure thus obtained we arrive at a total of 245,000 for the Province.'

The Barotse Province is apparently the only one for which the estimates were not discontinued in 1935. Here, without any change in boundary, the *de facto* population was said to have increased from 177,403 in 1921 to 327,617 in 1931.[1] The latter figure was obtained by deducting 5,181 absentees from the estimated figure of 1930 (332,798). Including absentees the estimates for 1931–4 were 342,439, 352,716, 352,384, and 332,093 respectively. The comments of the Provincial Commissioner in his reports for 1935–8 read as follows:

1935.[2] The native population of the Province numbers approximately 331,680 persons, a decrease of 600 since last year. The reduction of 6,000 in the Mongu–Lealui District, due to the estimate given last year being considered excessive, is partly counterbalanced by an increase of about 3,600 in the Balovale District, attributed entirely to immigration. In the remaining districts the population has remained about stationary. . . .

It is not claimed that the figure given above is correct: that 23,000 natives have had to be 'written off' in two years shows that estimation is far from perfect.

1936.[3] The population of the Province is estimated to be 325,082 souls, a decrease of 6,600 since last year or 17,357 since the decennial census in 1931. . . .

The decline since last year is due to the deletion from the Registers of persons absent at work and in default of tax for the past four years or more. But the decrease since 1931 is more difficult to account for. It has not been due to emigration, which is more than counter-balanced by immigration from Angola into the Balovale District; nor is it entirely attributable to a high infant mortality and a high sterility rate. I am inclined to infer that former computations have been over-estimated, and where actual enumeration of the population has been carried out, this opinion has been confirmed.

1937.[4] The native population of the Province is estimated to be 297,000, a decrease of 38,082[5] since last year. . . .

The greatest decreases are in the Mongu–Lealui, 11,784; in Balovale District, 9,000 and in Sesheke District, 5,000. The District Commissioners of these districts state that the decrease is due to more accurate estimating and the deletion from the registers of persons who have left the Province and of others who have died. Population is estimated by a careful count in one area to ascertain the proportion between the number of taxpayers and the total population and then applying the factor obtained to the whole district. It is thought that in the past this factor has been estimated at too high a figure.

1938.[6] There has been little alteration in the estimates of population of the Province during the year and, as women and children are not normally counted, it is difficult to obtain an accurate estimate. . . .

The principal decrease is in the Kalabo District and the principal increase in the Senanga District. The general count of the population is gradually becoming more accurate as careful checks are made on the tax registers and persons who have left the Province for a number of years are deleted.

It is obvious that at least in this Province, which according to the 1931 census report comprised one-quarter of the population of the whole Territory, the errors in the estimates were so great that reasonable conclusions concerning population increase or decrease are out of the question.

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 36.
[2] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, pp. 85–6.
[3] Ibid. *1936*, p. 85. [4] Ibid. *1937*, p. 95. [5] Should read '28,082'.
[6] Ibid. *1938*, p. 89. The total population was estimated at 295,741.

How chaotic the population statistics had become since 1934 can also be inferred from the fact that the Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Financial and Economic Position of Northern Rhodesia (the Pim Commission) was provided with a table[1] according to which the total native population 'as at May, 1937' numbered 1,436,941, a figure which, it seems to me, can be explained only by several areas having been entered twice.[2] The Commission itself came to the following conclusion:

> Little reliance can be placed on the figures for the native inhabitants, as is usual in the case of statistics relating to the African. The apparent large increase between 1911 and 1931 is probably due to a somewhat more accurate estimate, while the estimates for later years rest mainly on a basis of speculation. All that can be said is that there does not appear to be any reason for thinking that there has been any substantial increase of population since 1931, and in some areas it has probably diminished.[3]

But it is difficult to tell whether any of the estimates can claim to be 'more accurate' than the others. As to the so-called census figure of 1931—it actually is the estimated figure of 1930 minus the estimated number of absentees in May 1931—the only thing which distinguishes it from the other estimates is that it has been incorporated in the report on the 1931 census of non-natives.

This report contains, however, some information concerning natives which deserves mentioning. 'Advantage was taken of the Census organization to obtain from employers of native labour a return of all natives in their service, the nature of the work performed, and the countries whence this labour came.'[4] This information is very valuable, so far as it goes. It covers 77,763 males and 1,503 females, i.e. about one-quarter of the male adults and 0·3 per cent. of the female adults. An effort was also made to count the natives 'living in various proclaimed towns', but unfortunately 'purely mining townships where special conditions exist, such as Nkana, Mufulira, etc., were purposely omitted from this part of the Census'.[5] How important these omissions were can be inferred from the fact that the numbers of natives 'in employment' in Nkana and Luanshya were 7,889 and 7,796 respectively,[6] while the largest town for which the number of natives is given is Livingstone with altogether 7,930 native inhabitants[7] (of whom 4,786 were in employment). It is, moreover, difficult to reconcile the statement on page 99 of the Report that the total number of natives in the town of Solwezi was 172 with the statement on page 38 that the number of natives in employment in this town was 1,318.

[1] See Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 388.

[2] According to the table on page 388 of the Report the area of the Western Province would be 65,585 square miles, while on page 164 it is given correctly as 43,985 square miles. The population of this Province is given at both places as 147,054, while according to *Blue Book 1937*, Section O, p. 2, it was estimated at 96,930.

[3] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 7.

[4] *Census Report 1931*, p. 36.

[5] Ibid., p. 38.

[6] See ibid.

[7] See ibid., p. 99.

2. *Non-native Population*

The censuses of 1921[1] and 1931 were taken in accordance with the following Ordinance:[2]

1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Census Ordinance.

2. An account shall be taken in manner hereinafter directed of the number of persons and the number of each kind of live stock within the Territory on such day in such year or years as the Governor may by notice in the *Gazette* appoint.

The Governor may by such notice either direct a general account to be taken or direct that the account shall be limited to any specified class or classes of persons or to any specified kind or kinds of live stock.[3]

3. For the taking of such account the Governor may appoint and remove Supervisors and define the districts or areas for which they shall respectively act and determine the number of Enumerators to be appointed by such Supervisors respectively.

4. Every Supervisor shall subject to the approval of the Governor appoint Enumerators for his district or area and assign sub-districts to such Enumerators and subject to such approval as aforesaid may remove any such Enumerator and appoint another in his place.

5. Every Enumerator shall make and subscribe before a *Magistrate or*[4] Justice of the Peace a solemn declaration in the form in the Schedule and shall deliver the same to the Supervisor of the district when returning the forms under this Proclamation.

6. The Governor may from time to time by notice in the *Gazette* make, alter and rescind regulations prescribing the forms to be used in the taking of the account in the second section mentioned and for the execution of all matters and things arising under this Ordinance not herein expressly provided for including regulations for ascertaining the number of natives and of persons travelling on the appointed day within the Territory and for the collection of agricultural, educational, industrial or other statistics by means of the Census Supervisors and Enumerators, and generally for the more fully carrying out the objects and purposes of this Ordinance: and every person who shall be guilty of a breach of any such regulations shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Five Pounds.

[1] Government Notice No. 113 of 1920 (28 Oct.), *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 5 Nov. 1920, p. 147, appointed 3 May 1921 as the census day. Censuses had been taken in 1911 in North-Eastern Rhodesia without special legal enactment, and in North-Western Rhodesia in accordance with 'The North-Western Rhodesia Census Proclamation, 1911' (reprinted in *The Statute Law of North-Eastern Rhodesia, 1908–11*, &c., pp. 81–3). This Proclamation, issued by the High Commissioner on 25 Feb. 1911, provided for the taking of an account 'of the number of persons and the number of each kind of live stock within the Territory of North-Western Rhodesia on such day in the year One thousand Nine hundred and Eleven, and on such date in any subsequent year as the Administrator may appoint'.

[2] No. 6 of 1918 (20 June), 'Northern Rhodesia Census Proclamation 1918', *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 2 July 1918, pp. 69–70, reprinted in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force 1930*, vol. i, pp. 184–6 (cap. 21). The Ordinance was originally issued by the High Commissioner as a Proclamation which began as follows:

WHEREAS there is in force in the former Territory of North-Western Rhodesia a law entitled the North-Western Rhodesia Census Proclamation 1911 (No. 9 of 1911):

AND WHEREAS it is desirable to repeal and with necessary modifications to re-enact the said law for the Territory of Northern Rhodesia:

Now Therefore under and by virtue of the powers in me vested I do hereby declare proclaim and make known as follows:

1. This Proclamation may be cited for all purposes as 'The Northern Rhodesia Census Proclamation 1918'.

[3] This paragraph was added by Ordinance No. 33 of 1945 (24 Dec.), 'Census Amendment Ordinance, 1945', *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 28 Dec. 1945, Supplement.

[4] Italicized words inserted by Ordinance No. 36 of 1933 (30 Nov.), 'Subordinate Courts Ordinance', reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1933*, pp. 237–65, and in *1939 Supplement to Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 637–64.

7. The Governor may in such localities as may to him appear proper cause the necessary forms together with general instructions to be printed on the back of such forms to be left on or before the day appointed by the Governor under the provisions of section *two* at any dwelling in any Enumerator's sub-district and in all such cases it shall be the duty of the occupier or person in charge of such dwelling to deliver on demand the said forms duly completed in every particular to the Enumerator calling for the same; provided that the said Enumerator shall forthwith examine the said forms as handed to him and shall satisfy himself that the said forms have been fully, truly and correctly filled up and if not so filled up in every particular the Enumerator shall himself then and there make the same complete according to the best information which he shall be able to obtain.

8. In cases not provided for by the last section the Enumerator shall on the day next following that fixed by the Governor under the provisions of section *two* or as soon thereafter as possible proceed to receive or take an account in writing of the number of persons who were within the limits of his sub-district on the night of the day so fixed and shall inform himself of all the particulars specified in the said forms using a separate form for each family occupying a separate dwelling or a separate portion of a dwelling, the word 'dwelling' meaning and including any house, building, booth, tent, wagon, cart, hut or other erection in or under which any person usually sleeps.

9. On receipt of the completed forms they shall be examined by such officer as the Governor may appoint for that purpose and any defects or inaccuracies found therein shall be supplied or corrected as far as may be possible.

10. If any occupier or person in charge of any dwelling shall refuse or wilfully neglect to fill up to the best of his knowledge, information or belief, the forms left under the provisions of section *seven* at such dwelling, or to sign and deliver the same or shall refuse or wilfully neglect to answer or shall untruly answer any inquiry made by an Enumerator for any of the purposes of this Ordinance or shall wilfully make, sign or deliver or cause to be made, signed or delivered any false return or statement of any particular in such forms, or shall obstruct any person in the performance of any duty under this Ordinance, the person so offending shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Five Pounds. Such fine shall not be imposed on any person who from conscientious scruples shall omit or decline to state his religion and the proof of such conscientious scruple may be the filling up of the column set apart for that purpose with the word 'object'; and such fine shall not be imposed for any false return or statement regarding the number of his livestock against any person who, not being aware of the precise number of such stock, shall give in respect thereof an estimate or reasonable approximation to the truth.

11. If any person accept the office of Enumerator under this Ordinance and afterwards without lawful excuse refuse or wilfully neglect to perform any duty of such office the person so offending shall on conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Five Pounds.

12. If any Officer, Supervisor, Enumerator or clerk divulge the contents of any forms under this Ordinance, he shall for every such offence be liable to a fine not exceeding Five Pounds.

13. All fines imposed under this Ordinance or the regulations promulgated thereunder shall be recoverable in a summary manner before a magistrate, and in default of payment of any fine the accused shall be liable to imprisonment with or without hard labour for any period not exceeding one month unless such fine be sooner paid.

A General Notice fixed 5 May as the day of the 1931 Census.[1]

The following Notice[2] concerning the forms to be used for the taking of the census was issued by the Director of Census:

It is hereby notified for public information that His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to declare that the forms, particulars of which appear in the Schedule

[1] No. 7 of 1931 (5 Jan.), *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 9 Jan. 1931, p. 3.

[2] General Notice No. 96 of 1931 (5 Mar.), ibid., 13 Mar. 1931, p. 50.

hereto and which shall be distributed by the enumerators, have been prescribed as the forms to be used for the purpose of the Census to be taken on Tuesday the Fifth day of May, 1931.

SCHEDULE

Form C. 1. Householders, Europeans.
Particulars. (1) Name and Surname. (2) Relationship to head of family. (3) Age. (4) Sex. (5) Particulars as to marriage. (6) Languages spoken. (7) Nationality. (8) Birthplace. (9) Religion. (10) Education of Children. (11) Profession or Occupation. (12) Infirmity. (13) Residence. (14) Length of Residence.
Form C. 2. Householders. Coloured Persons and other Persons of Mixed Race.
Particulars. Same as C. 1.
Form C. 3. Householders. Indian and Asiatic.
Particulars. Same as C. 1.
Form C. 4. Natives in Employment.
Particulars. Numbers of Natives in employment under the heads of 'Skilled', 'Unskilled' and 'Country of Origin'.
Form C. 5. Enumeration of House. Urban Areas only.
Particulars. . . .[1] (6) Total Number of Persons residing on premises.
Form C. 7. Enumeration of Buildings and Non-European Inhabitants in Government, Public and Labour Compounds (Urban Areas only).
Particulars. (1) Number of Buildings. (2) Number residing in Compounds.
Form C. 13. Special Rail and Coach Book.. (For persons travelling by rail or coach.)
Particulars. Same as Householders Form C. 1.

'For the purpose of tabulation the original data, contained in the completed European householders' schedules, having been coded into numerals were transferred to Hollerith cards by means of a punching machine, the cards, one for each European, being eventually sent to Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, for tabulation by the Hollerith Electrical Process at the office of the Government Statistician.'[2] All data concerning Asiatics, coloured and native persons, and information dealing with buildings were tabulated by hand in the Northern Rhodesia Census Office.[3]

The census report merely states that 'the enumerators as a whole performed their duties in a satisfactory manner'.[4] When asked in the Legislative Council (22 July 1931) 'Is Government satisfied that the recent Census in Northern Rhodesia is a complete one?', the Chief Secretary replied:

> The arrangements made for conducting the recent Census were adequate and the Government is satisfied that the figures will be as complete as possible, though it is realised that a few persons may have wilfully avoided enumeration.[5]

The cost of the census, as shown in the annual Blue Books,[6] was £1,064. 19*s.* 1*d.* or £73. 14*s.* 3*d.* for each 1,000 enumerated non-natives. The census report, dated 29 September 1931, at a time when not all expenses had been incurred, stated:[7]

> The cost of this Census calculated per head of the European, Asiatic and Coloured persons, was 13·59*d.* The enumeration of natives in employment and of natives living in the various towns has not been taken into account. The cost of office

[1] (1) to (5) refer to housing.
[2] *Census Report 1931*, p. 6.
[3] See ibid.
[4] Ibid. 5.
[5] *Debates*, vol. xiv, p. 4.
[6] See Northern Rhodesia, *Blue Book 1930*, Section B, p. 17; *1931*, Section B, p. 17; *1932*, Section B, p. 19.
[7] *Census Report 1931*, p. 42.

equipment (Hollerith Punch and Verifying Punch) and furniture, the salary of the Lady Clerk, pay and expenses of native staff,[1] cost of tabulation by the Southern Rhodesia Government, and charges in connection with some printing done outside the Government Printing Office have been included, together with payments to Enumerators,[2] when arriving at the above figure. The salary of the Director of Census has not been included.[3]

On 20 June 1946 the Acting Chief Secretary to the Government issued the following Notice:[4]

In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Governor by section 2 of the Census Ordinance, Tuesday the 15th day of October, 1946, is hereby appointed to be the day on which a census account shall be taken within the Territory.

And it is directed that the census shall be limited to Europeans, Asiatics and other races, Coloured Persons and employed Africans.

Census Regulations were issued by the Acting Chief Secretary to the Government on the same day.[5]

In exercise of the powers conferred upon the Governor by section 6 of the Census Ordinance, the following Regulations are hereby made:

1. These Regulations may be cited as the Census Regulations, 1946, and shall apply to the Census to be taken on the 15th day of October, 1946.

2. In these Regulations—

'Census Day' means Tuesday the 15th day of October, 1946;

'Chief Supervisor' means the person appointed as Supervisor for the whole Territory.

3. All persons, other than Africans who are not in employment, who are in the Territory or attending school or university outside the Territory on the census day shall be enumerated.

4. (1) The forms set out in the Schedules to these Regulations shall be the forms to be used in the taking of the census.

(2) The Chief Supervisor shall include directions on the prescribed forms explaining the manner in which they are to be completed.

5. (1) Every person, *other than an African*, travelling in any railway train on the night of the census day shall answer fully, truly and correctly, all questions put to him by an enumerator to enable such enumerator to complete in respect of such person or any member of his family travelling with him the form prescribed in Schedule I to these Regulations.

(2) Every form completed in terms of sub-regulation (1) of this regulation shall be attested by the signature or mark of the traveller.

(3) To every traveller who has furnished the particulars required in terms of sub-regulation (1) of this regulation the enumerator shall issue a certificate recording the fact that such person has been enumerated.

6. The occupier or person in charge of any dwelling, office, ship, store, mill, mine, factory, railway station, quarry, farm or other place where Africans are employed shall complete the form prescribed in Schedule V to these Regulations in respect of all Africans who are in employment at such place on the census day and hand or send

[1] According to ibid., p. 5, the native Census Office Staff consisted of one office boy.

[2] Of the 88 enumerators 66 were members of the Civil Service or Police who received no extra pay whilst employed on Census duties. Payments to enumerators for work done and transport allowances were £562. (See ibid., pp. 5, 42.) The appointment of Supervisors caused no expense as each Provincial Commissioner was Supervisor for his Province (see General Notice No. 9 of 1931, 5 Jan., *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 9 Jan. 1931, p. 3).

[3] The Director was a District Officer with a salary of £810 in 1931.

[4] Government Notice No. 149 of 1946, *Supplement to the Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 5 July 1946, p. 153.

[5] Government Notice No. 150 of 1946, ibid., pp. 153-63.

such form, duly completed in every particular, to the enumerator who calls for or requires the return of such form.

7. Any person liable to enumeration who is not enumerated on the census day shall obtain the appropriate census forms from a District Commissioner and within fourteen days of the census day send such form, duly completed in every particular, to the Chief Supervisor, Lusaka.

8. The Chief Supervisor shall prepare written instructions as to the duties of supervisors and enumerators and furnish a copy of such instructions to each supervisor and enumerator.

9. Any person who fails to comply with any of the provisions of these Regulations is guilty of an offence in terms of section 6 of the Census Ordinance and accordingly liable to a fine not exceeding five pounds.

The Schedules to be used in taking the census ask for the following particulars:

Schedule II. Europeans or White Persons only.—A. Full Names and Surname; B. Relationship to Head of Household; C. Usual Residence; D. Income Group; E. Sex; F. Age; G.–K. Particulars as to Marriage; L. Birthplace; M. Length of Residence of Persons not born in the Territory; N. Nationality; O. Religious Denomination; P.–R. Occupation and Industry; S. Class and Size of Dwelling; T. Monthly Rent and Rates; U. Householder's Terms of Occupancy; V. Number and Size of Families.

Schedule III. Coloured Persons or Persons of Mixed Race.—A.–R. Same as Schedule II; S. Parentage; T.–W. Same as Schedule II, S.–V.

Schedule IV. Asiatics and 'Other Races'.—Same as Schedule II.

Schedule I. Special Form for each Person other than an African travelling by Rail at Midnight between the 15th and 16th October, 1946.—A. Full Names and Surname; B. Race; C. Usual Residence; D.–O. Same as Schedule III, E.–S.

Schedule V. Africans Employed on 15th October, 1946.—Number by Occupation, Sex, and Country of Origin (Northern Rhodesia, Other Territories); Number by Sex and Country of Origin (Southern Rhodesia, Portuguese Territory, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika, Other Sources); Remuneration of Africans detailed above as 'Domestic Service and Hotel and Personal Services'.

Schedule VI. Europeans or White Persons who are (1) not attending school during 1946, but who are between the ages of 6 and 15½ years, and/or (2) attending a School or University, outside Northern Rhodesia, during 1946.—(1) Names in Full; Sex; Age; Reasons for not attending School. (2) Names in Full; Sex; Age; whether attending School or University; Name and Place of School or University; School Standard or University Year.

II. Total Population

In his report for the two years ending 31 March 1900 the Administrator of North-Eastern Rhodesia, R. Codrington, estimated the number of natives at 256,000, but thought that this was an under-estimate.[1] For

[1] The 'estimate must be understood as being of no real value, but given for the purpose of conveying a vague idea of the approximate number of people in the country. The true number is almost certain to be larger than the figures here given.' (British South Africa Company, *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1898–1900*, p. 63.)

1901 he gave '300,000 as an approximate figure'.[1] 'A hut tax, on lines similar to that in force in Southern Rhodesia, was imposed during 1901',[2] and 'according to the Census Returns made by Native Commissioners' the native population was given as 338,878 in 1902,[3] and was estimated at 345,961 for 31 March 1903.[4] But all these were apparently still understatements, since the native population was put for 1907, 1908, 1910, and 1911 at 398,000,[5] 406,375,[6] 438,500,[7] and 441,930[7] respectively.

For North-Western Rhodesia the early figures are more uncertain still. *Statistical Tables, British Colonies* put the native population for 1904 at 400,000, for 1906 at 500,000, for 1907 at 322,000, and for 1908 and 1909 at 500,000;[8] *Colonial Office Lists* gave for 1906–10,500,000;[9] but the British South Africa Company put it for 1907, 1910, and 1911 at 320,400,[10] 357,586,[11] and 379,055[11] respectively.

For 1911, when North-Eastern and North-Western Rhodesia were amalgamated, the Company put the total native population of Northern Rhodesia at 820,985.[12] For 1912, 1914, 1916, and 1918 it was given as 824,756,[13] 875,000,[14] 884,000,[15] and 928,975[16] respectively. From 1918 to 1934 figures are available for each year.

The methods by which the estimates were obtained by the Department of Native Affairs have been discussed in Section I of this chapter. The figures include absentees. Their number, of course, varied considerably in the course of time. An attempt to ascertain the *de facto* population,

[1] See B.S.A.C., *Directors' Report and Accounts 31 Mar. 1899, and 31 Mar. 1900*, p. 38.

[2] Ibid., *31 Mar. 1901, and 31 Mar. 1902*, p. 14.

[3] See B.S.A.C., *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia, 1900–1902*, p. 433. 'This figure may be taken as being approximately correct, but it is probable that several groups of villages have not been enumerated.' See also Duff, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*, p. 392: 'With regard to the native population of North-Eastern Rhodesia, the census of 1900–1902 puts it at 338,878, which Mr. Codrington thinks is approximately correct. If this is so, then this territory must be but thinly peopled, with barely three inhabitants to the square mile; but, while I am not entitled to pronounce an opinion in this matter with regard to North-Eastern Rhodesia particularly, my general impression, based upon a good deal of practical experience, is that a census of natives in a new and wild country nearly always gives a total much below the true one, however carefully the figures may have been compiled.'

[4] See B.S.A.C., *Directors' Report and Accounts 1902–3*, p. 11. See also B.S.A.C., *Official Handbook of North-Eastern Rhodesia, Apr. 1903*, p. 9: 'Careful census returns are being made from every Native Division, and the following figures may be taken to represent very approximately the number of natives in the country: . . . Total 345,961.'

[5] See *Colonial Office List 1908*, p. 327.

[6] See B.S.A.C., *Directors' Report and Accounts 1907–8*, p. 50. Figure refers to 31 Mar. 1908.

[7] See ibid. *1910–11*, p. 61.

[8] See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1903*, p. 843; *1906*, p. 303; *1907*, p. 307; *1908*, p. 315; *1909*, p. 322.

[9] See *Colonial Office List 1907*, p. 317; *1908*, p. 327; *1909*, p. 326; *1910*, p. 332; *1911*, p. 325.

[10] See *Directors' Report and Accounts 1906–7*, p. 61. 'The figures for the Barotse, Ndola and Kasempa Districts are only approximate, the census being incomplete.'

[11] See ibid. *1910–11*, p. 56.

[12] *Colonial Office List 1912*, p. 327, says that in 1911 'the native population is estimated at about 1,000,000'.

[13] See *Directors' Report and Accounts 1911–12*, p. 78. 'The Native population is estimated by the District Officers at 824,756. A complete native census has not yet been possible; but when all natives are counted it is thought the total will be found to exceed 900,000.'

[14] See ibid. *1912–13 and 1913–14*, p. 15.

[15] See *Colonial Office List 1919*, p. 364. Figure refers to 31 Mar. 1916.

[16] See *Report on Native Affairs 1924–5*, Appendix 1. Figure refers apparently to 31 Dec. 1918.

TABLE 1. *Population by Race, Northern Rhodesia, 31 December 1918 to 1943*[1]

Year	*Natives*[2]	*Europeans*	*Asiatics*[3]	*Coloured*[4]
1918	928,975	..	..	..
1919	938,383	..	..	..
1920	977,674	..	..	..
1921	999,876	3,634[5]	56[5]	145[5]
1922	1,001,062	..	..	..
1923	1,052,193	..	55	..
1924	1,106,534	4,424	60	150
1925	1,140,642	4,624	59	150
1926	1,199,063	5,581	60	..
1927	1,237,486	7,275	79	..
1928	1,261,972	7,536	85	..
1929	1,298,651	9,981	100	..
1930	1,331,229	12,538	..	..
1931	1,372,235	13,305	176[6]	425[6]
1932	1,382,705	10,553	192	..
1933	1,371,213	11,278	179	..
1934	1,366,425	11,464	188	..
1935	..	9,913	227	..
1936	..	10,588	360	604
1937	..	10,588	421	..
1938	..	13,155	537	578
1939	..	13,087	620	714
1940	..	15,188	636	726
1941	..	14,948	683	664
1942	..	16,683	765	812
1943	..	18,745	819	929

[1] If not otherwise stated, figures are taken from *Blue Book 1924*, Section O, pp. 2–3, to *1943*, Section O, pp. 2–3.

[2] See for 1918–23 Department of Native Affairs, *Statistics 1925*, p. 4 B.

[3] See for 1921, 1931 *Census Report 1931*, p. 26; for 1923 *Legislative Council Debates* (vol. i), May 1924, col. 116; for 1924, *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1924–5*, p. 5; for 1925–7 *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 49, *1927*, p. 37; for 1928 *Police Report 1928*, p. 34; for 1929 *Legislative Council Debates* (vol. xi), Mar.–Apr. 1930, p. 9; for 1932–9 Police, *Report 1932*, p. 19, *1933*, p. 18, *1934*, p. 18, *1935*, p. 21, *1936*, p. 19, *1937*, p. 19, *1938*, p. 12, *1939*, p. 6.

[4] See for 1921, 1931 *Census Report 1931*, p. 31; for 1924, 1925 *Colonial Reports 1924–5*, p. 5, *1925–6*, p. 5.

[5] Census 3 May 1921.

[6] Census 5 May 1931.

however, was made in connexion with the non-native census of 1931 when the 'District Officers were asked to supply figures showing the population as estimated in their reports for the year 1930, less deductions based on calculations of the number of those who were absent from the Territory on Census night' (5 May). The population including and excluding absentees is shown in Table 2. The Director of Census drew the following conclusion:

> From the Annual Report for 1930 of the Honourable the Secretary for Native Affairs it appears that the native population of the Territory is 1,331,229. By deducting the total [supplied by the District Officers, i.e. 1,295,081] from this Annual Report it seems that some 36,000 natives domiciled in Northern Rhodesia were absent from the Territory in May last. They would be such as are known to be at work in other territories.[1]

But this conclusion is not correct.

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 35.

(1) In Kasempa Province the total for the *de facto* population is by 1,505 higher than the total for the population including absentees. 'The District Officer explains this by saying that he has recently revised his estimates.'[1] In Tanganyika Province the figure for the *de facto* female population is by 1,243 higher than the figure for the female population including absentees. Here, too, the revision of the original estimate is possibly the reason.[2] In any case, it is obvious that the total number of absentees recorded was larger than 'some 36,000'. Even if no absentee at all had been recorded in Kasempa Province and no female absentee in Tanganyika Province the total number of absentees recorded would have been 36,148+1,505+1,243 = 38,896. Moreover, some District Officers did not report absentee women or children, and these omissions may have been important.

(2) The figures of absentees do not represent only those who 'are known to be at work in other territories' but, in so far as the figures are complete, also the wives and children who accompanied those workers.

The estimates of the native population (including absentees) showed an increase from 938,383 in 1919 to 1,382,705 in 1932. The estimates for 1933 (1,371,213) and 1934 (1,366,425) showed slight decreases. From 1935 on the Colonial Reports have stated each year that no count has been made since 1934, 'but so far as is known there has been little change'.[3] The Medical Report for 1935 estimated the native population at 'about a million and a quarter',[4] and the report for 1936 said that 'there is probably justification for saying that the native population numbers something over a million and a quarter'.[5] The *Report on African Education* for 1944 puts the native population in 1944 at 1,544,000.[6]

The numbers of Europeans ascertained at the censuses of 1911, 1921, and 1931 were 1,497, 3,634, and 13,846 respectively.[7] For 1 April 1924,

[1] Ibid.

[2] It should be noted, however, that the revised estimate—36,766 adult females excluding absentees—would appear extraordinarily high since in the following year the number of adult females, including absentees, was stated to be 33,750 (see *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 47). It seems more likely, therefore, that the figure of 36,766 was an overstatement due to an arithmetical error.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1936*, p. 8; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 9.

[4] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 8.

[5] Ibid. *1936*, p. 6. The statement ibid. *1938*, p. 2, that the African population is 'guessed' at 1,377,959 is evidently due to a mistake. The *Blue Books* for 1936 and 1937 (Section O, p. 2) arrive at a *total* population of 1,377,959 by adding to the native population of 1,366,425 (1934) the number of 11,534 non-natives. The statement in *Medical Report 1941*, p. 2 (see also ibid. *1942*, p. 2), that the African population on 31 Dec. 1934 was estimated at 1,383,191 is likewise wrong; *Blue Book 1940*, Section O, p. 2, shows a *total* population (including non-natives) of 1,383,191.

[6] *Report*, p. 3.

[7] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 7. The figure for 1931 includes 195 visitors to the Territory at the time of the census; see ibid., p. 6.

Early figures for North-Eastern Rhodesia were as follows: 'Europeans residing or travelling in North-Eastern Rhodesia' 30 Sept. 1899 and 1900, 129 and 164 respectively (see British South Africa Company, *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1898–1900*, p. 73, *Directors' Report and Accounts 31 Mar. 1899, and 31 Mar. 1900*, p. 38); 1902, approximately 188 (see *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1900–2*, p. 433); Mar. 1903, 241 (see *Official Handbook of North-Eastern Rhodesia, Apr. 1903*, p. 10); 1904, 250 (see *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1903*, p. 843);

TABLE 2. *Native Population including Absentees and De Facto Native Population by Sex and Age, Northern Rhodesia, 1930–1*[1]

Province	*Population including Absentees 1930*					*De Facto Population 1930–1*					*Difference*				
	Adults		*Children*			*Adults*		*Children*			*Adults*		*Children*		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Awemba . .	34,929	46,066	34,157	33,040	148,212	32,983	45,841	34,084	32,968	145,876	−1,946	−245	−73	−72	−2,336
Barotse . .	96,553	117,404	57,643	61,198	332,798	91,533	117,323	57,614	61,147	327,617	−5,020	−81	−29	−51	−5,181
Batoka . .	37,430	49,474	33,419	32,333	152,656	36,584	48,866	33,067	32,031	150,548	−846	−606	−352	−302	−2,106
East Luangwa .	55,644	78,608	44,885	45,594	224,731	40,284	78,608	44,885	45,576	209,353	−15,360	—	—	−18	−15,378
Kafue . .	14,539	16,991	9,689	9,366	50,585	13,768	16,991	9,689	9,366	49,814	−771	—	—	—	−771
Kasempa . .	16,474	21,119	12,570	11,663	61,826	16,769	22,011	12,712	11,839	63,331	+295	+892	+142	+176	+1,505
Luangwa . .	33,633	41,241	26,279	24,918	126,071	26,942	40,433	26,279	24,918	118,572	−6,691	−808	—	—	−7,499
Mweru-Luapula	31,637	42,047	28,093	26,243	128,020	29,834	41,297	27,843	25,987	124,961	−1,803	−750	−250	−256	−3,059
Tanganyika .	24,678	35,523	23,517	22,612	106,330	22,114	36,766	23,517	22,612	105,009	−2,564	+1,243	—	—	−1,321
Totals . .	345,517	448,493	270,252	266,967	1,331,229	310,811	448,136	269,690	266,444	1,295,081	−34,706	−357	−562	−523	−36,148

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 36; *Census Report 1931*, p. 35.

when the Territory came under British administration, the population was estimated at 4,182.[1] The increase, therefore, was small in the early 1920s but became very large, owing to immigration, since the discovery of rich copper deposits in 1925 in the north-west of the Territory.[2] The census report contains the following comment on the increase of the European population between 1921 and 1931:[3]

> It is known—from information supplied by the Registrar-General and the Immigration Officer—that the natural increase of the population in the past ten years, due to excess of births over deaths, was 751, and immigrants (excluding those from Southern Rhodesia of whom prior to November, 1930, no record is available[4]) numbered 9,790 in the same period. Whilst this period does not exactly coincide with the intercensal period, it is sufficiently close to show that at least three hundred persons, plus an unknown number to balance immigration from Southern Rhodesia, must have been absent from the Territory at the time of the Census either permanently or temporarily, probably the former.

Since the number of persons in Northern Rhodesia born in Southern Rhodesia (or Bechuanaland) was about 775 larger in 1931 than in 1921, the number of immigrants from Southern Rhodesia (and Bechuanaland) must have exceeded 775. Assuming that the total number of European immigrants into Northern Rhodesia in 1921–30 was 11,500, the number of European emigrants would have been only in the region of 2,000. In 1926–30 alone the excess of immigrants was about 9,000.[5]

But this quinquennial period presented exceptional conditions in the history of Northern Rhodesia. Already in 1931, and still more so in 1932, emigration considerably exceeded immigration, owing in part to the completion of construction in the mines but mainly to the fall in the price of copper.[6]

'European residents' 31 Mar. 1906, 1907, and 1908, 199, 229, and 243 respectively (see *Directors' Report and Accounts 1906–7*, p. 68, *1907–8*, p. 47); 1910, 250 (see *Colonial Office List 1911*, p. 325).

For North-Western Rhodesia the following figures have been given: 1904, 600 (see *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1903*, p. 843); 1906, 1907, and 1909, 1,000, 625, and 650 respectively (see *Colonial Office List 1907*, p. 317, *1908*, p. 327, *1910*, p. 332); 1910, 1,042 (see *Directors' Report and Accounts 1910–11*, p. 55).

According to the census of 7 May 1911 the Europeans numbered 259 in North-Eastern and 1,238 in North-Western Rhodesia (see ibid., pp. 55, 61). These figures included 'many persons on railway trains, in hotels, and temporary visitors to the Territory' (ibid. *1911–12*, p. 77).

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1924–5*, p. 5.

[2] Of the 9,790 European immigrants recorded by the Immigration Office in 1921–30, 1,530 arrived in 1921–5 and 8,260 in 1926–30 (see *Census Report 1931*, p. 8). According to the 1921 census only 133 Europeans were employed in mining (see ibid., p. 19). In 1927–30 their number averaged 782, 891, 1,374, and 2,694 respectively (see Mines Department, *Report 1930*, Schedule 8). The European population in the Ndola District alone increased during 1929 from 1,775 to 4,247 (see *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, Appendix A; *1929*, p. 28).

[3] *Census Report 1931*, p. 8.

[4] The same is true of immigrants from Bechuanaland Protectorate; see 'The Immigrants Regulation (Northern Rhodesia) Proclamation, 1915' (No. 15, 4 Aug.), *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 23 Aug. 1915, pp. 109–14, reprinted in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force June 1930*, vol. i, pp. 187–98 (cap. 22), and 'Immigrants Regulation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1930' (No. 18, 21 Nov.), *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1930*, pp. 147–8. *Medical Report 1927* states (p. 37) that immigrants from Nyasaland were likewise not recorded, but I found no legal evidence of this omission.

[5] I assume here that the European population on 31 Dec. 1930 was 14,000. In the 1930 *Report upon Native Affairs* (p. 35) the European population was estimated at 12,538 for that date, but this was doubtless an understatement (see footnote 4, p. 421 below).

[6] The number of European immigrants dropped from 3,604 in 1930 to 1,661 in 1931, and to 585 in 1932 (see *Blue Book 1930*, Section O, p. 3, to *1932*, Section O, p. 3). See also Northern

'Europeans had to be dismissed wholesale',[1] and their number is reported to have decreased by the end of 1931 to 13,305[2] and by the end of 1932 to 10,553.[3] In 1933 renewed activity in the copper mines resulted in an increase to 11,278, and for the end of 1934 the European population was reported as 11,464. In 1935 the Provincial Administration stopped making estimates of the European (as of the native) population, and from then on the situation becomes obscure. The annual *Blue Books* give for 31 December 1935, 9,913, both for 31 December 1936 and 1937, 10,588, and for 31 December 1938 to 1943, 13,155, 13,087, 15,188, 14,948, 16,683, and 18,745 respectively.[4] The *Annual Colonial Reports* are more vague and do not show much confidence in the accuracy of these figures.

1935. The European population is now in the region of 9,900 . . .[5]
The above figure for the European population is little more than a guess, since no record of emigration is kept though immigrants are recorded.[6]
1936.[7] 1937.[8] The European population is now in the region of 10,500.
1938.[9] The European population is now in the region of 13,000.

Finally, the Medical Report, which for 1938 says that 'the European population is guessed at 13,155',[10] states for 1935–6:

1935.[11] The European population is somewhere about 14,000. It fluctuates constantly and at times changes quickly. Immigrants are recorded but not emigrants so that no clear estimate is possible.

Rhodesia Police, *Annual Report 1931*, chapter iii (Immigration Department), p. 9: 'The large decrease in Immigration [1931] . . . was occasioned by the closing down of the Bwana Mkubwa Mine in February, 1931, the partial closing down of the Broken Hill Mine in July, 1931, the retrenchment at Nchanga Mine and ultimate closing down in December, 1931, the retrenchment at Mufulira Mine and ultimate closing down in December, 1931, and the completion of construction work on the Roan Antelope Mine during the latter months of 1931.' See furthermore Davis, *Modern Industry and the African*, p. 59: 'At the end of 1931 only Roan Antelope, Nkana and Broken Hill were employing more than a clean-up and watchman force. The other six mines [Luiri Goldfields, Bwana Mkubwa, Kasanshi, Nchanga, Chambishi, Mufulira] were closed.'

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 19.

[2] According to *Blue Book 1931*, Section O, p. 2; 13,161 according to *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 46.

[3] 'In addition to those who left the country of their own accord, Government also assisted a considerable number of unemployed and their dependents to return to their countries of origin' (*Medical Report 1932*, p. 8). The number of persons repatriated by the Government in 1931–4 was 157, 409, 175, and 27 respectively. 'It is of interest to note that arising out of the depression practically 750 men, women and children were repatriated from Northern Rhodesia at Government expense' (*Report of the Commissioner for Unemployment 1934*, p. 12).

[4] The figures for 1941–3 possibly include Polish evacuees, of whom 427 were received in the autumn of 1941 (see *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xli, col. 14). In May 1943 there were 1,453 resident in camps of whom 780 were women and 498 children under 16 years (see ibid., vol. xlv, col. 6). On 20 Nov. 1943 the Governor said: 'The number of Polish evacuees at present accommodated in the various Camps throughout the Territory is now 2,438 and approximately 50 people have left the Camps to take up employment outside' (ibid., vol. xlvi, col. 6). On 6 Jan. 1945 he described the position as follows: 'The number of Polish evacuees accommodated in the various camps in the Territory is 2,918. . . . Approximately 90 evacuees have left the camps to take up employment outside, the majority being employed as children's nurses. In addition, 77 Polish women have joined the Southern Rhodesia Women's Auxiliary Air Service . . . .' (Ibid., vol. xlix, cols. 25–6.)

[5] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1935*, p. 8. [6] Ibid., p. 9.

[7] Ibid. *1936*, p. 8. [8] Ibid. *1937*, p. 8. [9] Ibid. *1938*, p. 8.

[10] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 2. The 'approximate population' is still put at 13,155, ibid. *1940*, p. 1, but at 15,188, ibid. *1941*, p. 2, at 16,638, ibid. *1942*, p. 2, and at 15,000, ibid. *1943*, p. 3.

[11] Ibid. *1935*, p. 8.

1936.[1] Knowledge of the number of the European population is little if at all more reliable than in the case of the African population. Some put the present European figure at 14,000, but this is little more than a guess . . . .

The Medical Department was right in mistrusting the accuracy of the official estimates which indicated that the European population at the end of 1935 was lower than at the end of every year since 1929. It was right also in emphasizing that the European population 'fluctuates constantly and at times changes quickly'. The reason for this phenomenon particular to Northern Rhodesia is the instability of employment at the mines. Table 3 shows the number of Europeans thus employed at the end of each month from January 1930 to December 1938. A comparison of the official estimates of the European population in the Protectorate on 31 December with the number of Europeans employed on the mines at the same date leads to the following results:[2]

	1930	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
Total . . .	12,538	13,305	10,553	11,278	11,464	9,913	10,588	10,588	13,155
Total male adults .	6,959	6,584	4,675	5,051	4,998	4,323	4,643	4,643	6,063
On mines . .	3,307	1,943	1,000	1,632	2,091	1,955	1,951	2,627	2,853
Other male adults.	3,652	4,641	3,675	3,419	2,907	2,368	2,692	2,016	3,210

The number of European men living in the Protectorate is also influenced, of course, by factors other than employment at the mines.[3] But it is safe to say that the official estimates both for the male adults and for the total population were far too low for 1935 and 1937.[4] For 31 December 1932 the European population had been estimated at 10,553, and this estimate may have been correct. The number of Europeans employed on the mines was then only 1,000. But since on 31 December 1935 the Europeans employed on the mines were nearly twice as numerous it is impossible that the European population could have dropped to 9,913. The Medical Department over-estimated it when it said that it was 'somewhere about 14,000', but it is difficult to conceive that it was below 12,000, and it certainly exceeded 12,000 on 31 December 1937, when it was estimated officially at 10,588. Since the number of Europeans employed on the mines continued to increase in 1938 the estimate of the total European population for the end of that year (13,155) may have been correct.

[1] Ibid. *1936*, p. 6.

[2] The data for 'Total' and 'Total male adults' were taken from *Blue Book 1930*, Section O, p. 3, to *1938*, Section O, p. 3.

[3] The number of male European officials in service on 31 Dec. 1930–41 was 507, 667, 596, 515, 457, 472, 491, 516, 581, 621, 597, and 587 respectively; see *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 2, to *1941*, p. 2. According to the Medical Reports the average number of European officials increased from 619 in 1939 to 828 in 1943; see Table 22 below.

[4] The estimates were certainly wrong for other years too. According to the census of 5 May 1931 the total Europeans numbered 13,846 and the male adult Europeans 7,257. Since the number of Europeans employed on mines was 3,090 on 30 Apr. 1931 and 3,071 on 31 May 1931, the number of 'Other male adults' was about 4,170 on census date. It must have been at least as high on 31 Dec. 1930 and much lower on 31 Dec. 1931. The population estimate for 31 Dec. 1930 was certainly too low and that for 31 Dec. 1931 certainly too high.

TABLE 3. *Europeans employed on Mines and Concessions at End of Month, Northern Rhodesia, 1930–8*[1]

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Average	
													Mines	Concessions
1930	2,002	2,156	2,242	2,397	2,577	2,723	2,910	3,053	3,276	3,479	3,538	3,307	2,694	119
1931	3,456	3,307	3,246	3,090	3,071	2,953	2,839	2,791	2,698	2,477	2,268	1,943	2,744	101
1932	1,670	1,495	1,400	1,235	1,150	1,099	1,058	1,028	1,008	995	1,001	1,000	1,130	49
1933	1,010	1,055	1,093	1,135	1,170	1,182	1,200	1,388	1,478	1,583	1,623	1,632	1,272	24
1934	1,696	1,700	1,750	1,795	1,852	1,949	2,061	2,073	2,106	2,110	2,118	2,091	1,922	19
1935	2,144	2,152	2,164	2,140	2,008	2,070	2,068	2,060	2,033	1,989	1,978	1,955	2,036	34
1936	1,943	1,889	1,863	1,852	1,843	1,839	1,843	1,836	1,855	1,866	1,903	1,951	1,847	35
1937	2,007	2,068	2,172	2,263	2,307	2,358	2,408	2,471	2,563	2,606	2,626	2,627	2,373	39
1938	2,615	2,638	2,667	2,688	2,707	2,736	2,704	2,743	2,758	2,798	2,845	2,853	2,700	30

[1] See Mines Department, *Report, 1930*, Schedules 4 and 8; *1931*, Schedules 4 and 7; *1932*, Schedules 4 and 7; *1933*, pp. 20, 22; *1934*, pp. 19, 21; *1935*, pp. 20, 22; *1936*, pp. 18, 20; *1937*, pp. 28, 30; *1938*, pp. 28–9.

The Bledisloe Commission described the geographical distribution of the Europeans as follows:

In Northern Rhodesia the majority of the Europeans live within a few miles of the railway running north-east from Livingstone to the Copperbelt, and apart from Government officers, the greater number are engaged in mining activities, mostly in the Copperbelt. Elsewhere there are but few. European settlers engaged in farming are to be found mainly either within the area along the railway, or in the small isolated districts of Abercorn and Fort Jameson. These represent about 97 per cent. of the total white farmers of the Territory.[1]

The number of Asiatics and Coloured increased from 201 in 1921 to 601 in 1931, the main rise occurring, as in the case of the Europeans, in the second half of the period. Since 1934 their number has increased very much, reaching apparently 1,748 by 31 December 1943. But the figures given for recent years in the various official documents vary greatly.[2]

The total area of the Territory is about 290,000 square miles,[3] so that there are about 5 inhabitants to the square mile.[4] In 1931 the population density (excluding absentees) varied in the nine Provinces between 1·6 (Kasempa) and 10·1 (East Luangwa).[5]

The population of the towns, particularly the mining towns, fluctuates

[1] *Rhodesia–Nyasaland Royal Commission Report* (1939), p. 4. See also *Medical Report 1939*, p. 2: 'It is to be noted that half or more of the European population resides in the Copperbelt, in the three mine townships (Roan Antelope, Nkana, Mufulira), in the adjoining public townships (Luanshya, Kitwe, Mufulira) and around the rapidly developing new copper mine at Nchanga.' It may be mentioned incidentally that the native population in the Copperbelt was estimated in 1938 at about 76,000 (see *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 19), i.e. at 5 or 6 per cent. of the total native population.

[2] The number of Asiatics is given for 1936, 1938, and 1939 in the *Blue Books* (*1936*, Section O, p. 2; *1938*, Section O, p. 2; *1939*, Section O, p. 2) as 342, 596, and 575 respectively, in the *Annual Reports* of the Police (*1936*, p. 19; *1938*, p. 12; *1939*, p. 6) as 360, 537, and 620 respectively. The number of Coloured is given for 1936 in the *Blue Book* as 604, in the Report of the Pim Commission (p. 7) as 640.

[3] *Blue Book 1939*, Section O, p. 2, and *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 448, give 284,745 sq. m.; *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire 1928–37*, p. 3, and *An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire* (*1937*), p. 50, give 290,323 sq. m.

[4] See Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 147: 'One of the outstanding factors which has prevented general development in Northern Rhodesia has been the widespread occurrence of tsetse flies, *Glossina morsitans* being by far the most important species. It is estimated that no less than five-eighths of the whole Territory is infested by this scourge, and much of this area is excellent land for cattle and general agriculture. This insect is without doubt mainly responsible for the comparative sparseness of the population in this Territory, and the small native communities who are scattered throughout the fly bush areas are living under conditions which are most unsatisfactory as regards both health and general welfare.' See also in this connexion Game and Tsetse Control Department, *Report 1944*, p. 7: 'It can hardly be said that more than an effective start has yet been made with tsetse control in the Territory as a whole.' The spread of the tsetse-fly has been discussed quite frequently at recent meetings of the Legislative Council; see, in particular, *Debates*, vol. xlv, cols. 250–71, vol. xlvi, cols. 534–46.

[5] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 88. *Report upon Native Affairs 1933*, p. 16, states: 'The Fort Jameson District in this Province [East Luangwa] is the most thickly populated in the Territory, carrying as it does in some parts 258 persons to the square mile, with a mean density of 57.' But in arriving at a mean density of 57 the area of this District had probably been grossly underestimated.

Some redistribution of the population has occurred recently for purposes of soil preservation. In the Eastern Province 271 villages with 33,000 inhabitants were moved in 1941–3. See Department of Agriculture, *Report 1943*, p. 5.

very much. As regards the African population of Broken Hill, Wilson says:

> In 1930, before the slump, it was probably about 10,000, to which height it had climbed from nothing in 1905.[1]

By May 1931 the African population had decreased to 7,415, and there were in addition 1,414 Europeans, 17 Asiatics, and 13 Coloured.[2] For 1933 Wilson estimates the African population at only 5,000 or 6,000, but for 1940 at 15,000.[3]

III. Migration to and from the Protectorate

Between 1919 and 1939 there has been an enormous immigration of native families from neighbouring territories into the Protectorate while few Northern Rhodesian families have emigrated. On the other hand, many more Northern Rhodesian labourers left the Protectorate temporarily than alien natives entered it in search of work.

1. *Immigration*

According to the official estimates the native population of the Protectorate increased from 1919 to 1931 by 46 per cent. In Barotseland alone the population is reported to have doubled in that period. Although these estimates are quite untrustworthy, and although it is most likely that the increase was actually not as large, there cannot be any doubt that immigration was enormous and was particularly conspicuous into Barotseland. Gluckman reports that 'from about 1919 on there has been a large influx of Wiko from Angola . . . to Loziland and beyond for political and economic reasons'.[4] While the bulk of the immigration into the Protectorate probably had come before 1927, it remained considerable until 1934. In his report for 1927 the Secretary for Native Affairs referred to increases of native population in the Kalabo and Balovale Districts through immigration from Angola.[5] Again in 1928:

> In the far Western Barotse Districts natives continue to arrive from neighbouring Territories, and here there is a definite steady increase. The population of the Kalabo and Balovale Districts has been largely augmented by immigrants, comparatively few of whom return to their original homes.[6]
>
> 1929. Immigration from the neighbouring countries on the East and West into the Barotse and East Luangwa Provinces has continued. In the Balovale District 1,718 able-bodied males were registered during the year and a large number of them were accompanied by their wives and children.[7]
>
> 1930. Immigration continues, from the neighbouring Territories on the East and West, and, to a much lesser degree, from the Belgian Congo and Nyasaland. The main flow of immigrants is from the West to the Barotse Province; the population

[1] Godfrey Wilson, *An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia*, Part I, p. 46.

[2] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 46, 99.

[3] See Wilson, Part I, p. 46. See also ibid., p. 36: 'Of the 15,000 Africans in Broken Hill, 7,500 are men, 3,500 women and 4,000 children.' He puts for 1940 the Europeans at 1,600; see ibid., p. 35.

[4] *Economy of the Central Barotse Plain* (1941), p. 15. See also ibid., pp. 51, 88, 122.

[5] Quoted in *Medical Report 1927*, p. 37. [6] *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, p. 5.

[7] Ibid. *1929*, p. 8.

of Barotseland has increased from 274,237 in 1926 to 332,798 in 1930, the percentage of increase over five years being 21 per cent.[1]

1931. . . . in the Kalabo District the number of new arrivals is estimated to be about 2,000.[2]

1932. It is observed that new arrivals from the west are not now settling in the Balovale District but prefer to migrate to the more fertile portions of Mankoya. In the Lealui District the number of immigrants is approximately the same as last year and a considerable number of people from the west continue to make their home in the Sesheke and Kalabo Districts where there is ample land for their needs. As a result of immigration and natural increase the population of Barotseland has grown from 140,210 in 1912 to 352,716 in 1932.[3]

1933. The inflow from neighbouring territories still continues to a limited extent. It is estimated that some 4,000 souls entered the Barotse Province during the year from the west.[4]

1934. In the Balovale district of the Barotse Province it is recorded that a steady influx from the west continues and that some 1,600 persons have entered the district from that source during the year.[5]

Immigrants had become so few that, at least temporarily, returning former immigrants considerably exceeded new arrivals. The 1934 report, as stated above,[6] related that some 6,000 adults returned from the Kalabo District to Portuguese West Africa, and subsequent reports indicate that a reaction in the attitude towards immigrants had set in.

1935. Immigration into Barotseland from Angola which has been proceeding for some years has slowed down and it appears that these immigrants, who were at one time welcome, are becoming too numerous, and causing some congestion.[7]

The influx of Mawiko, the generic term for natives immigrating from Angola has caused anxiety in most districts. In Balovale where . . . the immigration amounted to about 3,600 a year, the District Commissioner believes that, having regard to waterless and uncultivable areas, saturation point has been reached. The District Commissioner, Mongu-Lealui, believes that the shrinkage in immigration is due to the fact that all the best land has been occupied and gives it as his opinion that if it had continued at the same rate as formerly, the density of population would have amounted to congestion. The Mawiko immigrants have given so much trouble, not only to District Commissioners but also to the Native Government that the Lealui Khotla has recently deliberated the policy of excluding fresh immigrants and rigidly restricting the movement of those already settled in the Province.[8]

1936. Restrictions, not on the immigration of Mawiko from Angola, but on their settlement in the Province, limiting the areas in which they might reside and imposing on Indunas a stricter obligation to report their presence, were made early in the year. It is doubtful whether they have been very effective, but it is certainly a fact, for what it is worth, that District Commissioners have less to say this year of the disagreeable habits of these immigrants. The increasing population in the Balovale and Mankoya Districts is largely attributable to them, and in the former district the time has arrived when a policy of exclusion must be substituted for restriction.

Emigration, except by those seeking work in industrial centres, is negligible.[9]

[1] Ibid. *1930*, p. 10. It was discovered only much later that the population had been grossly over-estimated in 1930 (see pp. 405, 408 above).

[2] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 12. [3] Ibid. *1932*, p. 15.

[4] Ibid. *1933*, p. 16. [5] Ibid. *1934*, p. 12. [6] See p. 405 above.

[7] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 7. [8] Ibid., p. 86.

[9] Ibid. *1936*, p. 86. In the same report (p. 85) the Provincial Commissioner expresses the opinion that the apparent decrease of the population since 1931 cannot have 'been due to emigration, which is more than counter-balanced by immigration from Angola into the Balovale District'.

1937. It is reported that approximately 200 Natives have entered the Kalabo District, 600 the Balovale District and about 100 the Senanga District, all from Angola. The immigration into the Mongu–Lealui and Mankoya Districts has been very small.

Many immigrants appear to report at Government stations for the sole purpose of obtaining a registration certificate so that they may enter the industrial areas to look for work and it is probable that many who are entered in the registers are not permanent immigrants but men who came to work for a few months and then returned to Angola.[1]

1938. It is reported from Balovale that 550 Natives have immigrated from Angola during the year. The type of Natives who come in from Angola is not good and, although in this area the population is only 5·3 persons to the square mile, it seems a pity that these people are likely to prove more of a liability than an asset to the Territory. The present political situation in this district is in no small measure due to this influx from Angola over a period of years. Very few Natives have emigrated from the Balovale District.

Returns from Kalabo show that immigrants from Angola numbered 250 and emigrants were very few.

In the Senanga District, immigration has been inconsiderable but emigrants have numbered 250 persons. . . .

No other movements of importance are reported.[2]

But official reports show that immigration had by no means been confined to the Barotse Province.

1928. There is still a steady influx of natives from other Territories. In the East Luangwa District immigration has been continuous since 1917: the Petauke population is to some extent a floating one, but the balance undoubtedly lies with Northern Rhodesia.[3]

1929. Accurate statistics of native immigration are not available, but at least 4,000 appear to have entered the country during 1929 for purposes of domicile, apart from the large number who came to seek employment on the mines. The majority of these immigrants came from Mozambique and Angola.[4]

In the Petauke District the new arrivals total over 4,000 men, women and children during the past two years, and a further 10,000 arrived during the preceding eight years.

It is noteworthy that there are practically no immigrants from Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland or the Belgian Congo.[5]

1930.[6] Immigration from the East[7] into Petauke District has been checked. It was pointed out to the Native Authorities that the Reserves were liable to become overcrowded if immigration remained completely uncontrolled. The Authorities have therefore taken steps to prohibit immigration into densely populated areas, and would-be immigrants are disinclined to take land in other areas which have been reserved for them, but in which they would not find relatives already domiciled.[8]

There was a certain amount of immigration into Petauke District from Nyasaland, a somewhat unexpected development which may not recur.

1931. Immigrants continue to arrive from adjoining territories to settle within Northern Rhodesia. For the most part, the arrivals belong to more backward tribes

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, p. 95. Major Orde Browne in his report of 14 May 1938 probably referred to earlier years when speaking of 'the considerable immigration from Angola; natives to the number of several thousand annually move over the Portuguese border and settle in Barotseland and in the Balovale District' (*Labour Conditions in Northern Rhodesia*, p. 43).

[2] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 89. [3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 5.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1929*, p. 7. Strange to say *Colonial Report 1930* contains (p. 8) literally the same statement, with this difference, that 'during 1930' is substituted for 'during 1929'.

[5] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 8. [6] Ibid. *1930*, pp. 10–11.

[7] This means evidently from Portuguese East Africa.

[8] See also ibid. *1931*, p. 12; *1932*, p. 15.

but they establish themselves very quickly and soon become accustomed to their new conditions and surroundings. There is a tendency now for immigrants to spread over the country more, rather than confine themselves to the border districts, and this movement is being encouraged as some of the districts adjacent to the neighbouring territories are becoming somewhat congested. The District Commissioner, Livingstone, reports the arrival of many immigrants from the West who have built themselves houses of the two-roomed type with high pitched roofs . . . .[1]

1932. Immigration from neighbouring territories continues but owing to existing economic conditions the flow of population is much less than formerly and in the east has practically ceased. . . .[2]

1933. It is interesting to note that in the Petauke District the population, which in 1913 amounted to 35,000, stood last year at 72,069. The rate of increase indicated by these figures is very high, but this is a border district and there was considerable immigration in the first ten years of the period. . . .

Immigration from the east is now almost negligible and has practically ceased in the greater part of the East Luangwa Province, action to prevent it having been taken by the native authorities owing to congestion in the reserves. In the case of the Petauke District the policy is to offer intending new settlers land in certain reserves or on crown land, and a few families have availed themselves of these facilities. It is remarked that immigration from Nyasaland is on the increase in this district, the native authorities of which are to be congratulated on the resolute and yet sympathetic manner in which they have handled this problem.[3]

1934. In the Lundazi District an increase of 3,071 is attributed to immigration from Nyasaland, which is said to be due to the need for more land suitable for agricultural development.

. . . it is stated that there is also a certain measure of immigration into the [Eastern] Province from Portuguese East Africa, which would very largely increase were it not for the stringent measures adopted to prevent anything of the kind, such steps being rendered necessary owing to the danger of really harmful congestion in a country which already is quite sufficiently thickly populated.

Apart from the movements indicated above there has been little or no immigration elsewhere beyond the usual comings and goings, dictated largely by family reasons, over the borders of the Belgian Congo and Tanganyika Territory.[4]

Subsequent reports do not mention any appreciable immigration into any other Province than Barotse.

1935. [Eastern Province] Since the foci of settlement of immigrants from Portuguese territory are in the bordering Southern Chewa and the Senga Reserves, already congested, it is not unreasonable that no encouragement should be given to would-be settlers. The Native Authorities in these areas have therefore been advised to adopt an inflexible attitude towards any considerable movement into these parts so as to protect the interests of their own people.[5]

1936. [Central Province] From the Congo Belge the movement into the old Kasempa Province seems to have ceased on account of mining developments in the former. But there is still a drift in from the pedicule, back to their old homes, of early Lala inhabitants of this Territory.[6]

[Eastern Province] The number of permanent immigrants is if anything probably in excess of the number of permanent emigrants. There is always a small gradual influx into the Lundazi District from the heavily populated areas across the Nyasaland border but this is not considered to have exceeded 150 persons during the year.

[1] Ibid. *1931*, p. 12. [2] Ibid. *1932*, p. 15. [3] Ibid. *1933*, pp. 16–17.
[4] Ibid. *1934*, p. 12. [5] Ibid. *1935*, p. 69.
[6] Ibid. *1936*, p. 15. See also the statement of the District Commissioner, Serenje (Northern Province) 'that emigration to the Belgian Congo, which was checked last year, is now definitely reversed, but that many of those who emigrated do not seem to have any intention of returning at present, the immigrants being mostly newcomers to this Territory' (ibid., p. 46).

Immigration from Portuguese Territory into the neighbouring Reserves within the Fort Jameson and Petauke Districts would present a problem if it were permitted. Native Authorities are unanimous in discouraging immigration as much as possible for they realize the serious congestion that would result.[1]

1937. [Central Province] There is a certain amount of movement from the Congo 'pedicule' into the North Swaka Reserve and the Serenje District. In the case of the former the crowding in the North Swaka Reserve deters many from returning from the Congo Belge to what was their home some years ago. In the case of the Serenje District, whereas for some years the movement has been into the pedicule, this year emigrations and immigrations have balanced.[2]

There has probably been more immigration into the [Western] Province than emigration out of it. A few Natives from the Belgian Congo have taken up residence in the Mwinilunga District owing to a compulsory system of cotton growing, which is unpopular, on the Congo side of the border. A small number of Natives from Portuguese Angola have also crossed the international border. But the numbers are inconsiderable.[3]

[Eastern Province] Immigration from Nyasaland into the Lundazi District is on the increase. This is due to the shortage of garden lands in that territory adjoining the border and to the famine which was recently experienced there.[4]

1938. [Western Province] In the out-districts there has been normal increase, except that in the Mwinilunga District it is estimated that about 2,000 souls took up residence from the Congo, Angolaland and Balovale. The immigration from the Congo is found to be due to the unpopularity of compulsory cotton growing on the other side of the border, while that from Angolaland is said to be due to unpopular legislation. Perhaps the decreased tax in the Mwinilunga District has also had something to do with it.[5]

[Northern Province] Statistics collected at Kawambwa during the last half of the year show an immigration of 200 taxable males, which would probably mean an immigration of approximately 2,000 persons in a full year.[6]

[Eastern Province] The occupation of Crown land in the Lundazi District by immigrants from Nyasaland is . . . creating a situation which requires careful watching. It is estimated that since October, 1937, some 5,000 persons have entered the district. They are mainly of the Tumbuka and Chewa tribes closely related to their Lundazi neighbours. The cause of this immigration is the lack of suitable land where they had been living.[7]

2. *Emigration*

The 1931 census report of Nyasaland suggests that in the preceding years there had been some immigration from Northern Rhodesia.

The Provincial Commissioner [of the Northern Province] reported 'The District Commissioner, Fort Manning, is officially informed that some 2,000 natives from reserves in Northern Rhodesia wish to settle in Nyasaland in 1929', and in the following year, '2,200 natives settled in Fort Manning from neighbouring districts', the neighbouring districts referred to being Portuguese East Africa and Northern Rhodesia.[8]

Wemba (Wisa)—There were 5,736 natives belonging to this tribe, showing an increase of 3,563 or 117·9 per cent over the number for 1921. Of this increase, it is probable that many of the 3,230 shown in the Kota-Kota, Kasungu, Dedza, and Dowa districts have assumed the name since the 1921 Census, for the name did not

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 65. [2] Ibid. *1937*, pp. 13–14.
[3] Ibid., p. 26. [4] Ibid., p. 74. [5] Ibid. *1938*, p. 19. [6] Ibid., p. 48.
[7] Ibid., p. 70. The numbers of immigrants from the Mzimba District of Nyasaland who settled in Northern Rhodesia in 1937–9 were 967, 3,369, and 541 respectively; see Nyasaland Protectorate, *Reports of the Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 38.
[8] Nyasaland Protectorate, *Census Report 1931*, p. 14.

appear in the returns from those districts in that year. Their home is Northern Rhodesia and there can be little doubt that immigration is the other main reason for the increase in their numbers.[1]

But by 1945 the number of Northern Rhodesians (Wemba) in Nyasaland had decreased to 1,159,[2] and the Northern Rhodesia Reports upon Native Affairs continually emphasize that there has been little emigration from the Protectorate.

1929. Emigration is very slight and shows no sign of increasing. It is purely of a domestic nature, brought about by members of families proceeding to rejoin their relations or clans in neighbouring territories.[3]

1930. On all foreign borders there is a more or less constant flow of individuals from one side to the other. Such movement is mainly domestic, and has no political significance. A whole village, or sometimes two or more villages may cross a foreign border and return after a period of years. The total aggregate of emigrants from the Territory is, however, negligible at the present time.[4]

1931. There is . . . a certain amount of movement to and fro between the villages on both sides of our foreign borders. The number of individuals concerned is not very large and if at the end of each year there is any balance it is probably in favour of Northern Rhodesia.[5]

1932. . . . there is . . . a certain amount of movement to and fro along our borders but this movement is inter-tribal and on balance is probably in favour of this Territory. A few of the Mashanjo villages on the Mashe River have moved across into Angola since the Boundary Commission completed its survey; it is almost impossible to state the number of people affected as the Mashanjo people are settled in small family hamlets. Since the decline in the activities on the mines in the Ndola and Solwezi Districts one or two villages have transferred their domicile to the Belgian Congo.[6]

1933. Generally speaking no emigration of any considerable extent has taken place in the Territory. The exceptions are in the Mwinilunga District, to the emigration from which and its causes reference has been made under the heading of 'Population',[7] and the former Feira District, now a portion of the Lusaka District. Here it is stated that since the closing of the Government station at Feira some 5,000 souls, including 1,300 taxable males have removed to Portuguese East Africa.

Elsewhere such slight movements as have taken place in districts lying along the borders of the Territory have been made for family reasons or for the purpose of evading the native tax.[8]

1934. Attention has already been directed to the exodus of some 6,000 people reported from the Kalabo District.[9] It is stated also that there has been some movement back to Angola of natives from that Territory who settled on the main routes between Barotse and Livingstone during the boom years and carried on a lucrative trade in prostitution and beer selling, but who have now, owing to the very large decrease in the stream of workers returning home, abandoned their sites and gone back to their place of origin.

In the Eastern Province it is reported that on balance the number of natives who emigrate to Nyasaland is rather greater than of those who come in from that Territory. Practically all are from the Vubwi Valley in the Fort Jameson district. No reason is assigned for this movement. . . . Apart from the instances mentioned there has been little or no emigration during the year.[10]

1935. [Central Province] There has been the customary movement between the

[1] Ibid., p. 24.
[2] Ibid. *1945*, p. 15.
[3] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 8.
[4] Ibid. *1930*, p. 11.
[5] Ibid. *1931*, p. 13.
[6] Ibid. *1932*, p. 15.
[7] See p. 405 above.
[8] Ibid. *1933*, p. 17.
[9] See p. 405 above.
[10] Ibid. *1934*, pp. 12–13.

Congo, Angola and Northern Rhodesia with the balance probably favouring Northern Rhodesia owing to the reduction of the tax in the old Kasempa Province.[1]

[Southern Province] In the eastern portion of the Lusaka District there is a constant movement backwards and forwards between Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa. The District Commissioner remarks that food supplies are the important factor in this movement, but that it can safely be said that there is no great fluctuation in the total population.[2]

The Northern Province marches with the Belgian Congo, Tanganyika Territory and Nyasaland, but no pronounced movement of population has taken place. Tribal boundaries overlap the territorial boundaries, and there is a constant movement in both directions arising from normal domestic need and influences.

The District Commissioner, Serenje, reports a total reduction on his Congo border area of 650 natives. I found a similar movement on the Fort Rosebery—Congo border. The movement was attributed to the low rate of taxation there. They will come back again when economic conditions improve in this Territory.[3]

[Eastern Province] . . . the number of immigrants may be said to be almost proportionate to the number of emigrants. Fewer natives are entering the Province from Nyasaland and Portuguese East Africa and the emigration to the first-mentioned territory appears to be at a standstill. The number of those who continue to creep in from Portuguese East Africa is less than formerly and possibly balances the number of those, work-seekers in the first instance, who are taking up domicile in Southern Rhodesia. The number of these latter is believed to be increasing and, what is more, though some of them take unto themselves wives in Southern Rhodesia, the number of women leaving the Province to join their husbands or prospective husbands is becoming increasingly greater.[4]

[Barotse Province] In the Sesheke and Senanga Districts emigration equalises immigration; in the Balovale District immigration largely preponderates, and in the Mongu–Lealui and Mankoya Districts the influx of natives is said to be 'falling off' and 'slightly less' thus implicitly assuming that in recent years it has been appreciable. That part of the population living adjacent to the Angola Border is, in fact, liable to constant fluctuation conditioned by the state of the food supplies and the pressure applied in tax collection respectively in Northern Rhodesia and Angola. In recent years this state of flux has been accentuated by the paucity of food, which has impelled natives to settle on whichever side of the border food was most plentiful. While in recent years emigration from the Kalabo District has amounted to 17,000 persons, the District Commissioner anticipates an influx in the forthcoming year in view of the promising crops.[5]

1936. There is little or no emigration from the [Central] Province.[6]

[Northern Province] In districts bordering on other provinces or territories, a certain amount of emigration and immigration has taken place with in most cases the nett result that the two movements have in a large measure balanced each other. An exception to some extent is the Isoka District, regarding which the District Commissioner remarks that:

> 'A careful check of census of the south-eastern section reveals a considerable emigration to Nyasaland. This cannot be ascribed as having happened wholly in the year under review. This area had not been visited for some years (three) and it is probable that the emigration shown by taxes written off is spread over a number of years. For Muyombe division alone from 1933 on 158 names have been removed from a total of 532 taxable males. One must take into consideration deaths, exemptions and border jumpers but it may be said that of the figure given (158) probably 50 per cent. have moved to Nyasaland with their wives and families. This is most likely to have happened when tax was high here.'

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 14.
[2] Ibid., p. 30.
[3] Ibid., p. 50.
[4] Ibid., pp. 68–9.
[5] Ibid., pp. 85–6.
[6] Ibid. *1936*, p. 15.

In the Mporokoso District there has been some movement to and fro across the border between Northern Rhodesia and the Congo due, in the belief of the District Commissioner, to the desire on the part of our people to remove to a country where the tax is much lower than ours and on that of the immigrants from the Congo to escape taxation altogether for as long as possible. When this misfortune threatens them on our side, they return whence they came.

Of his natives the District Commissioner, Fort Rosebery, remarks that, seeing that most of the district is adjacent to the Congo and considering the difference in taxation on either side of the Luapula, it is surprising that more of our natives do not emigrate.[1]

1937. [Central Province] There is said to be a very small drift of permanent emigrants from the Serenje District.[2]

[Northern Province] Immigration and emigration entailing permanent removals continue in districts bordering on other territories. In the Fort Rosebery, Kawambwa and Mporokoso Districts emigration into and immigration from the Congo is perennial. Reports from Fort Rosebery and Mporokoso indicate that these movements tend to counter-balance one another. The District Commissioner, Kawambwa, however, notes that considerable numbers from that district appear to be emigrating into the Congo and ascribes this to the higher rate of tax prevailing in Northern Rhodesia. The District Commissioner, Isoka, reports no unusual movement to or from Nyasaland, and the same may be said of Abercorn in regard to interchanges with Tanganyika Territory.[3]

[Barotse Province] The District Commissioner, Senanga, estimates that 300 Natives have left his district for Angola and 200 for Mankoya District. There are no accurate figures of emigration but there is a continual drift to and from across the Angola border for domestic reasons.[4]

1938. [Northern Province] Immigration and Emigration remains almost static. The border districts of Fort Rosebery, Kawambwa, Mporokoso, Abercorn and Isoka report the usual inter-territorial migrations. At Isoka there is said to have been a slight emigration to Tanganyika Territory owing to lack of land for cultivation, and to normal movements within the same tribe.[5]

[Eastern Province] Emigration for purposes of settlement other than to Nyasaland is practically unknown. About thirty-six taxpayers with their families are stated to have returned to Nyasaland from the Lundazi District for domestic reasons. The emigration of Natives from the South Eastern portion of the Fort Jameson District, which was considerable a few years ago, has ceased. This exodus was attributable to land-shortage, and it seems likely that it may be resumed unless the Native reserves are extended.[6]

[Barotse Province] In the Senanga District, immigration has been inconsiderable but emigrants have numbered 250 persons. This emigration has been caused by the order to move cattle back behind the cattle cordon on account of the Pleuro-Pneumonia Eradication Campaign and those people refusing to do so, emigrated. This emigration may be a serious factor in times to come, for these people are almost sure to try to return to this country when it is 'clean', and they will attempt to bring with them their cattle which have been in contact with diseased herds in Angola.[7]

3. *Migration of Labourers into Northern Rhodesia*

Alien Africans entering Northern Rhodesia. Information concerning the coming of natives from other territories to work in Northern Rhodesia is scanty. It seems, however, that such migrants were numerous in the years preceding the slump of 1931.

1929. . . . Northern Rhodesia absorbs a considerable amount of immigrant labour from Nyasaland, Portuguese West Africa and Portuguese East Africa. These natives

[1] Ibid., p. 45.
[2] Ibid. *1937*, p. 14.
[3] Ibid., p. 59.
[4] Ibid., p. 95.
[5] Ibid. *1938*, p. 48.
[6] Ibid., p. 70.
[7] Ibid., p. 89.

are employed by planters in the East Luangwa Province and by farmers on the railway line, and considerable numbers of men who prefer industrial work gravitate to the railways and timber companies. Comparatively few of these labour immigrants work on the mines; their physique is generally not good.[1]

Real difficulty has . . . been experienced in recruiting labour for underground work, and recently a large number of alien natives were imported for this purpose from Southern Rhodesia.[2]

1930. The question of the labour supply for Mines in the Territory was much simplified by the organisation of the Native Labour Association. . . . 10,500 natives were recruited and distributed to members of the Association. Of these over 2,000 were recruited in the East Luangwa Province, many of them being Nyasaland natives who had crossed the border to look for work. 2,400 natives were imported from Southern Rhodesia; these were trained labourers introduced in order to get over the difficulty of the supply of underground workers, the local natives not being yet accustomed to this remunerative but unusual work.[3]

1931.... an increasing number of labourers are coming to work in Northern Rhodesia from Nyasaland, Portuguese West Africa and the Belgian Congo.[4] During recent years large numbers of alien natives have arrived in the Territory to work on the mines and on farms and no doubt their number has increased. Nyasaland natives are very popular on the mines because of their experience of underground work; natives from the West have usually found employment on farms or with the Zambezi Saw Mills.[5]

But the depression starting in 1931 reduced considerably the influx of alien labourers. The change in the situation finds its expression in the Reports upon Native Affairs for 1932 and 1933.

1932. . . . the falling off in employment is greater in Northern Rhodesia than in neighbouring countries . . . . The position is not made easier by the arrival from Portuguese West Africa of large numbers of natives in quest of work. These men have walked long distances in the hope of getting employment and are willing to accept work of any nature at very low wages while they look around for the class of work which they prefer.[6]

1933. Natives from Portuguese West Africa continued to enter the Territory in large numbers in search of work as was the case in 1932 and previous years.[7]

The number of Nyasaland natives working on the copper mines has decreased since 1932, the cause assigned being partly the restrictions imposed on the entry of Nyasaland natives into Northern Rhodesia but more especially the fact of workers from that territory being gradually replaced by Northern Rhodesia natives, who have become efficient in duties previously undertaken by aliens.[8]

The more recent Reports upon Native Affairs do not mention the subject.

Alien Africans staying in Northern Rhodesia. In connexion with the 1931 census of non-natives, information was obtained from 'employers of native labour'[9] as to the countries whence this labour came. It appears that of the 79,813 'Natives in Employment'[10] 69,517 or 87·1 per cent. gave

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 16. [2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] Ibid. *1930*, pp. 20–1. But see also ibid., pp. 18–19: 'An unprecedented event was the recruitment in Southern Rhodesia of over 2,000 natives for Northern Rhodesian Mines. These were mostly Northern Rhodesian and Nyasaland natives, who had been trained on Mines in Southern Rhodesia which do not need their services at the present time.'

[4] See also *Rapport sur l'Administration du Congo belge 1930*, p. 142; *1933*, p. 9.

[5] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, pp. 25–6. [6] Ibid. *1932*, p. 25.

[7] Ibid. *1933*, p. 29. [8] Ibid., p. 31.

[9] This probably means 'non-native employers of native labour'.

[10] Including 547 prisoners in jail (see *Census Report 1931*, p. 37).

TABLE 4. *'Natives in Employment' by Country of Origin and Sex, Northern Rhodesia, 1931*[1]

Sex	Northern Rhodesia	Southern Rhodesia	Nyasaland	Tanganyika Territory	Portuguese Africa	Belgian Congo	Other or unspecified	Total
Males . .	68,147	627	4,542	267	3,697	562	457	78,299
Females . .	1,370	8	55	1	30	49	1	1,514
Total . .	69,517	635	4,597	268	3,727	611	458	79,813

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 98.

Northern Rhodesia as their country of origin, while 10,296 or 12·9 per cent. did not do so. Of the 10,296 natives returned as aliens 4,597 came from Nyasaland, 3,727 from Portuguese Africa, and 1,972[1] from other territories. Nearly two-thirds (6,560) were employed in the Luangwa Province where 86 per cent. of all native mine workers employed in Northern Rhodesia were working.[2] But by the time the census was taken (5 May 1931) the number of alien natives employed had already started its downwards trend. The number of alien natives employed on the mines which at the end of 1930 had amounted to 7,596 had decreased to 5,755 by the end of April 1931. The Administration has published a great mass of figures concerning the number of miners employed in Northern Rhodesia, adding in some cases a classification by country of origin. I have summarized the principal data in the table on p. 434.

The Mines Department shows (A) the 'Actual number [of Natives] under engagement at end of month', distinguishing the 'Sources of Supply' (Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Other Sources). I have reproduced the figures for 31 December.

The Mines Department shows (B) for each year the 'Average Native Labour on Mines and Concessions', and (C) the 'Average Number of Natives in the Service of Companies and Contractors' by 'Territorial Classification' (Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Other Sources). The figures under B are the averages of the 'Actual number [of Natives] under engagement at end of month' (see A). The figures under C are somewhat muddled. For 1927–30 and 1933–8 they are again the averages of the numbers under engagement at end of month, but for 1931–2 they are the number under engagement on 31 December. The drop in 1931 and 1932 and the rise in 1933 are therefore grossly overstated.

The Department of Native Affairs shows (D) the 'average number of natives employed monthly by the mining and concession companies'.[3] These figures are still more misleading than those under C. For 1928–31 they represent the sum of (1) the averages of the Natives under engagement at end of month (A) and (2) the averages of the Europeans under engagement at end of month (as given in the reports of the Mines Depart-

[1] Including 458 natives entered under 'Other or Unspecified' country of origin.

[2] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 97–8.

[3] The reports for 1936–8 say 'average of natives employed on the mines'.

Year	A[1] Number of Natives under engagement on 31 Dec. — Sources of supply: N. Rhodesia	Nyasaland	Other sources	Total	B[2] Average Native labour on mines and concessions	C[3] Average number of Natives in the service of companies and contractors — Sources of supply: N. Rhodesia	Nyasaland	Other sources	Total	D[4] Average number of Natives employed monthly on mines	E[5] Average number (of Natives) employed on mines	F[6] Average number of Natives employed on mines
1927	..	..	..	10,946	9,955	9,113	544	298	9,955	..	9,493	..
1928	..	..	..	16,073	11,766	10,747	685	334	11,766	12,733	11,036	..
1929	..	..	..	22,341	18,119	16,584	1,055	480	18,119	19,720	17,608	..
1930	22,093	3,944	3,652	29,689	27,325	21,839	2,593	2,894	27,326	30,138	28,004	30,138
1931	9,323	2,623	1,315	13,261	20,412	9,323	2,623	1,315	13,261	23,357	21,888	23,357
1932	5,053	1,126	498	6,677	8,183	5,053	1,126	498	6,677	8,183	27,851	6,929
1933	10,335	1,354	672	12,361	9,961	8,052	1,267	643	9,962	10,786	9,920	9,920
1934	16,122	1,457	784	18,363	16,863	14,617	1,462	784	16,863	16,598	14,245	14,245
1935	15,800	1,310	680	17,790	18,542	16,464	1,369	709	18,542	18,464	17,298	17,381
1936	16,171	1,208	582	17,961	16,997	15,137	1,230	630	16,997	16,776	18,326	18,326
1937	23,890	1,239	736	25,865	24,898	23,057	1,150	691	24,898	22,504	23,689	..
1938	24,187	1,274	972	26,433	25,434	23,433	1,185	816	25,434	23,754	23,754	..

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 16; Mines Department, *Report 1930*, Schedule 4; *1931*, Schedule 4; *1932*, Schedule 4; *1933*, p. 20; *1934*, p. 19; *1935*, p. 20; *1936*, p. 18; *1937*, p. 28; *1938*, p. 28.

[2] See Mines Department, *Report 1931*, Schedule 7; *1933*, p. 22; *1938*, p. 29.

[3] See ibid. *1935*, p. 21; *1938*, p. 29.

[4] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1932*, p. 26; *1933*, p. 31; *1934*, p. 26; *1935*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 3.

[5] See *Blue Book 1927*, Section W, p. 2, to *1938*, Section W, p. 2. The figure for 1939 is 29,524 (see ibid. *1939*, Section W, p. 2).

[6] See *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1930*, p. 40; *1931*, p. 9; *1932*, p. 10; *1934*, p. 25; *1935*, p. 22; *1936*, p. 23.

ment).[1] The figure given for 1932 (8,183) represents the average of the Natives under engagement at end of month; the drop from 1931 to 1932 is grossly overstated, since the figure for 1931 includes Europeans while the figure for 1932 excludes them. As to the figures for 1933–8 their meaning is obscure; all that can be said is that they are not comparable with any of those given for 1928–32.

But the data published in the annual *Blue Books* (E) and those published in the *Annual Colonial Reports* (F) are, if possible, even more chaotic. The figures in the Blue Books are described as the 'Average numbers employed' on mines, for 1935–9 the words 'Natives only' being added. It is possible that the figures for 1927–31 actually represent the numbers of (native and European) labourers employed on mines (excluding Concessions), though it is hard to see how these averages were arrived at. The figure for 1932 (27,851) is absolutely erratic; the total number of European and native labourers employed on mines or concessions decreased steadily from 15,204 at the beginning to 7,677 at the end of the year. The figures in the Colonial Reports, though they are all described as showing the average number of natives employed, actually include for 1930–1 Europeans (as D). For 1932 the figure is only one-quarter as high as that given in the Blue Book. From 1933 on the figures given in the Colonial Reports are nearly all identical with those given in the Blue Books. But, whatever may be their meaning, they are not even comparable among themselves.[2]

Considering only the alien natives employed on mines and concessions it appears that their number averaged in 1927–9 842, 1,019, and 1,535 respectively. By 31 January 1930 it had risen to 3,149 and reached its peak at the end of that year, amounting on 31 December 1930 to 7,596. It then dropped to 1,624 on 31 December 1932, rose to 2,383 on 31 July 1934, and dropped to 1,757 on 31 October (and 30 November) 1936. It increased thereafter and amounted on 31 December 1938 to 2,246. The proportion of aliens among the natives employed averaged about 8 or 9 per cent. in 1927–29 and about 20 per cent. in 1930. It oscillated from October 1930 to May 1933 between 23 and 28 per cent.[3] In 1933–8 it averaged about 19, 13, 11, 11, 7, and 8 per cent. respectively.

The majority of the aliens were most of the time natives from Nyasaland, but from May 1930 to February 1931, when the demand for alien labour was greatest, there were sometimes more natives from other foreign

[1] As a consequence of this mistake some statements in the *Reports upon Native Affairs* of that period are erroneous. Thus the 1930 report says (p. 20): 'The average number of natives employed on mines during the year was 30,138, and the number employed at the end of the year was 29,700.' This sentence should have read: 'The average number of natives employed on mines during the year was 27,326 and the number employed at the end of the year was 29,700.'

[2] For example, the 1936 report states (p. 23): 'An average of 18,326 natives was employed in the mining industry against 17,381 during 1935.' Yet, according to the figures published by the Mines Department the average daily number of natives employed decreased from 18,464 in 1935 to 16,693 in 1936, and the average of the number under engagement at end of month from 18,542 to 16,997.

[3] See in this connexion ibid. *1932*, p. 26: 'The proportion of aliens on the mines is unreasonably high but the mine authorities anticipate that the number of Nyasaland natives will gradually decrease although it is pointed out that many of these aliens belong to the mechanical and semi-skilled type of natives who cannot readily be replaced.'

sources than from Nyasaland. According to the Reports upon Native Affairs for 1932–4 these other sources were 'mainly Portuguese West Africa and Belgian Congo'.[1] According to the report of the Pim Commission the origin of the Natives employed at the Copper Mines and Broken Hill at the end of April 1937 was as follows:[2]

Northern Rhodesia	*Nyasaland*	*Tanganyika Territory*	*Congo*	*Portuguese East Africa*	*Portuguese West Africa*	*Other Territories*	*Total*
17,975	1,044	95	58	94	168	48	19,482

Some of these figures, particularly those referring to Angola, are surprisingly low. The Commission says: 'The actual number from this country is, however, greater, as many of the natives returned as Balovale[3] are in reality emigrants from Portuguese territory.'[4]

As to the total number of alien native labourers in employment in Northern Rhodesia the census of 5 May 1931 had shown that it then amounted to 10,296. Since the number of alien natives on mines was 1,841 lower on 30 April 1931 than on 31 December 1930, it is safe to say that the total number of alien native labourers exceeded 12,000 at the end of 1930. The natives in employment from Nyasaland on 5 May 1931 numbered 4,597, of whom about 1,400 were not employed on mines. The Committee appointed by the Governor of Nyasaland to inquire into Emigrant Labour, in its report dated December 1935, stated:[5]

> The Northern Rhodesian Government estimates that there are approximately 2,000 Nyasaland Natives employed in Northern Rhodesia at present.

As the number of natives from Nyasaland employed on Northern Rhodesia mines was slightly over 1,300 from September to December 1935, it would seem that the number of Nyasaland natives working in Northern Rhodesia for employers other than the mining companies had decreased considerably since 1931. But the estimate of the Northern Rhodesian Government was probably an understatement. A survey of the adult male population, including absentees, carried out in Nyasaland from February to October 1937, showed the 'number of fit adult Nyasaland males employed for wages in Northern Rhodesia' to be 4,108.[6] For 31 December 1938–41 the numbers of Nyasaland native labourers in Northern Rhodesia were given as 4,300, 3,390, 3,000, and 4,500 respectively.[7]

A considerable number of these are employed on the Copper Belt, while others are engaged in Government service, on farms and with industrial undertakings.

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1932*, p. 26; *1933*, p. 31; *1934*, p. 26.
[2] See Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 362.
[3] The number of natives returned as from Balovale was 2,167.
[4] Ibid., p. 44.
[5] Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 15.
[6] See Bell Commission, *Report on Nyasaland*, pp. 13, 96, 337. The number of Nyasaland natives employed on Northern Rhodesia mines at end of month oscillated from Feb. to Oct. 1937 between 1,086 and 1,221; see Northern Rhodesia, Mines Department, *Report 1937*, p. 28.
[7] See Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of the Labour Department 1939*, p. 19; *1940*, p. 1; *1941*, p. 7.

They usually obtain seasonal employment and there is a constant to and fro movement.[1]

Of natives from Portuguese West Africa, there was, as shown above, a notable immigration in 1932 and 1933. The Pim Commission mentions 'Balovale or immigrants from Angola, who, while waiting for something better to turn up, work for little more than rations for other natives, such as the holders of mining or Government plots near Broken Hill'.[2] It refers furthermore to the employment of alien labourers in the Eastern Province.

There is a curious position in a part of the Fort Jameson area, where the farmers employ not local labour but men called in from Nyasaland or Portuguese territory.[3]

But nothing perhaps better illustrates the irrelevance of alien labour in Northern Rhodesia in recent times than the fact that Major Orde Browne in his excellent report on Labour Conditions in Northern Rhodesia (1938) does not mention this subject at all.

4. *Migration of Labourers from Northern Rhodesia*

Introduction. If one considers merely the net number of persons involved, immigration into Northern Rhodesia would appear to be the most important migration movement that affected the country in 1919–39. But immigration of, say, 50,000 families into a territory five times as large as England and Wales and sparsely settled by only about 200,000 families was readily absorbed without any severe repercussions. It is a much more serious matter if, on the other hand, year after year, say, 50,000 able-bodied men are absent from such a country working in neighbouring territories. This kind of exodus has indeed affected the composition of the native population decisively for the last thirty-five years, and the opinion prevailing twenty years ago that the expansion of the domestic labour market through the copper mines would put an ever-increasing check to emigration[4] has proved to be wrong.

Northern Rhodesians at first apparently migrated only southwards. They left 'the country to seek work in Cape Colony and in the coastal

[1] Ibid. *1939*, p. 12; see also ibid. *1938*, p. 16.

[2] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 51. Recent reports refer repeatedly to such natives from Angola who apparently were waiting in Northern Rhodesia for something better to turn up. Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 5, says: 'There is a considerable influx of Natives from Angola in search of work in Southern and Northern Rhodesia. The number was probably about 5,000 in the year under review. Many of these Angola Natives settle eventually in Barotseland.' The same report states (ibid.) that '1,440 adults and 20 youths who originated in Angola' were recruited in Northern Rhodesia for work in Southern Rhodesia. In the following year 843 natives from Angola were thus recruited for Southern Rhodesia (see ibid. *1941*, p. 5). Even when, from 1 Jan. 1943 on, recruitment of Northern Rhodesia natives by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association was suspended, the Association continued to recruit Angola natives in Northern Rhodesia (see ibid. *1943*, p. 6).

[3] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 51.

[4] See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1925–6*, p. 18: 'A great change has come over the field for native labour. Three years ago, opportunities for work in the Territory, even at the lowest wage, were entirely insufficient. Now mining and prospecting developments, combined with their inevitable repercussions on agricultural and other activities, have produced a large and increasing demand for labour within the Territory. It is highly probable that the numbers of natives who leave Northern Rhodesia to work in other countries will decrease with every succeeding year.'

areas before the Rhodesias were occupied by Europeans'.[1] In a letter written in January 1889 on behalf of King Lewanika of Barotseland to the Administrator of Bechuanaland Sir Sidney Shippard, the French missionary François Coillard said:

> Many a Zambesian has found his way to the Diamond Fields, and come back deeply impressed with the prestige of the British Government. The tale of what they have seen and heard, and of its dealings with the native races, naturally leads their chiefs and their countrymen to yearn after the protection of Her Majesty the Queen's Government.[2]

While Barotseland natives continued to go to the Rand Mines it was not until 1898 that they went to Southern Rhodesia. The Administrator of Northern Rhodesia, Major P. W. Forbes, in his description of the activities of R. T. Coryndon, who had been appointed by the Foreign Office to the post of Resident Commissioner of Barotseland and who arrived in the capital in October 1897, relates:

> Since his arrival at Lialui a number of the natives have expressed their intention of travelling to Bulawayo for work, and Mr. Coryndon has made arrangements for any natives so proceeding to be fed on the journey, and provided with employment on their arrival.[3]

By that time the natives of Barotseland evidently had heard of the urgent demand for alien labour on the part of the newly developed gold mines in Southern Rhodesia. The Chief Native Commissioner of Matabeleland in his report for the year ending 31 March 1898 described the situation as follows:

> The labour problem is one that requires the most serious consideration; there is not sufficient labour in Matabeleland to supply the various mines when they are at work; we must therefore look to the outside provinces for our supply. It is estimated that when the gold companies are fully engaged in developing their properties they will require from 15,000 to 20,000 native labourers. Our best source of supply is from the north of the Zambesi. . . . When once we can establish a system whereby natives coming from the north to work are given fair and just treatment with reasonable remuneration for their services I do not fear any difficulty in the supply of labour from the north; and every year many natives from the north proceed to the Rand in search of work; it would be much more favourable to them to obtain the work here.[4]

With a view to keeping up a constant and regular supply of labour, 'the Government, in combination with certain of the mine managers, initiated

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 29.

[2] Marshall Hole, p. 213. See also ibid., p. 102.

[3] British South Africa Company, *Report on the condition of the Territories within the sphere of its operations 1896–7*, p. 48.

[4] B.S.A.C., *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1897–8*, pp. 215–16. The scarcity of local labour at the Southern Rhodesia mines in the early years may be illustrated by two quotations. In his report for 1900–2 the Administrator of Rhodesia, W. H. Milton, stated 'that out of a total of 7,500 labourers employed during a recent month on certain mines on which careful statistics are kept, less than 700 were aboriginal natives of Southern Rhodesia' (ibid. *1900–2*, p. 18). 'A return of the natives at work in the mines of Matabeleland at the end of last year [1902] showed that out of a total of about 8,000 employed only about 600 were [Southern] Rhodesian natives' (*Directors' Report and Accounts 31 Mar. 1901 and 31 Mar. 1902*, p. 26). The situation changed only after the establishment of a Native Labour Bureau. 'The Compound Inspectors reports for April [1904] . . . show that . . . out of a total of 9,547 natives employed [on mines], 3,188 or 33·3 per cent. were natives of Southern Rhodesia, and 6,359 or 66·7 per cent. natives of other countries' (ibid. *1902–3*, p. 43).

a scheme for the introduction of labour from north of the Zambesi',[1] and the Deputy Administrator of Matabeleland, Captain A. Lawley, discussed this matter with King Lewanika personally.

Towards the end of 1897 the desirability of extending our administration in a northerly direction seemed to me so important that I arranged with Major Coryndon, our representative with Lewanika, to meet me with the king in person at the Victoria Falls . . . I accordingly proceeded in May, 1898 . . . to the Zambesi river. . . .

In my interview with the king . . . I entered at length into the question of the supply of native labour to the mines of Matabeleland.[2]

A few months later the Chief Native Commissioner of (Southern) Rhodesia reported from Matabeleland:

The first batch of Barotse natives (about 150) arrived here towards the latter end of August; as mine boys they are rather inferior, but this is a good deal owing to their rawness.[3]

While this was the beginning of a continuous flow of natives from North-Western Rhodesia to Southern Rhodesia similar efforts were made to draw natives from North-Eastern Rhodesia. In June 1898, Major Colin Harding arrived at M'peseni's (Fort Jameson) for the purpose of recruiting natives for the police in Mashonaland.[4] He reported:[5]

The natives make excellent policemen and readily came and were enlisted for service in Mashonaland, in all four or five hundred must have gone south from this district alone, between the months of June and December for labour[6] and police duties.[7] I am of opinion that large quantities of native labour can be drawn from this district, provided that the first batches are treated with consideration and fairness, enabling them to return with satisfactory accounts of the country and the treatment they have received.

The various reports of the British South Africa Company deal very fully with the migration of Northern Rhodesia natives to Southern Rhodesia mines.[8] I shall quote here a few passages from the reports for 1898–1903.

In the month of May, 1899, a Labour Bureau was instituted at Bulawayo . . . .

The importation of labour from outside has only been tried on a small scale. . . .

[1] B.S.A.C., *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1897–8*, pp. 108–9. See also B.S.A.C., *Directors' Report and Accounts 1897–8*, p. 26: 'The Administration, with the co-operation of the Mining Companies, is making every endeavour to cope with the labour difficulty. A scheme for the introduction of labour from Northern Rhodesia has been initiated.'

[2] B.S.A.C., *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1897–8*, p. 112.

[3] Ibid., p. 220. [4] See ibid., p. 115. [5] Ibid., p. 399.

[6] See also in this connexion the following statement of the Deputy Administrator of Northern Rhodesia, R. Codrington, ibid., p. 114: 'The export of labour to Mashonaland is one of the most obvious directions in which we can contribute to the development and prosperity of Rhodesia, and our preliminary experiments in this direction seem likely to be successful.'

[7] Of the natives thus enrolled as policemen many stayed for a long time in Southern Rhodesia. See 'Report of the Commandant of the British South Africa Police for the Period ending 31 Mar. 1900' (ibid. *1898–1900*, p. 48): 'The present strength of the Mashonaland Native Police is 299. All, with the exception of three, are natives of British Central Africa . . . .'

[8] See, for example, ibid. *1897–8*, pp. 103, 109, 196–7, 206, 219–20; *1898–1900*, pp. 155–6, 252–3, 284; *1900–2*, pp. 164, 176, 179–80, 297, 411; *Directors' Report and Accounts 1902–3*, p. 15; *1903–4*, p. 13; *1905–6*, pp. 7, 9, 30, 51; *1906–7*, pp. 6, 9, 47, 71; *1907–8*, pp. 6, 31, 34–5, 49; *1908–9*, pp. 10, 39, 41, 46; *Report of the Seventh Ordinary General Meeting*, 4 Dec. 1901, p. 15; *Report of an Extraordinary General Meeting*, 23 Jan. 1908, p. 12.

The Government has also made experiments either directly or indirectly (by rendering financial and other assistance to private labour agents) to encourage the importation of natives from Angoniland and the country North of the Zambesi, but in this case also the numbers who have come down are disappointing, and a long time elapses before they become really efficient miners.[1]

Over fifteen hundred labourers from M'peseni's Country have gone down to Salisbury to work in the mines, where they receive higher pay than in their own country. The men who have returned from Mashonaland express themselves as quite satisfied with the conditions of their service, and a gradually increasing number may be expected to go down every year.[2]

Together with the Batonga . . . they [the Batoka people] supply the bulk of the labour from this territory now employed in the Matabeleland mines, but considering the population I am of opinion that with a more intelligent and energetic system of labour-agency, the supply might be trebled.[3]

The men even at this distance [from Barotseland] find their way to Bulawayo and Salisbury for work. I was constantly meeting boys who had just returned from Southern Rhodesia, or were going down, but they object to be taken down in a mob by an agent. Being improperly fed on the journey, some of them run away, some die *en route*, and only a certain percentage arrive at Bulawayo, where, so I am informed, they often wait a month to recruit their health before they are fit for work. Those who desert return to their kraals, and prejudice their brothers and friends against going down. One or two do such harm in this way that it takes months to eradicate it. Those who arrive safely work well, earn good money, buy hoes, &c., then return to their homes, and after a few months of idleness they leave again for the mines.

Up to now, it has been impossible to keep an authentic record of the exportation of native labour from this country, but I am of opinion that a far greater number travel south of the Zambesi than is generally imagined, and it only requires an organised bureau to enable the Barotse country to play a great part in the supply of native labour for Southern Rhodesia.

A Company's official or a Police Officer should be stationed at each of the principal drifts, viz., Kazungula, Victoria Falls, and Walker's Drift, to stop the inroad of unauthorised agents, to keep a record of all boys who leave the country, showing under whose direction they go, to what destination, and at the same time to do all that is possible to persuade the indunas and chiefs of the different districts to bring in those boys who want work.

I was particularly struck on my road to Lealui by the quantity of available labour, which I saw at the different kraals *en route*. Hitherto neither the King nor his son Letia have done much to encourage their followers to cross the Zambesi for work.[4]

[Batoka District] The supply of labour is not so plentiful as is imagined, owing to the depopulation referred to [due to former raids of Matabele and Barotse], and to the inducements held out to the natives to go down to the mines in Southern Rhodesia, Johannesburg and Kimberley.[5]

The agreement with the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association . . . having proved unworkable, a new agreement is under discussion. It is proposed that the agreement should provide for recruiting for the common benefit in both Northern

[1] 'Report by the Administrator of Matabeleland (Sir Arthur Lawley), for the Two Years ending March 31st, 1900', *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1898–1900*, p. 28.

[2] 'Report by the Administrator of North-Eastern Rhodesia (R. Codrington) for two Years ending March 31st, 1900', ibid., p. 71.

[3] 'Reports by the Administrator of North-Western Rhodesia (Barotseland) (R. T. Coryndon)', ibid., p. 94.

[4] Report by the Acting British Resident of Barotseland (Major Colin Harding), 22 Dec. 1899, ibid., p. 98.

[5] Extracts from a report of the District Commissioner, 'North-Western Rhodesia, Report of the Administrator (R. T. Coryndon) 1901–1902', ibid. *1900–2*, p. 449.

and Southern Rhodesia, on the understanding that no natives recruited in either territory will be sent to the Witwatersrand until the local requirements for labour have been fully met.[1]

A Native Labour Bureau was established by the Company in September, 1903, to organise a better supply of native labour. Agents have been stationed in North-Western Rhodesia, and much has been done to regulate the supply of labour coming from North-Eastern Rhodesia and the Nyasa district, via Feira.[2]

It is considered, however, that the development of mines in the Kafue District, added to the ever increasing requirements of settlers, missionaries and officials, in North-Eastern Rhodesia, will absorb all the available labour in the near future.[3]

In 1905 the Administrator of Southern Rhodesia, Sir William Milton, appointed a Committee to inquire into the causes of the annually recurring labour shortage, and into the working of the Native Labour Bureau.[4] One cause of the labour shortage appeared to be the higher wages in the Transvaal mines.

The evidence before the Committee has very clearly shown that the practice of bringing gangs of labourers, recruited by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association in Northern Zambesia and territories lying to the north, through Rhodesia is detrimental to Rhodesian industries, and is calculated to spread discontent among the natives of Southern Rhodesia.

The Committee recommends that the Government of Southern Rhodesia should take steps to arrange with the Governments of North-Eastern and North-Western Rhodesia that the Rhodesian industries should have the first call on any surplus labour available in those territories, and if any surplus remains which can be spared, it should be sent to the Transvaal by sea, and not by the land route through this country. . . .[5]

As regards the Labour Bureau the Committee came to the conclusion that a Bureau 'dependent on voluntary contributions can neither be effective in its work nor permanent in its character' and recommended the imposition of a tax upon employers of labour for the purpose of raising funds for the support of the Bureau. This recommendation led to the reconstitution of the Rhodesia Native Labour Bureau in 1906. The ensuing situation was described by the Administrator of Southern Rhodesia, Sir William Milton, as follows:

The recruiting of natives for the mines takes place either through private agents or through the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau. . . .

Its energies were chiefly devoted to opening up of new recruiting fields, and permission was obtained to recruit in North-Eastern and North-Western Rhodesia, under regulations framed by the respective administrations, safe-guarding the interests of the natives. Natives from North-Eastern Rhodesia contract for a term of twelve months, and those from North-Western Rhodesia for six months, with an option of renewing for another three months. Considerable numbers have been arriving from these provinces, and more are expected.[6]

[1] *Directors' Report and Accounts 31 Mar. 1901 and 31 Mar. 1902*, p. 27. But see also ibid., p. 30, the following resolution adopted by the South African Inter-Colonial Conference held at Bloemfontein, Mar., 1903: 'That all British possessions in South, Central and East Africa should be an open field for labour recruiting, and that all natives should be allowed to choose their own spheres of work.'

[2] Ibid. *1902–3*, p. 14.

[3] Ibid., p. 11.

[4] See ibid. *1905–6*, p. 31.

[5] Ibid., p. 32.

[6] Ibid. *1906–7*, p. 39. For further details concerning the activities of the Rhodesia Native Labour Bureau in Northern Rhodesia, see p. 443 below.

At the same time the Administrators of North-Western and North-Eastern Rhodesia reported:

> The total number of natives who have been registered for employment in the Southern Rhodesia mines is 5,180. The period contracted for is six months.
>
> The majority of these have been recruited by the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau, but not a few have travelled south in search of labour of their own accord, preferring to be independent in their choice of labour.[1]
>
> Most of the 700 men who were recruited by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association for a year's work on the Rand mines have already returned to their homes. Although the conditions of employment under the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association appear to be more favourable than those obtaining at any other labour centre, yet the death rate among these men was very heavy. Recruiting for the Rand is now prohibited, but it is likely that a considerable number of men, attracted by the high rate of pay given on the Rand, will find their way down on their own account during the coming year.[2]

In his Report for 1908–9 the Chief Native Commissioner of Matabeleland mentions the recruiting of Northern Rhodesia natives for farm labour.

> In order to meet the requirements of the farming community, permission was granted to recruit on behalf of the Agricultural Union 500 natives from North-Western Rhodesia. These natives were contracted to employers for nine calendar months under certain conditions pertaining to their welfare.[3]

In this century there has been in addition a large migration towards the north, mainly to the Katanga mines in the Belgian Congo,[4] but also to German East Africa[5] and later to Tanganyika, though the bulk of migrant labourers continued to go to Southern Rhodesia.[6]

The vital importance for the Protectorate of the migration of natives to other territories has been realized for more than two decades. Dozens of departmental and other reports published by the Administration have dealt with this subject, and almost every year the Advisory Council and

[1] 'Extracts from the Report of the Acting Administrator of North-Western Rhodesia, 1906–1907,' *Directors' Report and Accounts 1906–7*, p. 61.

[2] 'North-Eastern Rhodesia, General Report for the two Years ending 31st March, 1907,' ibid., p. 71. See also Davis, p. 136: 'Until the imposition in May 1913 of the restriction on recruitment north of latitude 22° South, a certain number of workers found their way to the gold-mines of Johannesburg.'

[3] *Directors' Report and Accounts 1908–9*, p. 38.

[4] 'The Congo mines were developed and worked in the early days largely by the labour of Natives derived from the Mweru-Luapala and Awemba provinces of Northern Rhodesia' (Davis, p. 155). 'For about twenty years the industries of Katanga have been able to count on considerable numbers of labourers originating from Northern Rhodesia' (*Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, Rapport 1930–1, Katanga*, p. 100). See also Northern Rhodesia, *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 30: 'Since the earliest days of mining natives have found in that Territory well paid congenial employment and large numbers have completed many contracts.' See furthermore Church (member of the East Africa Commission), *East Africa* (1927), p. 117: 'We were informed that not the least attraction of the Belgian Congo mines for the blacks is the absence of racial discrimination.' (The Mining Union of Upper Katanga had been created by a decree of 28 Oct. 1905 for the exploitation of the mines discovered by The Tanganyika Concessions, Ltd.; the mines were opened in 1911. See Davis, p. 53, and Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa*, vol. ii, p. 424.)

[5] See Davis, p. 136.

[6] See also in this connexion Northern Rhodesia, *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 73: 'Possibly there is some truth in the remark of the District Commissioner, Lundazi, that the exodus to Southern Rhodesia is a matter of habit, and that a native goes there because his father did and perhaps his grandfather before him.'

its successor, the Legislative Council, have debated the problem for hours. But a perusal of this vast amount of documents reveals very few facts, because the statistics collected in Northern Rhodesia are scanty and most contradictory and because neither the Administration nor anyone else has taken the trouble of adequately supplementing the Northern Rhodesia statistics by those of the territories to which the natives migrated. I shall try here to fill this gap in part by summarizing the pertinent statistics compiled in Southern Rhodesia, which throw much more light on the migrations of Northern Rhodesia natives to this territory than the statistics of their country of origin.[1]

Northern Rhodesia Natives leaving for Southern Rhodesia. The natives going to Southern Rhodesia in 1906–33 were either recruited by the (Southern) Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau or went there independently.[2] The Bureau started operations in 1906 and was closed in 1933. Statistics of the activities of the Bureau have been published by the Bureau itself, by the Rhodesian Chamber of Mines, by the British South Africa Company, and from 1926 on by the Northern Rhodesia administration.[3] The statistics given in the Bureau's own reports are, of course, the most detailed but they were prepared in a haphazard fashion. Some statements refer to all labourers from 'North of the Zambesi', but these figures evidently comprise sometimes only labourers from Northern Rhodesia and sometimes labourers both from Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. The figures show for some periods all the labourers recruited, for other periods only the labourers who arrived in Southern Rhodesia, for still other periods only the labourers who were distributed to employers (in Southern or Northern Rhodesia).

According to the statistics published by the Rhodesian Chamber of Mines the numbers of natives from Northern Rhodesia distributed by the Bureau[4] were as follows:[5]

1906	1,579	1910	9,120	1914	5,408	1918	5,418	1922	4,060
1907	7,590	1911	6,588	1915	6,602	1919	8,509	1923	5,348
1908	7,411	1912	12,126	1916	4,142	1920	14,579	1924	4,409
1909	7,457	1913	6,501	1917	8,549	1921	9,058	1925	9,028

[1] It is possible that a systematic perusal of the official (and private) publications on the Belgian Congo would likewise have proved useful. I shall, however, confine myself here to quoting at random a few passages from such documents.

[2] Often labourers who had first come as recruits, came again on their own account. See, for example, Southern Rhodesia, *Report on Public Health 1912*, p. 6: 'Northern Rhodesia . . . is practically the only field where fresh labour supplies can be recruited, and to that territory the operations of the Labour Bureau are entirely confined. This organisation taps the sources of labour and brings down the raw recruit to work on the mines. This recruit, returning home after his period of contract, may, and often does, elect to return to mine work, but then, having gained in knowledge of what is before him and what to expect, he comes almost invariably on his own account, being thus unfettered and independent.'

[3] The latter statistics refer only to recruiting in Northern Rhodesia for employment outside the Territory. They are reproduced p. 448 below.

[4] I suppose that these numbers comprise Northern Rhodesian and alien labourers recruited in Northern Rhodesia supplied to Northern or Southern Rhodesia employers, but do not include Northern Rhodesian labourers recruited in Southern Rhodesia.

[5] See Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, Bulawayo, *Report 1917*, p. 44; *1925*, p. 40. The Chamber did not publish the figures for 1926–33.

According to the same source the number of labourers supplied to employers in Northern Rhodesia was as follows:[1]

1914	892	1917	230	1920	834	1923	51	1926	13	1929	—	1932	—
1915	230	1918	288	1921	65	1924	31	1927	—	1930	46		
1916	100	1919	529	1922	64	1925	74	1928	—	1931	36		

As to the labourers coming on their own account, the Chief Native Commissioner of Southern Rhodesia has published for each year from 1925 on the number of 'Native foreigners entering the Colony in search of work', classified according to country of origin. Table 5 shows the

TABLE 5. *Northern Rhodesia Natives entering Southern Rhodesia in Search of Work, 1925–43*[1]

Year	Adults		Juveniles	Total
	Original registrations	*Re-entrants*		
1925	..	..	..	19,803
1926	..	..	..	23,312
1927	16,292	2,091	3,374	21,757
1928	15,456	2,728	3,154	21,338
1929	15,690	3,487	3,949	23,126
1930	13,031	2,593	3,599	19,223
1931	8,656	1,407	2,134	12,197
1932	6,039	2,537	2,268	10,844
1933	9,801	4,221	3,082	17,104
1934	12,470	4,222	3,032	19,724
1935	17,777	3,391	3,514	24,682
1936	16,576	3,313	5,213	25,102
1937	19,489	4,115	5,237	28,841
1938	9,104	1,851	1,494	12,449
1939	7,376	1,740	1,241	10,357
1940	9,773	3,248	979	14,000
1943	9,664	2,192	1,067	12,923

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1925*, p. 4; *1926*, p. 8; *1927*, p. 5; *1928*, p. 6; *1929*, p. 8; *1930*, p. 8; *1931*, p. 8; *1932*, p. 11; *1933*, p. 8; *1934*, p. 6; *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 8; *1939*, p. 6; *1940*, p. 8; Southern Rhodesia, *Report of Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration 1943*, p. 2. The totals given in the 1943 Report (ibid.) for 'Native Immigrants entering Southern Rhodesia' from Northern Rhodesia in 1930–43 differ for most years from those given above. They read: 19,223, 12,459, 10,848, 16,750, 20,417, 25,779, 25,231, 28,799, 12,449, 10,374, 14,030, 14,861, 12,435, and 12,923. The figure for 1944 was 12,823; see Secretary for Native Affairs, Northern Rhodesia, 10 Jan. 1945, *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xlix, col. 77.

figures of labourers thus coming from Northern Rhodesia. These figures are identical with those given (for 1927–34) by the Northern Rhodesia Secretary of Native Affairs as the numbers of natives estimated to have proceeded independently to work in Southern Rhodesia. But in his report for 1930 the Chief Native Commissioner of Southern Rhodesia stated that the 1930 figure of adult foreigners entering the Colony was not comparable

[1] See Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, Bulawayo, *Report 1914*, p. 20; *1915*, p. 20; *1916*, p. 20; *1917*, p. 20; *1918*, p. 20; *1919*, p. 20; *1920*, p. 18; *1921*, p. 18; *1922*, p. 18; *1923*, p. 18; *1924*, p. 18; *1925*, p. 18; *1926*, p. 13; *1927*, p. 17; *1928*, p. 17; *1929*, p. 17; *1930*, p. 17; *1931*, p. 9; *1932*, p. 9.

with that for 1929 as the latter 'was based on the Central Alien Tax Bureau figure (which includes R.N.L.B. natives)', while the former was 'the Native Department figure' which excluded natives recruited by the Native Labour Bureau.[1] The apparent drop in the number of Northern Rhodesians entering Southern Rhodesia in search of work from 23,126 in 1929 to 19,223 in 1930 would then, in fact, represent an increase, since in 1929 4,599 labourers were distributed by the Labour Bureau. Yet, the Commissioner writes on the following page of his report: 'It is to be presumed that this drop of nearly 17 per cent. is the result of activities in the Northern Rhodesia copper belt.'[2] Actually the number of natives employed on the Northern Rhodesia mines increased from 22,341 at the end of 1929 to 29,689 at the end of 1930. I am, therefore, inclined to assume that the 1929 figure and also all prior figures just as the figures for subsequent years exclude recruited labourers.

Northern Rhodesia Natives Staying in Southern Rhodesia. From 1911 on some count of Northern Rhodesians was made at each census in Southern Rhodesia. In 1911 there were 5,143 (5,012 male, 131 female) Northern Rhodesia 'Natives enumerated on Householders' Forms, travelling by Rail or Coach, and living in Urban Locations'. These figures excluded Northern Rhodesia natives employed on mines who in the census report were given as 12,000. The total of 17,100 is stated to represent the number of Northern Rhodesia natives 'living in Southern Rhodesia at 7th May 1911'.[3]

In 1921 'the Census Department by means of householders' forms filled in by employers, location managers, etc., counted all natives actually at work, or present in the towns, on Census day, including indigenes and aliens'. The number of such natives whose country of origin was stated to be Northern Rhodesia was 32,125 (31,201 males and 924 females).[4]

In 1926 'the machinery of the census organisation was utilised to obtain from employers of native labour returns of the natives in their service, . . . their number and their countries of origin'. The 'Natives employed on 4th May, 1926', whose country of origin was stated to be Northern Rhodesia was 35,486 (35,431 males and 55 females).[5] It should be noted that the results for 1926 are not comparable with those of 1921 and 1911

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1930*, p. 8.

[2] Ibid., p. 9.

[3] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report regarding the Census 7th May 1911*, pp. 24, 38. It should be noted, however, that the figure actually did not include all Northern Rhodesia natives living in Southern Rhodesia. It certainly excluded those who lived in a reserve, for example, after having married a Southern Rhodesia girl. (In his report for 1908–9 the Chief Native Commissioner of Matabeleland listed among the conscientious taxpayers 'those alien natives who have become domiciled and have elected to make this country their home, and have "konzad" to and have placed themselves under the tribal control of some chief'; see British South Africa Company, *Directors' Report and Accounts 1908–9*, p. 37.)

[4] See Southern Rhodesia, *Final Report regarding the Census 3rd May 1921*, pp. 6, 19. The number of Northern Rhodesia Natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines had increased considerably in the year preceding the census date (see Table 6). Davis says (p. 156): 'In Southern Rhodesia in 1920 some 24,000 Northern Rhodesian Natives were employed on mines, farms, railways and other work.'

[5] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report regarding the Census 4th May 1926*, Part III, pp. 21, 47.

TABLE 6. *Northern Rhodesia Natives employed on Southern Rhodesia Mines, January 1919 to December 1944*[1]

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Average
1919	5,488	5,395	5,274	5,264	5,616	5,587	6,024	6,608	6,889	7,176	7,325	7,347	6,166
1920	7,976	7,540	7,801	8,215	8,643	9,082	9,343	9,746	10,354	10,548	10,188	10,854	9,190
1921	11,224	11,038	10,919	10,944	11,406	10,854	10,158	9,760	9,238	9,515	8,759	8,025	10,153
1922	9,002	8,886	8,943	9,898	8,689	8,662	8,835	8,677	8,285	7,927	7,540	7,976	8,610
1923	7,263	7,904	7,707	7,800	7,892	8,349	8,649	9,494	10,129	10,506	10,591	10,944	8,936
1924	10,878	10,948	10,942	10,676	10,853	10,773	11,153	10,525	10,551	12,226	10,779	10,362	10,805
1925	10,452	10,696	10,764	11,209	10,780	11,168	11,219	11,130	11,463	11,585	11,558	11,801	11,152
1926	12,356	12,029	12,207	12,404	12,136	11,972	12,148	12,108	11,671	12,071	12,347	11,954	12,117
1927	12,305	11,842	12,188	12,330	12,141	12,026	12,091	12,125	12,218	12,363	12,145	11,883	12,138
1928	11,348	12,036	11,995	11,841	11,921	12,457	12,059	12,352	12,586	12,552	13,024	13,514	12,307
1929	13,921	13,739	13,724	13,670	13,779	13,428	13,933	14,196	13,929	14,106	14,202	13,868	13,875
1930	14,677	14,608	13,968	13,954	13,267	13,323	12,882	12,635	13,944	12,027	11,712	11,170	13,181
1931	11,147	10,457	10,595	10,172	9,920	9,505	9,406	8,868	8,791	8,892	8,727	8,854	9,611
1932	8,652	8,618	8,594	9,018	8,815	8,771	8,793	9,060	9,573	9,521	9,748	9,720	9,074
1933	10,166	10,293	10,502	10,828	11,178	11,762	12,531	12,888	13,082	13,133	13,539	13,718	11,968
1934	13,986	13,884	14,323	14,390	14,937	15,621	15,925	16,501	16,861	17,011	17,731	18,060	15,769
1935	18,342	18,390	18,341	18,725	19,546	19,959	20,364	20,226	21,189	21,566	21,784	22,247	20,057
1936	21,998	22,165	22,110	21,770	22,594	22,523	23,037	23,728	24,223	24,427	24,589	25,288	23,204
1937	25,606	25,620	25,888	25,735	25,844	26,008	26,694	27,145	26,610	27,030	27,062	27,121	26,364
1938	27,199	26,054	25,702	25,555	24,997	24,652	23,985	23,806	23,487	23,427	23,254	23,234	24,613
1939	22,721	22,273	22,133	21,923	22,052	21,547	21,558	21,630	21,681	21,935	22,147	22,618	22,018
1940	22,870	22,271	22,388	22,191	22,004	22,244	22,377	22,385	22,270	22,325	22,491	22,493	22,359
1941	22,393	22,419	22,172	21,986	21,697	21,506	21,819	21,930	21,683	21,494	21,543	21,542	21,849
1942	21,682	21,610	21,655	21,337	21,247	21,061	21,227	21,232	21,267	21,502	21,565	21,328	21,393
1943	21,394	21,205	20,979	21,135	20,826	21,234	21,043	21,343	21,129	21,274	21,162	21,212	21,161
1944	21,167	20,579	21,127	20,539	20,299	20,309	20,078	19,562	19,837	19,682	19,726	19,463	20,197

[1] See Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, *Report 1919*, p. 19; *1920*, p. 17, to *1930*, p. 17; *1931*, p. 9, to *1936*, p. 9; *1937*, p. 27; *1938*, p. 32; *1939*, p. 37; *1940*, p. 27; *1941*, p. 24; *1942*, p. 31; *1943*, p. 29; *1944*, p. 32. The yearly averages differ for some years from those given in Table 18 (col. 2).

since the object of the earlier counts was to cover not only natives employed on the census date but also unemployed adults and children.[1] The enormous drop in the number of enumerated females illustrates the difference in the scope of the counts.

No statement concerning the method used at the count of 1931 seems to have been published but it is probable that the enumeration was made in the same manner as in 1926. In 1936 the scope was the same as in 1926 but the method differed slightly:

> In former census years natives employed on mines were not enumerated at the census, but particulars were obtained from the monthly returns of employment on mines rendered to the Department of Mines. In the 1936 census, however, natives employed on mines were also enumerated, and all employers of native labour were required to furnish returns of all natives employed by them on 5th May, 1936.[2]

The report on the 1936 census showed 'the distribution of male native employees by countries of origin at each census date since 1921',[3] giving for Northern Rhodesia:

1921	*1926*	*1931*	*1936*
31,201	35,431	35,542	46,884

The report reached the conclusion that 'employment of Northern Rhodesia natives increased slowly between 1921 and 1931 and substantially in the succeeding inter-censal period'.[4] But in reaching this conclusion the author evidently overlooked the fact that the 1921 figure of 31,201 included other than employed natives and that the increase in male employed natives was actually larger between 1921 and 1931 than indicated by the above figures.

According to the census taken in 1941 the number of Northern Rhodesia male natives in employment in Southern Rhodesia was 48,163.[5]

Table 18 shows (col. 2) the average number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines in 1912–44. Table 6 shows the number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines at the end of each month from January 1919 to December 1944.

I shall now turn to the Northern Rhodesia statistics which, of course, cover also those natives going to other territories than Southern Rhodesia.

Northern Rhodesia Natives leaving the Protectorate. The Department of Native Affairs provided for 1926–33 details about the recruiting of

[1] Of the 161,813 natives returned on householders' forms in 1921, 18,891 were 'unemployed' (1,385 male adults, 4,226 males 14 years and under, 7,818 married females and 5,462 unmarried females); see *Final Report regarding the Census 3rd May 1921*, p. 20.

[2] 'Census of Population, 1936, Natives in Employment', *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia*, 21 Oct. 1937, p. 1. For schedule used see Southern Rhodesia, *Report on the Census of Population, 1936*, pp. 4–5.

[3] Ibid., p. 106.

[4] Ibid., p. 107.

[5] See *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia*, 21 Mar. 1942, p. 1.

Northern Rhodesia labourers for other countries (Southern Rhodesia, Congo mines, and Tanganyika Territory plantations):[1]

	1926			1927			1928		
	S.R.	Congo	T.T.	S.R.	Congo	T.T.	S.R.	Congo	T.T.
Recruited	4,882	4,609	506	4,718	6,153	230	4,022	5,176	27
Repatriated	7,104	6,376	—	5,533	3,774	383	4,387	5,296	150
Deaths	..	..	..	..	..	..	112	114	..
Employed 31 Dec.	..	..	..	..	..	..	6,083	3,140	..

	1929		1930		1931		1932	1933
	S.R.	Congo	S.R.	Congo	S.R.	Congo	S.R.	S.R.
Recruited	4,599	4,110	3,300	1,192	1,211	551	879	283
Repatriated	3,958	4,372	4,422	3,018	4,024	678	1,435	1,243
Deaths	112	75	92	27	21	13	25	..
Employed 31 Dec.	6,678	2,460	5,410	634	3,004	—	1,553	504

The figures of recruited labourers are considered accurate by the Administration, but I do not feel quite sure about that.[2]

The reports of the Department of Native Affairs show for some years also the number of natives leaving the Territory independently (by district or province of origin) and in particular the number of natives going to Southern Rhodesia. I have summarized the results in Table 7.

TABLE 7. *Native Labourers leaving Northern Rhodesia, 1927–34*[1]

Year	Recruited	Migrating independently					Migrants Total
		From			To		
		East Luangwa	Other Districts	Total	Southern Rhodesia	Elsewhere	
1927	11,101	..	..	31,438	21,757	9,681	42,539
1928	9,225	11,510	16,140	27,650	21,338	6,312	36,875
1929	8,709	14,442	19,299	33,741	23,126	10,515	42,450
1930	4,492	16,558	17,006	33,564	19,223	14,341	38,056
1931	1,762	15,675	13,506	29,181	12,197	17,016	30,943
1932	879	13,801	10,459	24,260	10,844	13,416	25,139
1933	283	11,462	9,548	21,010	17,104	3,906	21,293
1934	—	..	..	31,572	19,724	11,848	31,572

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, pp. 15–16, Appendix H; *1930*, pp. 40–1; *1932*, pp. 47–8; *1933*, p. 54; *1934*, pp. 25, 28. The number of natives going to Southern Rhodesia in 1927 has been taken from Table 5.

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1927*, p. 32; *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, pp. 15–16, Appendix F; *1929*, p. 33; *1930*, p. 40; *1931*, p. 51; *1932*, p. 47; *1933*, p. 52.

[2] According to the above statistics and also according to a statement by the Governor in his Address to the Legislative Council on 16 Apr. 1928 (see *Debates*, vol. viii, col. 16) the number of natives recruited in 1927 for employment outside the Territory was 11,101. But on 11 Mar. 1929 the Secretary for Native Affairs said: 'During 1927 the number of natives recruited for employment outside the Territory was 14,992' (ibid., vol. ix, col. 173).

According to the above statistics the number of natives recruited for the Belgian Congo was 4,110 in 1929 and 1,192 in 1930. But the report of the Belgian Commission on native labour gave 5,606 for 1929 and 1,789 for 1930 (see *Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, Rapport 1930–1, Katanga*, p. 98).

Northern Rhodesia Natives Staying Outside the Protectorate. The inadequacy of the figures of absentees furnished by the District Officers in 1931 has been discussed in Section II of this chapter. It may suffice here to mention that for East Luangwa, which sent out far more native labourers than any other Province, the returns were as follows: Men 15,360, Women nil, Boys nil, Girls 18. But unfortunately the current official figures concerning the number of labourers employed abroad are more confusing still. First of all the terminology used is extremely loose. Thus the Native Administration says in its report for 1931:[1]

> During 1931 the number of natives who entered Southern Rhodesia in search of employment was 12,197 .... That there is a distinct decline in the flow of natives to Southern Rhodesia is shown by the following figures which show the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed there:
>
> 1931 . . 12,197
> 1930 . . 19,223
> 1929 . . 23,126
> 1928 . . 21,338

The figure 12,197 represents according to the first sentence the number of non-recruited natives who *entered* Southern Rhodesia during 1931 and according to the second sentence the *total* number of Northern Rhodesia natives *employed* in Southern Rhodesia!

But it is not only the terminology which is loose. The various Reports upon Native Affairs contain a table which, for example, in the 1930 Report looks as follows:[2]

	1930	*1929*	*1928*
Natives recruited in Northern Rhodesia for work outside the Territory . . .	4,492	8,709	9,198
Natives working independently outside the Territory (estimated)	33,564	33,741	27,650
Average number of natives employed within the Territory (estimated)	76,646	61,730	46,680
	114,702	104,180	83,528

Here again the terminology is loose, since the second line of figures does not represent the 'natives working independently outside the Territory', but the natives who in the respective years left the Territory independently in search of work. Yet, what is much more serious is that the figures of those leaving the Territory in the course of a year are actually treated as if they represented the average number of those employed outside the Territory in that year. It is obvious, however, that the average number employed in a given year outside the Territory is not equal to the total number of people who left in that year in order to take up employment abroad. It may be larger or smaller.[3] By constantly confusing these two

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 31. [2] Ibid. *1930*, p. 19.

[3] The reader needs only to realize that (leaving aside the question of unemployment) the number employed at the end of a given year outside the Territory is equal to the number of people who were in employment abroad at the beginning of the year plus the number of people who left the Territory in that year in order to take up employment abroad, minus the number of people who died abroad or returned in that year. See also in this connexion the statement of the Member

figures the Administration not only deceived itself; it misled also, for example, the Pim Commission to which it furnished the following table:[1]

Average number employed[1] outside Northern Rhodesia

Year	Southern Rhodesia	Tanganyika Territory	Rand	Congo	Total
1928	23,373	2,500	—	11,000	36,873
1929	29,833	2,546	—	10,500	42,879
1930	27,398	3,000	—	9,000	39,398
1931	18,943	4,000	—	8,000	30,943
1932	12,813	6,000	—	7,000	25,813
1933	8,514	8,000	—	5,000	21,514
1934	20,572	10,000	—	1,000	31,572
1935	33,030	15,000	—	1,000	49,030
1936	34,212	15,000	1,000	1,000	51,212

[1] This means Northern Rhodesia natives in European employment; see Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 35.

The Commission makes the following comment:

The figures . . . are stated to be approximate only, those for Southern Rhodesia being probably somewhat more accurate than the others. The estimated number for the Congo is certainly wrong, and the Senior Provincial Commissioner considers that in 1937 about 11,000 were employed there. His estimate for Southern Rhodesia in 1937 is 45,000, and the mines alone of that country employed 23,204 Northern Rhodesia natives in 1936. The estimate for Tanganyika is also probably too low and there are a considerable number scattered over the Union of South Africa. It is, therefore, not surprising that the district estimates for the proportion of adult males absent should suggest much higher figures . . . .

The last argument, to be sure, is not convincing. It is a matter of course that the district estimates of the numbers of adult males absent are higher than the numbers of natives employed outside the Territory, since these estimates include all those absent from their district who are employed in another district of Northern Rhodesia. It may suffice to mention that according to a table given by the Commission 'the estimated proportion of adult males normally absent from their homes as reported by District Commissioners in a recent enquiry on emigrant labour instituted by Government' is for the Mumbwa District 45 per cent., while the Report of the Commissioner of the Southern Province states: 'In the Mumbwa District, where the highest percentage of natives leave their homes to work, that is 45 per cent. of the able-bodied males, it is estimated that only 2 per cent. are outside the Territory.'[2] But the Commission was right in believing that the official figures of natives employed outside the Territory are too low. It did not realize, however, that these figures meant something quite different from what they were supposed to mean. As will be seen by a glance at Table 7, the figures given to the Commission as representing

of the Eastern Electoral Area in the Legislative Council (7 July 1937): 'So far as I can gather, there are something like 30,000 natives who go annually to work in Tanganyika Territory, of which number about 10,000 are generally absent at one time . . .' (*Debates*, vol. xxviii, col. 223).

[1] The table is reproduced in Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 36, and also in Orde Browne, p. 12.

[2] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 35.

the 'average number employed outside Northern Rhodesia' were identical for 1931 and 1934 with the sum of the number of natives recruited for work outside the Territory and the number of natives migrating independently from Northern Rhodesia. By consulting in addition the first table on page 448 the reader will find that the figures for 1928–30 and 1932–3 were obtained by adding to the number of natives migrating independently from Northern Rhodesia the number of recruited natives employed outside the Territory on 31 December.[1]

The statistics given here so far do not provide an adequate basis for even a rough estimate of the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed outside the Territory. They must be supplemented by at least a brief story of the outward migration.

The fact that a large number of Northern Rhodesia natives stayed in Southern Rhodesia caused a great deal of concern in the early 1920s. On 24 June 1920 a member of the Advisory Council moved 'that the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau be permitted only to recruit such supplies of labour as shall remain after local requirements have been satisfied'.

> During last year 9,400 natives were recruited in Northern Rhodesia and this year natives were being taken out of the country in increasing numbers, and the natives who went south were the pick of those who were willing to work.[2]

On 17 July 1922 another member stated:

> Fully one third of the available labour of North-Eastern Rhodesia has been sent to Southern Rhodesia by way of the Rhodesia Native Labour Bureau and on their own. These labourers have been away for some years and are not likely to return.[3]

The actual numbers of natives recruited in Northern Rhodesia in 1919–22 by the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau (and distributed to other than Northern Rhodesia employers) were 8,509, 14,579, 9,058, and 4,060 respectively.[4] As to the Belgian Congo 'employment figures differentiating Rhodesian and Congo labour are available only from 1920, they show that in that year 5,747 Rhodesian natives were working for the Union Minière, i.e. 47·8 per cent of their entire Native force. This number rose to 6,006 or 56·1 per cent the following year.'[5] The reports on the Congo for the years 1921 and 1922 contain the following statements:

> 1921. The problem of recruiting has not changed essentially. We are still dependent upon Rhodesia in a large measure.
>
> In 1921, the firm of Robert Williams furnished to the Mining Union 8,759 men for a term of 180 working days. On the other hand, numerous Rhodesians came to

[1] Since by the end of 1934 all recruited labourers had been repatriated the figure for 1934 is comparable with those of the other years. But if for 1931 the same method had been applied as for the other years the figure for that year would have read 32,185 instead of 30,943. (Owing probably to an arithmetical error the figure for 1930 is given as 39,398 instead of 39,608.)

[2] *Report of the Proceedings of the Second Advisory Council, First Meeting*, p. 15. For 1920 the Managing Director of the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau stated: 'It is noticeable that a steadily increasing proportion of the natives seeking work through the Bureau come from more remote parts of Northern Rhodesia, entailing long railway journeys before they reach their employers' (Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1920*, p. 6).

[3] *Report of the Proceedings of the Third Advisory Council, First Meeting*, p. 6.

[4] See p. 443 above.

[5] Davis (1933), p. 53.

offer spontaneously their services to the industrial and agricultural enterprises of the Upper Katanga.[1]

1922. We remain all the time dependent upon Rhodesia in a large measure.

In 1921, the firm of Rob. Williams furnished to the Mining Union 4,137 men for a term of 8 tickets of 30 working days; previously the duration of engagement covered 6 tickets; this extension of the duration of engagement was effected for economy's sake.[2]

Furthermore, there are all the time Rhodesians in great numbers coming to offer spontaneously their services to the industrial and agricultural enterprises of the Upper Katanga.[3]

Even assuming that the figure given in the 1922 report was already included in that of the 1921 report, the number of natives supplied from Northern Rhodesia in 1921 by the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau to Southern Rhodesia employers and by Robert Williams to the Katanga Mining Union would have exceeded 17,000, and this number includes neither the Northern Rhodesians recruited by other agencies for the Congo (and other areas) nor those leaving the Protectorate independently. Since there were in Southern Rhodesia in May 1921 31,201 Northern Rhodesia native males 'actually at work or present in the towns', the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives who at that time were employed outside the Protectorate was probably in the neighbourhood of 50,000 and constituted probably about one-quarter of the able-bodied male Northern Rhodesia natives.

For the first two years of British administration the situation has been described as follows:

Many thousands of the natives leave the territory every year in order to obtain money by working elsewhere. The estimate given to us in September, 1924, was that 28,000 Northern Rhodesia natives were so employed outside the territory. At least 10,000 find work in the copper mines of the Belgian Congo . . . . Large numbers of natives go to Southern Rhodesia to work in the mines and on European farms, while several thousands are employed on plantations, principally sisal and cotton plantations, in the Tanganyika Territory.[4]

During the year, 8,000 were recruited by Messrs. Robert Williams and Company for the Katanga and an equal number by the Rhodesia Native Labour Bureau for Southern Rhodesia, and it is roughly computed that 10,000 sought work outside the Territory independently.[5]

[1] *Rapport sur l'activité du Congo belge 1921*, p. 240.

[2] But see also Davis, p. 54: '. . . until December 27, 1927, all Katanga contracts were for six months' duration . . . The labour turnover under these conditions was tremendous. . . . Gradual recognition of this situation caused the Union Minière belatedly to establish a three-year contract in 1927.'

[3] *Rapport 1922*, p. 106. See also Department of Overseas Trade, *Report on the Economic Situation in the Belgian Congo* (July 1924), p. 37: 'The main employers of labour in the Katanga are the railway and the Union Minière. Considerable numbers are still recruited from Rhodesia and many Rhodesians voluntarily re-engage themselves. In 1921 the Union Minière received 4,137 recruits from Rhodesia.'

[4] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 97.

[5] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1924–5*, p. 14. See also the statement of the Treasurer on 18 May 1925 in the Legislative Council: '8,000 natives were recruited in the North-Eastern district for work in the Congo. In the calendar year 1924 the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau recruited 4,400 natives, mostly from Barotseland and the Eastern Luangwa districts, for work in Southern Rhodesia.' (*Legislative Council Debates*, vol. ii, col. 25.) According to *Rapport sur l'activité du Congo belge 1924*, p. 87 (quoted by Buell, vol. ii, p. 536), the numbers of Northern Rhodesians recruited by Robert Williams & Co. in 1923 and 1924 were 4,137 and 8,773 respectively.

. . . not a few of the 22,000 who left this Territory for Southern Rhodesia in 1925, passed on to the Union . . . . The mandated South West Africa is also proving attractive to the natives of the western districts . . . while, in the north, Tanganyika and, still more the Katanga Province of the Belgian Congo rely to a very considerable extent upon Northern Rhodesian labour.[1]

The estimate given to the East Africa Commission in September 1924 that 28,000 Northern Rhodesia natives were then employed outside the Territory was certainly a gross understatement. A perusal of the Southern Rhodesia census statistics for 1921 and 1926 and of the monthly figures of Northern Rhodesia natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines leads to the conclusion that the number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed in September 1924 in Southern Rhodesia alone was not less than 28,000. As to the Congo the Commission for the study of the labour problem in the Belgian Congo, in its report dated 27 March 1925, stated: '8,500 Rhodesians are employed at present in the Katanga.'[2] The number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed in September 1924 outside the Territory was possibly smaller than in May 1921, but the difference cannot have been great.[3] By May 1926, when the Southern Rhodesia census revealed the presence of 35,431 Northern Rhodesia males in employment in that colony, the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed outside the Territory must have been again at least as large as in 1921; it probably exceeded 50,000. It declined, however, in the course of the year.

During 1926, the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau recruited 4,882 Northern Rhodesia natives . . . while Messrs. Robert Williams and Company recruited 4,609 . . . . Probably an equal number of natives leave the country to find work voluntarily, i.e., not under the auspices of a recruiting organisation, and travel to Tanganyika Territory, to the Belgian Congo, to Southern Rhodesia, and even to the mandated territory of South West Africa in search of work and, very likely, in the hope of adventure.[4]

Recruiting from 1926 on was certainly on a smaller scale than in the immediately preceding years. In view of the increasing demand for labour, particularly at the Northern Rhodesia mines,[5] the Government, at the

[1] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1925–6*, p. 18. See also *Report of the Secretary for Native Affairs 1925–6*, pp. 5–6.

[2] *Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, 1928*, p. 24.

[3] The Northern Rhodesia administration probably arrived at its estimate of 28,000 by again confusing the number of natives employed outside the Territory with the number of natives leaving the Territory in the course of the year.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1926*, pp. 25–6.

[5] See ibid. *1925–6*, p. 18 (quoted above). See also *Report of the Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Disturbances in the Copperbelt, Northern Rhodesia* (1940), pp. 7–8: 'It was emphasized before us that it was not until 1926 that industrial employment on a large scale came into existence in Northern Rhodesia, the railway and the mines at Broken Hill and Bwana Mkubwa being the only industrial undertakings of any importance at that time. There were then a very few natives who had done semi-skilled work and a large number who had done nothing but rough labour, and any native who wished to earn a wage in excess of something very low indeed—say 5*s*. a month with food—had to seek work outside the territory, in the Katanga area of the Congo, or in Southern Rhodesia. Most of these obtained work through recruiting agencies, and were taken to the place of employment, and brought back at the end of their contract, by the employers. In the Katanga, wages were about 15*s*. a ticket of 30 days for surface workers and 20*s*. for those underground; the contract was for six tickets, and free food, hospital and medical services and housing were provided in addition.'

beginning of 1926, restricted to 5,000 the number of Northern Rhodesia natives that the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau might recruit during the year 1926 for employment in Southern Rhodesia.[1] But the estimate that only about 10,000 left the country in 1926 independently was, no doubt, a gross understatement. According to Southern Rhodesia statistics the number of Northern Rhodesia natives entering Southern Rhodesia in 1926 in search of work was 23,312. Even if this figure should have included the 4,882 recruited labourers, the number of natives leaving independently for Southern Rhodesia would have amounted to 18,430, not to speak of those who left independently for Tanganyika Territory, the Congo, and South West Africa.

The official Northern Rhodesia estimates of those who left the Territory independently came probably much nearer the truth in the two following years.

> The number of natives estimated to have proceeded independently to work outside the Territory during 1928 is 27,650.[2] For the preceding year it was estimated to be 31,438. For various reasons, these figures must not be regarded as accurate—the estimate may be excessive or it may be too low but the figures supplied from the various districts clearly show that a large number of natives go beyond our borders in search of employment.[3]

In his Address to the Legislative Council the Governor stated on 16 April 1928 that 'an average of from 25,000 to 30,000 Northern Rhodesia labourers were employed for periods varying from six to twelve months outside the Territory'.[4] Quoting from a report by the Secretary for Native Affairs which emphasized the difficulties experienced by local farmers in obtaining an adequate supply of labour, he said:

> In one corner of the Territory labour troubles seem to be unknown. 'Local planters and (with one exception) Missions appear to have been able to get all the labour they needed. The local supply greatly exceeds the demand, with the result that the standard rate of pay remains low.' It sounds almost too good to be true! but that is what the Native Commissioner at Abercorn reports.[5]

But elsewhere low wages induced natives to seek work abroad.

> The native inhabitant of the Tanganyika Plateau to-day walks three hundred miles or more to find employment at sixpence a day rather than be content with twopence nearer home whether it be northwards to the sisal plantations of Tanganyika Territory, westwards to the Katanga, or southwards to the mines at Bwana Mkubwa or Broken Hill. It takes him three weeks or more to complete his journey, and, with a scant and uncertain supply of food on the way, he not seldom arrives and engages upon labour to which he is utterly unaccustomed, in a half starved and emaciated condition.[6]

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1926*, p. 8; for a similar restriction in 1927, see ibid. *1927*, p. 6. The number of men to be recruited by Robert Williams & Co. for the Congo was likewise limited to 12,000 per annum; see Northern Rhodesia, *Report upon Native Affairs 1926*, p. 23.

[2] While 'recruiting of labour in the Awemba and Tanganyika Provinces for work in Tanganyika has practically ceased' (*Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1928*, p. 31), 'large numbers of the best labourers proceed to the Cotton and Sisal fields of Morogoro and Kilosa in Tanganyika Territory' independently (*Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, p. 18).

[3] Ibid., p. 16.

[4] *Debates*, vol. viii, col. 17.

[5] Ibid., col. 15.

[6] Ibid., col. 16.

For 1929–31 Northern Rhodesia reports describe the situation as follows:

1929. . . . a very large number of the best workers still proceed to Southern Rhodesia, the Belgian Congo, Tanganyika Territory and South West Africa in quest of employment.[1]

It is noteworthy that of the 33,000 Northern Rhodesia natives who went to work independently outside the Territory no less than 14,442 were from the East Luangwa Province. Natives from that area have had a long association with Southern Rhodesia, and even during the tobacco boom in the Fort Jameson District, when there was a great deal of money in circulation and wages were comparatively high, these people persisted in going to Southern Rhodesia. Efforts by recruiters for the mines in Northern Rhodesia to persuade the natives of this District to enter into contracts to work at Ndola have been practically a failure. . . .

The British Vice-Consul at Elisabethville estimates that there are 10,500 Northern Rhodesia natives working in the Katanga portion of the Belgian Congo. Most of these are working on the mines.[2]

. . . from the Tanganyika Province . . . 2,546 natives went to work for the planters on the Central Railway in Tanganyika Territory.[3]

Figures compiled for the North Eastern Districts show that a greater proportion of the workers proceeds to other Territories than comes to the North Western Districts. The figures arrived at are:

	Natives proceeding to work in the north-western Districts	*Natives proceeding to Tanganyika Territory, Congo Belge and Southern Rhodesia*
East Luangwa Province . .	29·7%	70·3%
Tanganyika Province . . .	24·8%	75·2%
Mweru-Luapula Province . .	45·0%	55·0%
Awemba Province . . .	61·6%	38·4%[1]

[1] Governor's Address to Legislative Council, 7 Mar. 1930 (*Debates*, vol. xi, p. 7).

1930. From figures given in Annexure 'H' it appears that the nett decrease in the number of natives going to work independently outside the Territory is only 177, on a total of 33,700.

The figures in the annexures are, however, based on Tour Reports, and most of the touring was done between May and October, in which months the effect of financial depression in neighbouring Territories had not been felt, and natives were reported as having gone to work in neighbouring Territories when in point of fact they did not reach those Territories or, if they did so, re-crossed the border soon afterwards.[4]

. . . the number of natives absent from the Tanganyika Province and reported to be working independently outside the Territory increased from 3,253 in 1929 to 4,150 (or 22 per cent. of the able-bodied males) in 1930. Figures in respect of labour recruited in the Province for service outside the Territory show a decrease from 1,193 to 403.[5]

The flow of labour from Barotseland to Grootfontein, South West Africa, is probably increasing . . . . The number of men attracted to that labour market is in the neighbourhood of 1,000.[6]

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 15.
[2] Ibid., p. 16.
[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1929*, p. 40.
[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 20.
[5] Ibid., p. 11.
[6] Ibid., p. 19. See also Davis, pp. 102–3 (referring to 1931): 'No definite figures are available for the Union, but Rhodesian Natives are found from Johannesburg and Kimberley all the way to Cape Town.'

1931. Details are not available as to the distribution of independent labourers who leave the Territory to work abroad, but so far as the total number is concerned there has been a considerable reduction. . . .

The figures supplied by the various District Commissioners show that the number of natives abroad is still of some importance (see Annexure 'H').

This estimate of the number of natives working outside the Territory independently must not, however, be accepted too readily. It can at the very best be only an approximate figure and this year's total is probably on the liberal side. The figures are collected by District Officers when on tour in the various villages and the information supplied is not always to be relied upon.[1]

The Agent who recruits labour for employment on the mines in the Congo was informed two years ago that, owing to the growing needs for labour within Northern Rhodesia, the number of natives he might recruit would be gradually reduced and that in a few years time his licence would not be renewed. The Mining Authorities in Katanga in consequence, arranged for the procuring of natives within their own Territory and, as a result of their efforts and of retrenchment on many of the Congo properties, it became possible to cease recruiting in this Territory on 31st July, when all Northern Rhodesia labourers were repatriated. The only Northern Rhodesia labour left on the Katanga Mines at 31st December was of the skilled type and consisted of 368 voluntary workers employed as Clerks, Artizans, Mine Police and Overseers.[2] These men have contracts to work for three years and the majority of them have their wives and children with them.[3]

There can in fact be no doubt that the number of natives employed outside the Protectorate decreased considerably in the course of 1931. At the beginning of the year it certainly exceeded 50,000.[4] By the end of the year it was possibly less than 50,000,[5] and it probably did not change essentially in 1932.

1932. No details are available as to the distribution of the natives who have proceeded independently to work abroad but generally speaking they select the territory nearest to their homes. For instance natives from Mweru-Luapula Province find employment within easy reach in the Congo; the people of the Tanganyika and

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 31. Although the title of Annexure 'H' read year in, year out, 'Estimate of the Number of Natives Employed outside the Territory other than those Recruited by R. W. Yule and R. N. L. Bureau', this Annexure (as stated correctly in the above quotation from the 1930 report) actually showed the number of natives going to work independently outside the Territory.

[2] See also Davis, p. 159: 'In 1921 . . . Northern Rhodesia supplied some 56 per cent of the labour force of the *Union Minière*. In 1931 the Northern Rhodesian share was only 0·7 per cent of the total . . .'

[3] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 30. See also *Rapport sur l'Administration du Congo belge 1929*, p. 134, and *Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, Rapport 1930–1, Katanga*, p. 98. 'After 1923 the workers were permitted to bring their wives and families with them into Katanga' (Davis, p. 53).

[4] According to the Southern Rhodesia census of May 1931 there were then employed in that colony 35,542 male natives from Northern Rhodesia. But their number was certainly larger on 1 Jan. (Davis, p. 156, says: '. . . as late as 1930, when construction work at the mines in Northern Rhodesia was at its peak, it was estimated that as many as 38,056 Northern Rhodesian Natives were employed outside the Territory.' Actually the figure 38,056 represented the sum of the natives recruited in 1930 in Northern Rhodesia for work outside the Territory and the natives who in that year left the Territory independently in search of work. See Table 7 above.)

[5] The number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines dropped from 11,147 in Jan. to 8,854 in Dec. The number employed on the Congo mines had become negligible. It should be noted, however, that there were still many Northern Rhodesians in the Congo who were not employed on the mines. 'The Native inspector of the Katanga Province reports 5,698 registered men from Northern Rhodesia resident there in 1931, to which must be added approximately half that number who are unregistered' (Davis, p. 102).

Awemba Provinces invariably choose the mines and plantations in Tanganyika Territory as their most convenient place for work; while men from the East Luangwa Province, Feira and the Zambesi Valley prefer to go to Southern Rhodesia.

During the year 6,832 natives returned from working in Southern Rhodesia . . . .

The number of Rhodesian and Nyasaland natives reported to be at work in the Katanga Province of the Belgian Congo at 31st December, 1932, is approximately 8,000. It is impossible to separate the Rhodesian and Nyasaland figures but the proportion of Nyasaland natives is very small. The Katanga mines are able to obtain all the native labour they require from Ruanda and Urundi and the Northern Rhodesian natives now working on the mines are those who have worked for the Union Minière for a long time and are retained because they are skilled and trained workmen. The bulk of our natives are employed as domestic servants in Elisabethville and Jadotville but a few are working as market gardeners and sell their produce in the local markets.[1]

1933. During the year the Rhodesia Native Labour Bureau, the last organisation still engaged in recruiting native labour for employment outside the Territory, ceased operations and went into liquidation.[2]

In July the Southern Rhodesia Government asked that natives should be informed that there were few prospects of employment in that territory, and numbers who have travelled south in the hope of obtaining work returned unsuccessful to their homes.[3]

. . . Passes were issued in Southern Rhodesia to 7,887 natives to return to this Territory during the year.[4]

Throughout the greater part of the year conditions obtaining in respect of labour unfortunately showed no improvement as compared with the position in 1932 and supply has throughout the year been vastly in excess of demand. Nor could relief be obtained by any requirements outside the Territory. In Southern Rhodesia a similar state of affairs prevailed, and there was no scope for any considerable numbers of natives from Northern Rhodesia to obtain employment in that country. Equally unhelpful was the position in South West Africa, Tanganyika Territory and the Belgian Congo,[5] where requirements in respect of labour continued to decrease rather than to show any signs of a return to the conditions existing a few years ago, when large numbers of Northern Rhodesian natives found well paid and congenial employment within their borders.[6]

But this description of conditions in 1933 is not confirmed by the available statistics. It seems in particular that the statement that there was no scope for any considerable numbers of natives from Northern Rhodesia to obtain employment in Southern Rhodesia was erroneous. The number of Northern Rhodesia natives entering Southern Rhodesia

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1932*, p. 29. [2] Ibid. *1933*, p. 33.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1933*, p. 23. See also *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxvii, Oct. 1936, cols. 367–8.

[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1933*, p. 34. According to Southern Rhodesia statistics the numbers of 'Passes to Leave Territory' issued to Northern Rhodesia natives in 1934–44 were 8,191, 10,985, 12,384, 17,479, 16,513, 11,943, 8,360, 8,175, 9,591, 11,188, and 12,188 respectively; see Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1934*, p. 6; *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 8; *1939*, p. 6; *1940*, p. 8; Northern Rhodesia Secretary of Native Affairs, 10 Jan. 1945, *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xlix, col. 77. But see also Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1938*, p. 8: 'These figures are less than the actual numbers of migrants returning home. Many still do not take out passports, but this careless attitude is being changed by a better appreciation of the advantages of regular practices.' (The figures, of course, exclude also the Northern Rhodesians going clandestinely from Southern Rhodesia into the Union of South Africa.)

[5] See also ibid. *1933*, p. 7: 'The Belgian policy now is to reserve the labour field in the Katanga for natives of the Congo.'

[6] *Report upon Native Affairs 1933*, p. 29.

in search of work increased from 10,844 in 1932 to 17,104 in 1933. The number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines increased in the course of 1933 from 9,720 to 13,718. It is possible even that the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed in Southern Rhodesia had never been larger than at the end of 1933. As to the Belgian Congo no statistics seem to be available.[1] But there is no reason to assume that the situation in 1933 differed from that on 31 December 1932 described above. The total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed outside the Territory at the end of 1933 was certainly much larger than at the end of 1931, and it continued to increase.

1934. No recruiting of labour took place in the territory during the year, but there was a considerable independent exodus of natives in search of work to Southern Rhodesia and to the Lupa Goldfields in Tanganyika Territory. At the latter labour centre opportunities for employment increased until by the end of the year it was estimated that some 10,000 natives of Northern Rhodesia were working there.

At the end of 1934 there were 104,963 natives of Northern Rhodesia working in Southern Rhodesia, the number of those employed on mines being 42,876, an increase of 4,676 as compared with the same date in 1933.[2]

A certain number of Northern Rhodesia natives still find work in the now restricted labour market in the Belgian Congo, but the proportion is very small compared with the figures some years ago when recruiting in Northern Rhodesia for the copper mines in the Congo was in full swing.[3]

1935. No recruitment of labour took place in the territory during the year, but there was a considerable independent exodus of natives to Southern Rhodesia, the Union of South Africa[4] and Tanganyika Territory . . . .[5]

The outstanding feature of the labour position during the year has been the increased demand in the South and this has to a large extent been influenced by the increased demand for labour on the part of the Witwatersrand Mines, which are employing labour from Southern Rhodesia and to a less extent from this Territory in increasing numbers. . . . The Eastern Province is that most affected by the demand for labour in the South and it is estimated that 50 per cent. of the able bodied males are absent, chiefly in Southern Rhodesia. About 15,000 natives of the Northern Province are working on the Lupa Goldfields in Tanganyika Territory as compared with about 10,000 in 1934.[6]

It is estimated that over 18,000 (or 36·7 per cent.) of the taxable population [of the Eastern Province] are to be located in Southern Rhodesia; distributed over farms and mines. . . . The District Estimates give a total of 19,800 natives employed outside the Territory and 8,400 within the Territory: quite a few of these are, of course, not taxable, but of those who proceed to Southern Rhodesia a very small proportion remain there for less than one year whilst many stay away for periods of three or four years at a time. The number given above (19,800), which is 4,194 more than

[1] '. . . as a result of the closing of the office of the Inspector of Rhodesia Natives at Elisabethville no statistics have been furnished, as has been done in past years, of the numbers of Northern Rhodesia natives at work in the Katanga Province of the Belgian Congo' (*Report upon Native Affairs 1933*, p. 34).

[2] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1934*, p. 25. The figures in the second paragraph are evidently all wrong.

[3] *Report upon Native Affairs 1934*, p. 28.

[4] See also *Report of Chairman of the Native Industrial Labour Advisory Board*, p. 10: 'Between January and August . . . 30,000 Northern Rhodesian natives had got passes at Lomagundi and neighbouring Bomas, and 1,009 natives had gone to the Rand.'

[5] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1935*, p. 23.

[6] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 8. See also *Report of Chairman of the Native Industrial Labour Advisory Board*, p. 10: 'There are approximately 15,000 natives of Northern Rhodesia at present working on the Goldfields, most of them being short contract and second class labourers.'

the corresponding figure for 1934 and 8,338 in excess of the 1933 estimate, will justify the remark . . . that the extent of emigration from this Province in search of work is almost staggering. . . .[1]

The District Commissioner, Petauke, reports: 'The stream of labour to the Southern Rhodesia markets is steadily increasing and in large villages in the Senga Reserve it is the exception to see more than half a dozen able-bodied men.'[2]

There are in addition three official statements concerning the number of natives employed outside the Protectorate towards the end of 1935:

. . . 49,000 natives were estimated to have been working outside the territory at the end of the year.[3]

. . . out of a taxable male population of 288,000 close on 50,000 are at present in employment in neighbouring territories . . . .[4]

According to reports, some 30,000 Northern Rhodesia natives are employed in Southern Rhodesia and 20,000 in Tanganyika Territory.[5]

All these three statements show practically the same total, but each means something different. The first apparently is all-inclusive. The second comprises only taxables and excludes juveniles.[6] The third covers only those employed in Southern Rhodesia and Tanganyika Territory and excludes all those employed elsewhere. At the same time all three estimates are far too low.

According to the Southern Rhodesia census of 5 May 1936 there were then employed in that colony 46,884 male natives from Northern Rhodesia[7] and their number was probably about the same at the end of 1935.[8] There were in addition about 20,000 in Tanganyika Territory (of whom about 15,000 were working on the Lupa Goldfields). Including those in Belgian Congo and elsewhere, the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed outside the Protectorate at the end of 1935 must have exceeded 75,000.

The situation in 1936–8 is described as follows:

1936. . . . 51,212 natives were reported to be in employment outside the territory at the end of the year compared with 49,030 at the end of 1935. The exodus to work appears to have been greater in 1936 than in any previous year.[9]

The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association, being anxious to obtain labour from this territory, made an agreement with this Government whereby they should be allowed to engage one thousand Northern Rhodesia labourers as an experiment,

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p 74.

[2] Ibid., p. 75.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1935*, p. 23.

[4] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 5.

[5] Statement of Chief Secretary in Budget Speech of 21 Nov. 1935 (*Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxv, col. 184).

[6] Of the Northern Rhodesians entering Southern Rhodesia in search of work in 1934–5 15 per cent. were juveniles.

[7] The *Report of the Chairman of the Native Industrial Labour Advisory Board of Northern Rhodesia* said (p. 10) that 'in Southern Rhodesia there were as many Northern as Southern Rhodesian natives at work', and this statement was quoted on 31 Oct. 1936 in the Legislative Council (see *Debates*, vol. xxvii, col. 368) as a proof of the excessive demands of Southern Rhodesia on the Northern Rhodesia labour market. Actually the number of Southern Rhodesia male natives employed in Southern Rhodesia on 5 May 1936 was 107,581, or more than twice as large as the number of Northern Rhodesians.

[8] The number of Northern Rhodesians employed on Southern Rhodesia mines was practically the same on census date as at the end of 1935.

[9] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1936*, p. 23.

in order to ascertain whether climatic and other conditions on the Witwatersrand justify recruiting on a larger scale.[1]

The demand for labour increased considerably during the period both for work within the Territory and in Southern Rhodesia. Recruiting was resumed by a licensed recruiter at Livingstone and 3,460 natives were attested for Southern Rhodesia and 367 for Northern Rhodesia. Most of the recruits came from Barotseland. The demand in Southern Rhodesia was for labour on Government roads, railways, mines and farms in that order of priority.[2]

In the Zambezi Valley . . . it is estimated that from 45 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the able-bodied males are at work in Southern Rhodesia . . . .[3]

It is estimated that over 50 per cent. of the taxable population is absent from this Province [Eastern] for periods varying from one to three or four years. From this it is to be inferred that some 28,000 able bodied men are regularly absent from their homes. Actual statistics unfortunately are not available and without the necessary machinery it is not possible to do more than gauge an estimate from the various sources of information which are presented from time to time in the form of tax returns and tour reports, from the general incidence of native trade and observations by persons in close contact with native affairs (officials and non-officials), and through representations by Chiefs and responsible Headmen. . . .

It is estimated that of the 28,000 mentioned above 19,000 are employed outside the Territory of which number 18,000 are in Southern Rhodesia while the balance is on the Lupa goldfields or scattered throughout the Union of South Africa. Southern Rhodesia may be said to absorb in employment 36 per cent. of the taxable population of this Province.[4]

1937. It is estimated that there are 279,949 able-bodied males domiciled in Northern Rhodesia and of this number approximately 134,382 were in employment at the end of the year—66,606 within the territory and 67,776 outside. Of those working within the territory, 22,500 were employed on mines, about 10,000 as domestic servants and 9,000 on farms. Of those employed outside the territory about 46,000 were in Southern Rhodesia, 11,615 in Tanganyika Territory and 10,161 in the Belgian Congo, the Union of South Africa and elsewhere. The main labour supplying areas are the Northern Province, the Eastern Province and the Barotse Province.

A Migrant Labour Agreement between Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland came into force on 4th June for a minimum period of four years. The main objects of the Agreement are to regulate the flow of labour so that the requirements of the three territories shall be met as far as possible to ensure the comfort and well-being of the labourers both when travelling and at work, and to ensure the regular return of the labourers and some of their earnings to their homes.

In December the Governors of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland met a representative of the Transvaal Chamber of Mines at Salisbury and it was then decided, *inter alia*, that the experiment of employing 1,500 natives of Northern Rhodesia on the mines of the Witwatersrand, which started in 1936, should be continued for a second year and that in the meantime no recruiting for the Johannesburg Mines should be permitted in Northern Rhodesia.[5]

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 7. [2] Ibid., p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 35. In 1937 the proportion is given as 'some 43 per cent. of the adult taxpayers' (ibid. *1937*, p. 17). [4] Ibid. *1936*, p. 71.

[5] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1937*, p. 23. An Agreement concluded in September between representatives of the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland and the Transvaal Chamber of Mines had 'provided that, subject to the successful conclusion of the experiment, then in progress, of employing 1,000 natives from Barotseland on the Witwatersrand, the gold-mines on the latter should be permitted to recruit up to a maximum of 10,000 natives per annum in Barotseland . . . . A further meeting was to take place at the end of twelve months, after investigation into the amount of labour available in Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. . . . The further meeting did not take place until February, 1938. After carefully exploring the position in Northern Rhodesia, the Government of that

The number of Northern Rhodesia natives on the Lupa Goldfields in Tanganyika Territory is only 5,000 compared with double that number in 1936. Over 5,000 natives are, however, believed to be working on the sisal plantations in that territory. A recruiting agency for the Sisal Growers' Association has been opened in the Northern Province, but it is apparent that the flow of labour in this direction requires regulation and control. Negotiations have been opened for the conclusion of an agreement with the Tanganyika and Nyasaland Governments to deal with this problem.[1]

[Northern Province] The demand for labour on the Sisal Estates has been so keen that numbers of recruiters in Tanganyika Territory established themselves on their own side of the border, adjacent to paths leading to the Lupa and by offering motor transport and other inducements were able to enrol large numbers of labourers for Tanga who would otherwise have sought work on the Goldfields. . . .

From Kawambwa and Fort Rosebery, following the removal of restrictions imposed in recent years by the Belgian Authorities, between 4,000 and 5,000 labourers are estimated to have entered the Congo for work.[2]

[Eastern Province] It is estimated that some 20,000 Natives of this Province are regularly absent from the Territory, of whom 90 per cent. are on the mines and farms of Southern Rhodesia.

The remainder are to be located on the Rand; the Lupa Goldfields in Tanganyika Territory; and a few in Nyasaland.[3]

1938. It is estimated that there are 279,949 able-bodied males domiciled in Northern Rhodesia, and of this number approximately 152,230 were in employment at the end of the year, 97,976 inside the Territory and 54,254 outside. Of those working inside the Territory 23,754 were employed on mines, about 10,000 as domestic servants and 9,000 on farms. Of those employed outside the Territory about 44,000 were in Southern Rhodesia,[4] 8,000 in Tanganyika and the remainder in the Belgian Congo, the Union of South Africa and elsewhere. The main labour supplying areas are the Northern Province, the Eastern Province and the Barotse Province.[5]

In spite of the greater number of Natives reported to be at work outside the Territory, the flow of labour to Southern Rhodesia fell off during the earlier months of the year, and this caused the Southern Rhodesian employers and Government some anxiety.[6]

Territory was reluctant to acquiesce in the recruitment of large numbers of Barotse, pending further experience in relation to the health of tropical labour employed on the Rand, and until the situation as regards the demand and supply of labour within its own borders was further clarified. It was accordingly decided that the Chamber of Mines should be permitted to recruit no more than 1,500 Barotse during a further period of twelve months.' (Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 186.)

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, p. 7. [2] Ibid., p. 64. [3] Ibid., p. 81.

[4] On 23 May 1939 the Acting Senior Provincial Commissioner stated in the Legislative Council that in 1938 the number of Northern Rhodesia natives resident in Southern Rhodesia from whom Southern Rhodesia taxes were collected and remitted to Northern Rhodesia was 41,600, and the estimated number of Northern Rhodesia natives resident or employed in Southern Rhodesia 44,000 (see *Debates*, vol. xxxiii, col. 21).

[5] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1938*, p. 22.

[6] Ibid., p. 23. See also Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 188: 'From January to August, 1938, the migrants from Northern Rhodesia into the Colony numbered only 7,729, as compared with 19,395 in the corresponding period of 1937. Public opinion in Southern Rhodesia was inclined to attribute this fall in numbers to failure on the part of the Northern Territories to carry out fully their obligations under the Salisbury Agreement. The authorities in those Territories for their part ascribed the decline to other causes, including the increased opportunities of gainful occupation open to the natives in their own localities in the production of cash crops.' In 1939 the number of migrant labourers from Northern Rhodesia into Southern Rhodesia (10,374) was smaller even than in 1938 (12,449). See also Southern Rhodesia, *Report on Mines 1939*, p. 7: 'Native labour from Northern Rhodesia does not enter the country in the same number as heretofore; negotiations are in progress to try and improve this position.'

The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association continued to engage Northern Rhodesia Natives at Kazungula, in Bechuanaland on the Zambesi River, in pursuance of the arrangement whereby 1,500 Barotse Natives were employed in the Witwatersrand Mines as an experiment. Investigation showed that the health of the Natives so employed was improving and the mortality rate decreasing. At a meeting with the Manager of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association it was suggested that subject to a small further decrease in the death rate, recruitment for the Witwatersrand should be permitted up to the extent of 3,500 Natives and ultimately 5,000. A remarkable fall in the disease death rate of the Witwatersrand has been reported more recently and is attributed to the use of a new anti-pneumonia drug.[1]

[Eastern Province] Great numbers of Natives are attracted south and it appears evident that an increasing number are making their way to the Union where wages are higher than in the adjoining territories. It has not been possible to ascertain the division in numbers between the Union and Southern Rhodesia, but the value of remittances received by relatives from men at work in the Union is certainly very large. It is estimated that some 9,000 able-bodied males have been absent from the Fort Jameson District alone for over four years and the majority are probably to be located in the Union. Some 12,000 Natives are absent at any one time in Southern Rhodesia from various parts of the Province, but it has been a noteworthy feature of recent months that the number of returning Natives has exceeded the outflow. . . .

Very little advantage has been taken of the free motor transport services provided by the Southern Rhodesia Government from Misale through Portuguese Territory. The Lupa Goldfields in Tanganyika are still regarded as their normal labour market by Senga Natives in the northern part of the Lundazi District, and a few were recruited for work on the sisal plantations in that territory.[2]

The picture conveyed by these statements is quite chaotic. The Colonial Report for 1936 says that 51,212 natives were reported to be employed outside the territory at the end of the year, but this figure which was also given to the Pim Commission apparently showed the number of natives leaving the Protectorate in that year.[3] The Colonial Report for 1937 says that at the end of the year 67,776 male Northern Rhodesians were employed outside the Territory; about 46,000 in Southern Rhodesia, 11,615 in Tanganyika Territory, and 10,161 in the Belgian Congo, the Union of South Africa, and elsewhere. The Colonial Report for 1938 speaks of 'the greater number of Natives reported to be at work outside the Territory', but says at the same time that only 54,254 male Northern Rhodesians were employed at the end of the year outside the Territory; 44,000 in Southern Rhodesia, 8,000 in Tanganyika, and the remainder [2,254] in the Belgian Congo, the Union of South Africa, and elsewhere. But on 30 April 1938 2,121 Northern Rhodesians were employed on the Rand mines alone.[4] However, the comments quoted from the official reports for 1937 and 1938 indicate that the Administration by that time had realized the necessity of ascertaining more fully the resources of man-power available for the

[1] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1938*, pp. 23–4. [2] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 75.

[3] The same confusion is to be found in the statement of the Senior Provincial Commissioner in the Legislative Council, 15 Dec. 1938: 'The number of natives who have proceeded, or have worked in Southern Rhodesia from this territory seems to have risen from something in the vicinity of 10,000 in the year 1933 to 45,000 in the year 1937' (*Debates*, vol. xxxi, col. 376). His figure of 10,000 evidently referred to the fact that in 1932 (not 1933) only 10,844 Northern Rhodesians entered Southern Rhodesia in search of work (as against 28,841 in 1937), while his figure of 45,000 referred to the Northern Rhodesians employed in 1937 in Southern Rhodesia (who in 1933 numbered about 35,000).

[4] See Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 184.

foreign labour market. This is also confirmed by the following statement of Major Orde Browne in his report dated 14 May 1938:[1]

In the absence of accurate records of labour movements extending over a number of years, there is at present no possibility of forming an exact estimate of the position. Somewhat tardy recognition of the urgency of the problem has led to the collection of estimates and computations where these are available, and every effort has been made to produce such information as may be procurable; the results unfortunately cannot be considered very valuable as a guide to the true situation in the country. The following table embodies such information as the Administration has been able to procure for me. I cannot feel fully confident of its accuracy, and I am dubious about the reliability of the methods of estimating the various items; it must however form the basis of discussion.

NORTHERN RHODESIA

A.—Total adult tax-paying population		279,949
B.—Estimated number of (A) unfitted for full manual labour	48,541	
C.—Estimated number earning livelihood other than by wage-earning	60,361	
D.—Number employed as wage-earners in Northern Rhodesia	66,606	
E.—Number employed as wage-earners in Southern Rhodesia	27,791	
F.—Average turn-over on (D) and (E) to keep up number to level stated	23,599	
G.—Number employed as wage-earners in Tanganyika	11,615	
H.—Number employed as wage-earners in Congo Belge and elsewhere	10,161	
	248,674	
Balance	31,275	
	279,949	279,949

Most of the basic data of the table have since been published for the individual Provinces.[2] They had been compiled in accordance with the following clause of the Agreement on Migrant Native Labour concluded on 21 August 1936 between the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland:[3]

The Governments agree to take the necessary action to ascertain the amount of labour available for wage-earning employment. Each Government will furnish an annual statement of the labour situation within its territory to the other Governments.

An addition of the figures for the Provinces shows the following results:

(1) Total adult male tax-paying population	279,949
(2) Number of above unfit to proceed to work for wages	48,541
(3) Number of those making their livelihoods at home in the production of agricultural crops for sale (excluding subsistence producers)	37,888
(4) Number of those making their livelihoods at home in other economic production and distribution	21,973
(5) Numbers employed for wages other than on mines (in Northern Rhodesia)	54,334
(6) Numbers employed for wages in Southern Rhodesia	27,791
Nyasaland	542
Congo	6,531
Tanganyika	11,615
Other Countries	3,088
(7) Estimate of industrial requirements for ensuing year	119,534

[1] Orde Browne, p. 46. [2] See *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, pp. 21, 36, 53, 72, 87, 108.
[3] Reprinted in Orde Browne, pp. 95–6.

(1) corresponds to A. (2), (3)+(4), and (6) correspond, with slight deviations, to B, C, and E+G+H respectively. (5) is lower than D, as (5) excludes workers on mines in Northern Rhodesia, but the difference is far too small, since D includes 22,500 mine workers.[1]

It should be realized in fact that, first of all, the official figures showing the 'average number of natives employed within the Territory' are quite contradictory. A comparison of the figures given to the Pim Commission with those published in the Reports upon Native Affairs shows the following discrepancies:[2]

	1928	*1929*	*1930*	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*
Native Affairs, Reports	46,080	61,730	76,646	79,165	42,308	39,359	49,641	66,702	77,300
Pim Commission, *Report*	50,978	56,679	70,478	66,597	53,721	37,492	48,924	57,137	53,462

For 1937 and 1938 the Report upon Native Affairs gives 86,274 and 97,976 respectively while the Colonial Reports give 66,606 and 97,976 respectively.[3]

But the figures of natives employed outside the Territory which were furnished for 1937 to Major Orde Browne and which were published for 1937 and 1938 in the Reports upon Native Affairs were more puzzling still. A summary by Provinces is given in Table 8. It will be seen that the numbers shown to be 'Employed outside Territory' and those shown to be 'Employed for wages outside Territory' differ in part considerably, although they all, of course, refer to persons employed for wages. The greatest difference appears for the Eastern Province, 1938. In this case the low figure for those 'Employed for wages' outside the Territory is explained as follows:[4]

> The above figures refer *only* to Registered Tax-payers. It is estimated that, in addition, there are approximately 11,000 able-bodied men distributed between the Union of S.A., the Copperbelt, and S. Rhodesia who have been absent for over four years—viz.
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | Fort Jameson . . | 9,000 |
> | Lundazi . . . | 1,000 |
> | Petauke . . . | 700 |
> | | 10,700[5] |

It is obvious, moreover, that both totals referring to the number of natives employed outside the Territory are far too low. They read for 1937, 49,567 and 51,492. As stated above, the Annual Colonial Report for 1937 gave 67,776. This figure was obtained by taking the figure of 49,567 and substituting for the 27,791 Northern Rhodesians shown by the Provincial Commissioners to have been employed for wages in Southern

[1] See the above quotation from *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1937*, p. 23.

[2] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 15, *1934*, p. 25, *1936*, p. 7; Pim Commission, *Report*, p. 35.

[3] The figures in the Colonial Reports are said to refer to the end of the year.

[4] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 82.

[5] This would indicate that the figures as a rule represent rather the number of absentees and not the total number of people employed outside the Territory.

TABLE 8. *Northern Rhodesia Natives in European Employment inside and outside Northern Rhodesia, 1937–8*[1]

Province	Adult male taxpayers		Employed within Territory		Employed outside Territory		Employed for wages outside Territory											
							S. Rhodesia		Nyasaland		Belgian Congo		Tanganyika		Other countries		Total	
	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938	1937	1938
Central	27,446	27,447	11,760	11,760	1,540	1,540	1,376	2,390	—	—	51	110	3	5	110	100	1,540	2,605
Western	22,813	..	7,450	6,651	1,127	815	115	..	2	..	1,010	..	—	.	6	..	1,133	..
Southern	42,362	41,358	7,600	9,255	2,500	3,187	1,900	3,134	50	—	50	20	—	—	—	44	2,000	3,198
Northern	74,475	79,097	26,146	36,950	18,620	17,992	1,095	2,129	180	179	5,010	3,232	11,300	11,702	142	132	17,727	17,374
Eastern	50,318	43,464	10,618	12,760	20,250	22,800	17,850	12,000	300	380	—	5	302	510	1,250	800	19,702	13,695
Barotse	62,535	62,948	22,700	20,600	7,455	7,920	5,455	5,635	10	10	410	355	10	10	1,580	2,095	7,465	8,105
Total	279,949	.	86,274	97,976	51,492	54,254	27,791	25,288[2]	542	569[2]	6,531	3,722[2]	11,615	12,227[2]	3,088	3,171[2]	49,567	44,977[2]

[1] The figures of 'Employed within Territory' and 'Employed outside Territory' are taken from *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, pp. 19, 34, 51, 70, 85, 105; *1938*, pp. 12, 26, 40, 60, 80, 97. All other figures are taken from ibid. *1937*, pp. 21, 36, 53, 72, 87, 108; *1938*, pp. 14, 42, 63, 82, 100 (no figures given for Western Province).

[2] Excluding Western Province.

Rhodesia the 46,000 who according to the 1936 census of Southern Rhodesia were employed in that Colony. It was probably to this estimate of 67,776 that the Member for the Ndola Electoral Area referred when he said in the discussion of Major Orde Browne's report in the Legislative Council:

> Major Orde-Browne himself admits in the report that he is dubious of the reliability of the figures he quotes. I am not dubious about that figure of 50,000. I am confident it is underestimated. The latest available figures I believe show there are about 65,000 of our natives absent from Northern Rhodesia and in employment in other parts of Africa . . . .[1]

But the estimate of 67,776 was actually far too low. The number of male Northern Rhodesia natives employed in Southern Rhodesia, which according to the 1936 census amounted to 46,884, was certainly much higher on 31 December 1937, since the number of Northern Rhodesia labourers employed at Southern Rhodesia mines had increased in the meantime by about 5,000. As to the Northern Rhodesia natives employed in other territories the figures of the Provincial Commissioners were too low because the Commissioners naturally disregarded the 'machonas' (the lost ones) who have not been heard of for a number of years and because they dealt only with the taxable population and, therefore, excluded juveniles.[2] It is absolutely certain, therefore, that the number of Northern Rhodesia natives employed outside the Territory at the end of 1937 exceeded 80,000, and it is possible that it was much higher.[3]

The estimate in the Colonial Report for 1937 (67,776) had been much higher than any previous estimate. But although even this new estimate was far too low the Colonial Report for 1938 gave 54,254 as the number of able-bodied male natives working outside the Territory at the end of that year. This figure was taken from the reports of the Provincial Commissioners who reckoned with something like 30,000 natives employed in Southern Rhodesia. But since according to the Acting Senior Provincial Commissioner 44,000 were employed in Southern Rhodesia,[4] the Colonial Report accepted the latter figure for Southern Rhodesia and reduced the figures for all other territories to about 10,000! Nothing, it seems to me, shows more clearly the Administration's utter ignorance of the amount of migrant labour than this, its latest pre-war estimate.

[1] *Debates*, vol. xxxi, col. 555 (19 Dec. 1938).

[2] These two factors alone, however, can hardly explain how the Provincial Commissioners arrived for the unspecified countries which included the Union at so low a total as 3,088.

[3] One of the reasons why the actual number may be higher is that all available records are necessarily incomplete. Thus the Member for the Ndola Electoral Area stated in the Legislative Council on 6 Dec. 1940: 'In actual practice it is not difficult for a Native to get out of Northern Rhodesia without a medical certificate and also without a permit. He can go across our border, there is no real restriction about his leaving Northern Rhodesia, and if he is inclined to be not quite exact in his statement to the people of Southern Rhodesia, and if he says that he is a Native from Portuguese East Africa, then he does not need to have a pass from Northern Rhodesia. That in itself is a loophole which I understand is being taken advantage of by a considerable number of Natives.' (Ibid., vol. xxxviii, cols. 172–3.) It is evident that such natives would not be included in the official figures of Northern Rhodesians leaving the Territory nor in the records of Northern Rhodesians entering Southern Rhodesia in search of work nor in the Southern Rhodesia census figures of Northern Rhodesians employed in Southern Rhodesia.

[4] See p. 461 above, footnote 4.

The lack of adequate official figures has at last also been resented by unofficial members of the Legislative Council. When on 6 December 1940 the member for the Eastern Electoral Area had complained that when he inquired with regard to figures he was 'informed that there were no figures available for 1939 of those who left the Eastern Province',[1] the Member for the Ndola Electoral Area said:

The Hon. Member opened his remarks by one statement which I think should be taken up by the Government, and that is that he was unable to obtain certain figures as regards the exodus of Natives from Northern Rhodesia. That I have found, for possibly the last ten years, is one of the great difficulties in forming a fair and reasoned judgment on this question of the immigration of Natives from Northern Rhodesia to other Territories. It seems impossible, and I admit there are very great difficulties in the way, to get an absolutely accurate figure of, first the number of Natives who are leaving this Territory, and second, the number of Natives who are really available for work within the Territory. I realise all the difficulties in the way but I do think it is up to the Government to make some real effort to find out the exact position as regards the number of Natives in and outside the Territory.[2]

The Secretary of Native Affairs replied:

We are endeavouring at the present time to tighten up the rendering of returns which will enable Government to get a very much better idea in regard to the exact position as regards the Natives in and outside this Territory, and those required for work in this Territory.[3]

The Report of the Labour Department for 1940 said:

It is difficult in a large and sparsely populated territory such as Northern Rhodesia to ascertain the available labour supply. While the number of taxpaying Natives is known to be approximately 306,000 there are considerable numbers of youths under taxpaying age who are potential labourers. Their number is not at present known. During the year under review a real effort was made by the Provincial Administration to collect more reliable statistics than have hitherto been available of the number of able-bodied males domiciled in the Territory, of the number of these making their livelihood otherwise than by wage-earning and of the number absent at work at the various labour centres. The results of these enquiries will be available shortly.[4]

The main emigration of Native labour is to Southern Rhodesia, where there are approximately 40,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives working. . . . Some of the Natives proceeding to Southern Rhodesia migrate clandestinely into the Union of South Africa in spite of restrictions. During the year 638 adult Natives of Barotseland were recruited for work in Southern Rhodesia and in addition 1,440 adults and 20 youths who originated in Angola but were recruited within the Territory.

It is estimated that there are 7,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives working in the Union of South Africa, of whom 3,000 have been recruited by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association for the Gold Mines . . . . This Association was licensed during the year to recruit up to 3,500 Natives of the Barotse Province. Previously the Association had been engaging a limited experimental number of Natives at a depot in the Bechuanaland Protectorate adjacent to the border of Northern Rhodesia. The remaining 4,000 Natives entered the Union clandestinely, being prohibited immigrants, and are for the most part employed on farms in the Transvaal. This clandestine immigration causes some concern but is difficult to control.

It is estimated that about 10,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives are employed in Tanganyika Territory, mainly on the Lupa Goldfields and on Sisal estates in the Tanga area; 200 of the latter were recruited by a Labour Agent operating in the

[1] Ibid., col. 168.
[2] Ibid., col. 172.
[3] Ibid., col. 176.
[4] Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 2.

Northern Province. In addition, approximately 3,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives are working either in the Congo Belge or in Nyasaland.[1]

Thus the Labour Department estimated the total number of natives employed in 1940 outside the Protectorate at about 60,000.

The report for 1941 contained much more ample statistical data. It gave first the following table:[2]

Province	Total males	Taxable males	% taxable males employed for wages	% taxable males employed outside their Province	% taxable males employed within Northern Rhodesia	% taxable males employed outside Northern Rhodesia	% taxable males engaged at home on private business	Balance % at villages
Barotse . .	69,855	52,349	44	33	28	16	10	46
Central . .	38,149	32,340	49	24	44	5	18	33
Eastern . .	69,258	59,569	62	50	23	39	26	32
Kaonde-Lunda	46,005	36,524	35	31	30	5	20	45
Northern .	102,035	81,122	40	32	31	9	11	49
Southern .	52,127	43,683	33	18	22	11	52	15
Western .	14,102	11,274	37	3	36	1	19	44
	391,531	316,861	44	32	30	14	17	39

The report gave similar data for each of the thirty Districts.[3] It appears that the percentage of taxable males employed outside the Territory for wages was highest in the three Districts of the Eastern Province (Fort Jameson 47, Petauke 35, Lundazi 30) and in two of the five Districts of the Barotse Province (Mongu 22, Kalabo 22). But the following table, 'Numbers employed outside Northern Rhodesia',[4] shows that the figure for Fort Jameson is swelled by the inclusion of an enormous number of 'Machona' some of whom may have died.[5]

Province	Southern Rhodesia	Nyasaland	Union of S.A.	Tanganyika	Congo	Elsewhere
Barotse	4,961	1	3,701	1	18	132
Central	1,135	2	46	30	76	110
Eastern	13,051	305	1,758	267	3	8,881[a]
Kaonde-Lunda	370	—	331	3	724	20
Northern	517	99	76	4,743	1,425	48
Southern	3,691	5	217	3	—	59
Western	14	—	10	—	23	40
Totals	23,739	412	6,139	5,047	2,269	9,290

[a] 8,654 = 8,207 'Machona' whereabouts unknown: probably in Southern Rhodesia, Union of South Africa, and Northern Rhodesia from Fort Jameson.

It appears that, even including the 'Machona' from the Eastern Province, the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives shown to be employed outside the Territory was only 46,896. The report contains the following comment:

The main migration of labour outside the Territory is to Southern Rhodesia. . . . A census taken in Southern Rhodesia showed that there were 48,824 Northern

[1] Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 5. [2] Ibid. *1941*, p. 6. [3] See ibid., p. 7.
[4] Ibid., p. 6. [5] The meaning of the figures in footnote *a* is not clear.

Rhodesia Natives employed in that Territory in the year 1941. The figure for the 1936 census year was 46,884. . . .

Approximately 7,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives were working in the Union of South Africa at the end of the year. Most of them are in the Transvaal. 2,766 of these were recruited in Barotseland by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association which recruited a total of 3,078 Natives during the year. About 1,000 Natives entered the Union clandestinely. . . .

It has not so far been found possible to control the migration of labour to the Union of South Africa. Migration to Southern Rhodesia is governed by the terms of an inter-territorial agreement made between Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia and Nyasaland . . . .[1]

The reports for 1942 and 1943 give the following distribution of the natives employed at the end of the year 'apart from those employed in His Majesty's Forces':[2]

	1942	*1943*
(1) Employed in Northern Rhodesia:		
Mines and Works (excluding Public Works Dept.)	47,461	49,889
Farms	10,000	12,000
Government (excluding Public Works Dept.)	5,000	10,000
Trade and Commerce	2,500	2,500
Domestic	18,000	18,000
Missions	3,000	3,000
Local Government	2,000	2,000
Public Works Department	9,228	8,724
(2) Southern Rhodesia	50,000	50,000
(3) Union of South Africa	7,000[3]	3,791[4]
(4) Tanganyika Territory	5,000	5,000
(5) Congo	2,000	2,000

The reports contain the following comments:

1942. Unfortunately, owing to shortage of Provincial Administration Staff, it has not been possible to compile up to date statistics showing the distribution of labour within and without the Territory, but the following figures are believed to be approximately accurate:[5]

The vast majority of able bodied labour is still migrant but there is an increasing degree of urbanisation, the extent of which is now the subject of special investigation. The potential labour strength of the Territory is about 317,000 and the percentage of males left in the villages is believed to be approximately thirty.[6]

The migration of Natives to Southern Rhodesia is governed by the Migration Labour Agreement which was revised and renewed during the year until May 1944. It is estimated that there are approximately 50,000 Northern Rhodesia Natives in Southern Rhodesia. . . .

The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association which operates in Barotseland recruited 2,631 Natives during the year[7] out of their quota of 3,500. 2,654 were repatriated.[8]

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

[2] See ibid. *1942*, p. 4; *1943*, p. 6.

[3] Transvaal 6,335, Natal 260, Orange Free State 20, Cape Colony (including Mafeking) 470, Total 7,085. See ibid. *1942*, p. 5.

[4] Transvaal 3,221, Natal 200, Orange Free State 20, Cape Province 350, Total 3,791. See ibid. *1943*, p. 7.

[5] For figures see table above.

[6] This low percentage, of course, does not represent the average. See also Governor Waddington, 20 Nov. 1943, *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xlvi, col. 23: 'The question of recruitment . . . required careful planning, particularly in view of the fact that in some Native areas the number of able-bodied men left in the reserves had been reduced to the seriously low figure of 30 per cent. of the total.'

[7] See also *Report of the Witwatersrand Mine Natives' Wages Commission*, p. 52: 'The mine-workers from Northern Rhodesia who work on the Witwatersrand Gold Mines are drawn from Barotseland, the average number recruited during the period 1940–1942 being 2,799.'

[8] Labour Department, *Report 1942*, pp. 4–5.

1943. Recruiting by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association for the Witwatersrand Mines was suspended owing to an acute shortage of labour for essential production within the Territory.[1] . . . The Association having agreed to suspend the recruiting of Northern Rhodesia Natives within Northern Rhodesia and to discontinue engaging Northern Rhodesia Natives in the Union of South Africa it was with surprise we learnt that they were engaging Northern Rhodesia Natives at Kazungula in Bechuanaland, just over our borders. Strong protest was made and the matter is still under discussion. 2,680 Natives were repatriated during the year by the Association . . . .

Apart from those recruited by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association Natives are prohibited by the Union of South Africa immigration laws from entering the Union but there is some clandestine immigration nevertheless. The Nyasaland/Northern Rhodesia Labour Officer estimates that 750 Northern Rhodesia Natives entered the Union during the year and that there were at the end of it 3,791 Northern Rhodesia Natives in that Territory . . . .[2]

Duration of Absence. It is certainly true that it would mean a great step forwards if the Administration succeeded in getting more accurate information on the number of natives employed outside the Territory, but it is evident that the knowledge of this number alone would not be sufficient. Major Orde Browne, in commenting upon the table contained in his report,[3] pointed out:[4]

In this [table], the number employed outside the country is estimated (E, G and H, above) at just under 50,000, while there is a figure of 23,599 for the 'turnover' of Northern and Southern Rhodesian labour. Details of length of absence, time occupied by the journey, percentage of sick, and various other particulars, would be necessary for an accurate estimate of the numbers involved in the maintenance of an exterior employment figure of 50,000, and these details are entirely lacking. Taking account, however, of the length of the journey (almost always on foot at present), the percentage of sickness, the average period of absence and the period of recuperation after return home to the village, a reasonable estimate (founded on experience elsewhere) of the total numbers required for this exodus would be about 90,000; but this is a guess without any supporting figures. Far more serious is the lack of any detailed information to show the length of absence and the proportion who do not return at all.[5]

Thus Major Orde Browne pointed out some of the information we would need in order rightly to appraise the importance of migrant labour. One must realize in fact that the natives employed outside the Territory consist mainly of six groups:

(1) Genuine emigrants who when leaving the Territory intend to stay abroad for good and do so;

[1] See also Governor Waddington, 28 Nov. 1942, *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xliv, col. 12. See furthermore *Report of Witwatersrand Commission*, p. 4: 'In July, 1942, permission to the W.N.L.A. to engage natives was withdrawn by the Governments of Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, in order that there should be no hindrance to military recruiting in those areas.'

[2] Labour Department, *Report 1943*, pp. 6–7.

[3] See p. 463 above.

[4] Orde Browne, pp. 46–7.

[5] Ten years earlier it had been estimated that in 1927 the 248,948 adult taxable males of the Territory had worked 573,398 man months in the Territory and about 300,000 man months outside the Territory. 'When due allowance is made for the time spent in essential work in their home villages, and the time spent going to and from the labour centres (often as much as two months), the fact that Northern Rhodesia able-bodied males have averaged 3½ months per year in work for European enterprise can only be regarded as most satisfactory' (*Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1927*, p. 33).

(2) Emigrants who when leaving the Territory intend to stay abroad for good but return;
(3) Migrants who when leaving the Territory intend to return sometime but stay for good;
(4) Migrants who when leaving the Territory intend to return after a definite time (between 3 and 12 months) but stay abroad for years;
(5) Migrants who when leaving the Territory intend to return after a definite time and do so;
(6) Migrants who when leaving the Territory intend to return after a definite time but return prematurely.

Unfortunately it is impossible at present to appraise the numerical importance of the various groups. Yet, it is obvious that the effects of the exodus of labourers depend to a high degree on the length of their absence. During the whole period from 1919 to 1943 the proportion of natives employed outside the Territory varied probably between one-sixth and one-third of the total number of able-bodied men.[1] If each able-bodied native had been absent for three months during the year and if migrations had been distributed over the year so as to suit the needs of the rural community at home the harm done by those migrations would have been negligible. But the duration of absence varied greatly. In the case of recruiting, it is true, the contract is made for a definite time[2] and the majority of the recruits are repatriated after the expiration of the contract. But those who migrate independently—and they constitute the vast majority—may stay away for much shorter periods than the recruits, for example, if they find no job, while others may stay away for ever. I shall give here a few extracts bearing on the length of stay of the returners.

1928. There were 21,338 natives of Northern Rhodesia working in Southern Rhodesia at the end of the year. Some of these had of course been away for a number of years.[3]

1929. A few of the natives who go to Tanganyika Territory and Southern Rhodesia in quest of employment marry and settle down there and are lost to the Territory. The number of such natives is, however, small in comparison with the number of men who travel abroad to work, and it is noticed that such men often return after long periods of absence, bringing their families with them.[4]

[1] The percentage of absentees, of course, varied enormously from village to village. Referring to the fact that nearly one-half of the adult men of the Bemba tribe leave their home annually to work in the mines of Northern Rhodesia, Katanga, Southern Rhodesia, or South Africa, Audrey Richards states: '. . . to say that 40 or 50 per cent. of the total male Bemba are away annually from the Territory gives a misleading impression. It seems to imply that each village has half of its men present, whereas in fact some communities have plenty of male labour for a year or two while the others are so denuded of men that the remaining inhabitants tend to sink into apathy or leave the village to join a more flourishing community.' (*Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia*, p. 404.)

[2] See, for example, *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 23: 'With regard to the period of absence the longest contract offered by recruiters is the twelve months' contract of the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau. Mr. Yule's recruits for the Congo, and the recruits of the Native Labour Association for Northern Rhodesian Mines are all engaged for six tickets work, usually performed within seven months. (As far back as 1908 the labourers recruited in North-Eastern Rhodesia were engaged for twelve calendar months; see Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau, *Report 1908*, p. 30.)

[3] *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1928*, p. 31. The figure 21,338 actually represented the number of natives leaving Northern Rhodesia for Southern Rhodesia in the course of the year 1928 (see Table 7).

[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 8. See also ibid. *1931*, p. 13.

1930. One result of financial depression in foreign labour markets has been the return to the Territory from the Congo, Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa of numbers of natives who had gone to work years ago, and had been erased from our Tax Registers. It is not possible to give statistics of natives (and their families) so returning, but this form of 'immigration' has been noted in several districts, and the aggregate gain in population must be considerable.[1]

The voluntary worker is generally away from his home for a longer period than the recruited labourer. There is no fixed time limit to his contract and he drifts from employer to employer at will.[2]

1931. Unemployment in South Africa and in the adjoining territories continues to bring back to Northern Rhodesia numbers of natives who have been away for long periods, and who are now unable to find profitable occupation in these places. Many of these people have been living for years in large towns under conditions in no way resembling life in the ordinary native village, but it is believed they return to tribal rule and the pursuit of agriculture as a means of subsistence in a very short space of time, and receive a ready welcome from their relatives and clan. It is impossible to supply any statistics regarding the people so returning but there is no doubt they have helped to account for the slightly larger percentage of increase in population this year.[3]

1932. Of the large number of natives who leave the Territory in quest of employment a small proportion remain abroad and are lost to their country of origin . . . .[4]

1933. It is remarked that, although a not inconsiderable number of men who have gone south for work settle there on the expiration of their period of service, yet they almost invariably return home in the long run, even after so long a period of unbroken absence as ten years.[5]

1934. It is remarked that of the large number of men who regularly go to work in Southern Rhodesia, and many of whom remain there for considerable periods, a certain proportion never return to Northern Rhodesia, having married and settled down in the south.[6]

In the Eastern Province some 15,600 out of a taxable male population of less than 50,000 are estimated to be away at work in Southern Rhodesia at any one time. It is seldom that any one is away for less than a year and many remain for three and four years.[7]

1936 [Southern Province] . . . 207 Northern Rhodesia natives who had been working for some years in South Africa in trades and as domestic servants were repatriated by the Union Government . . . .[8]

[Northern Province] The removal from tax registers of the names of men long absent, which has been carried out during the year in the light of information gained on tour, is gradually bringing us towards a closer estimate of the real numbers of the people. In the Mporokoso District alone close on nine hundred names were thus deleted during the year.[9]

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 11. See also ibid., p. 19, and *Colonial Reports, Northern Rhodesia 1930*, pp. 7, 46. For the long stay of many Northern Rhodesians in the Katanga, see *Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, Rapport 1930–1, Katanga*, p. 104; see also ibid., p. 102.

[2] *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 23. But see ibid. *1934*, p. 26: '. . . many natives prefer to select their own employer and to enter on a short term contract only, in order to be able to keep in touch with their homes.'

[3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 13; see also ibid., p. 31.

[4] Ibid. *1932*, p. 15. See also Davis, p. 137: 'At the Wankie coal-mines in Southern Rhodesia, for example, out of a sample of 692 workers, largely recruited in Northern Rhodesia, 173, or exactly 25 per cent, had in 1932 been with the firm ten years or more without any break of service.'

[5] *Report upon Native Affairs 1933*, p. 17.

[6] Ibid. *1934*, p. 13.

[7] Ibid., p. 28. See also ibid. *1935*, p. 74, and ibid. *1936*, p. 71 (both quoted pp. 458–60 above).

[8] Ibid. *1936*, p. 34. See also the Debate of 29 Oct. 1936 in the Legislative Council (*Debates*, vol. xxvii, cols. 287–92).

[9] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 45.

[Eastern Province] The tendency is for a greater number [of labourers] to become ultimately domiciled in Southern Rhodesia.[1]

1937 [Central Province] Some 43 per cent. of the adult taxpayers in the Zambezi Valley are absent at any one time, working in Southern Rhodesia, but they seldom stay away long, and are generally able to return to their villages in time to cultivate their gardens.[2]

[Eastern Province] Such emigration as takes place is mainly temporary and is confined to Natives who leave their villages in search of work.

These remain away for varying periods—in some cases for as many as twelve years—but it is generally found that they eventually drift back to what they continue to regard as their homes however unattractive these may appear to be.[3]

1938. Very few Natives of the [Western] Province leave the Territory for long periods. The Mwinilunga and Kasempa Districts supply about 800 labourers a year to the Congo Mines. But they will not work for long periods, and so Southern Rhodesia has little attraction for them. They have a strong homing instinct.[4]

Comparatively few seek work outside the Territory and those that do return to their homes at frequent intervals, therefore the problem of emigrant labour is not a serious one in the Southern Province.[5]

. . . there are estimated to be between 10,000 and 11,000 males who have been absent from the [Eastern] Province for over four years, mainly in Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa.[6]

The males of some tribes remain away much longer than others. This is particularly noticeable amongst the Ngoni and Kunda in the Fort Jameson District.[7] . . . Amongst these two tribes absenteeism also is greatest. Other tribes, it is interesting to note, have evolved a system whereby emigration is regulated by the needs of village life. Men and youths of the village agree to take it in turns to go away for periods not usually exceeding two years, and arrangements are made for those who remain behind to look after their interests in their absence. . . . It is remarked that Natives who remain absent for periods much exceeding two years and who have lost any real interest in home affairs, do not make a long sojourn on their return but are happy to be away again after a few weeks. This does not give them time to resume their tribal connections and it is considered that it would be for the general benefit if they were compelled to remain at home for a minimum period of one month for each year of absence.[8]

[Barotse Province] From reports received, it would appear that 38 per cent. of the taxable male population are away at work outside the Province. The most serious aspect of the situation is the very long periods the Natives stay away without returning to their homes. The normal periods range from one to three years and sometimes longer . . . .[9]

The 1936 Agreement on Native Labour between the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland[10] had provided:

The Governments agree that it is desirable that emigrant Natives in general should return to their homes after working for an economic period which should not exceed two years and might well be less, and that after two years they should be repatriated, exceptions to this rule being allowed on reference to the Labour Commissioner of the labourers' country of origin.

The report of the Labour Department for 1941 said:

Where Natives are recruited for work outside the Territory deferred pay, repatriation after a limited period and proper travelling arrangements are insisted on.[11]

[1] Ibid., p. 71.
[2] Ibid., pp. 76–7.
[3] Ibid., p. 37.
[4] Ibid. *1937*, p. 17.
[5] Ibid. *1938*, p. 23.
[6] Ibid., p. 70. See also p. 438 above.
[7] See also p. 448 above.
[8] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, pp. 75–6.
[9] Ibid., p. 94.
[10] See Orde Browne, pp. 95–6.
[11] *Report 1941*, p. 5. Almost literally the same ibid. *1940*, p. 5.

The report for 1942 stated with regard to the Northern Rhodesia natives recruited in the Protectorate for Southern Rhodesia:

> Most of these recruited Natives are repatriated within a year of attestation. . . . Considerable numbers of Northern Rhodesia Natives are recruited by Southern Rhodesia labour agents in Southern Rhodesia.[1] Unfortunately, these are not repatriated free by the Agents although the Southern Rhodesia Government provides free transport back for all Northern Rhodesia Natives who have worked for more than nine months in Southern Rhodesia as well as running free transport services from this Territory.[2]

The proceedings of the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 10 January 1945 suggest in fact that, contrary to the 1936 agreement, many Northern Rhodesia natives did not return from Southern Rhodesia within a year or two.

> Mr. Page asked: Has Government taken any steps to implement the desirability expressed in the Tri-partite Labour Agreement that Africans leaving the Territory for work should return to their homes after a maximum period of two years?
>
> The Secretary for Native Affairs replied: Government does not feel justified in pressing for the compulsory repatriation of African labourers after two years during the present period of emergency, since to do so might cause a serious dislocation of labour. If recruiting in Northern Rhodesia for Southern Rhodesia is resumed, a clause will be included in the contracts limiting the period of their validity.[3]

IV. Composition of the Native Population

Country of Origin. No data concerning the country of origin are available for the African population as a whole. According to information obtained in 1931 from 'employers of native labour' 10,296 of the 79,813 'Natives in Employment' came from other countries.[4] But the 'Natives in Employment' evidently comprised only those Africans who were employed by non-natives. The figure of 10,296 strangers, therefore, does not include (1) Africans originating from another country who were employed by natives, (2) Africans originating from another country who were not employees. How important the immigration of Africans not employed by non-natives was may be inferred from the fact that in 1931 only 186 immigrant 'Natives in Employment' were enumerated in Barotse Province, while according to the official statistics the population of the Province (excluding absentees) had increased from 177,403 in 1921 to 327,617 in 1931. Although a considerable part of this apparent increase may be due to understatement in 1921, overstatement in 1931, or both, and a small part to natural increase and to immigration from other Provinces, it is obvious that the number of people born outside the Protectorate must have been large.

Sex. According to the 'census' of 1921 there were in the Protectorate 447,709 males and 531,995 females,[5] or 118·8 females per 100 males. Since

[1] It should be realized that the total number of Northern Rhodesia natives recruited either in Northern or in Southern Rhodesia for work in Southern Rhodesia is very small. According to the census of 1941 there were 3,524 recruited and 44,639 unrecruited male natives from Northern Rhodesia in employment in Southern Rhodesia; see *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia*, 7 Apr. 1942, p. 3.

[2] Labour Department, *Report 1942*, p. 4.

[3] *Debates*, vol. xlix, cols. 77–8.

[4] See pp. 452–3 above.

[5] See *Blue Book 1924*, Section O, p. 2.

these figures, according to the 1931 census report,[1] exclude absentees and since in the decades preceding the census many men had left the Protectorate never to return, it is not surprising that there was a large excess of females. Ten years later the 'census' showed (excluding absentees) 580,501 males and 714,580 females or 123·1 females to 100 males. The number of males had increased by 29·7 per cent. while the number of females had increased by 34·3 per cent. That the excess of females increased by nearly 50,000 is difficult to explain, since the number of men staying abroad was apparently about the same in 1931 as in 1921.[2] The preponderance of females is much greater still if one takes account only of the adults.[3] The number of women per 100 men in 1931 was 144·2 excluding absentees and 129·8 including absentees. In the Provinces which are considered as labour-supply areas (Awemba, Barotse, East Luangwa, Kasempa, Tanganyika) there were 147·6 women to 100 men, excluding absentees, in the other Provinces (Batoka, Kafue, Luangwa, Mweru-Luapula) 137·8. The excess was particularly large in East Luangwa Province and Tanganyika Province.

Awemba	*Barotse*	*Batoke*	*East Luangwa*	*Kafue*	*Kasempa*	*Luangwa*	*Mweru-Luapula*	*Tanganyika*
139	128	134	195	123	131	150	138	166

In every single Province the preponderance of women, even including absentees, is very large, and it seems not unlikely that the estimates of the District Officers overstated the proportion of women to men.[4]

Age. According to the figures for 1930–1 which exclude absentees there were 70·6 children to 100 adults of both sexes and 119·6 children to 100 women. Both these ratios seem acceptable, though it must be kept in mind that the estimates of the numbers of children were more arbitrary even than those of adults.

V. Composition of the Non-Native Population

Birthplace. Of the 14,447 non-natives enumerated in 1931 only 1,561 were born in Northern Rhodesia, 5,877 in the Union of South Africa, 953 in Southern Rhodesia, 163 in other British possessions in Africa, 83 elsewhere in Africa, 4,225 in British possessions in Europe, 792 elsewhere in Europe, 222 in British possessions in Asia, 12 elsewhere in Asia, 95 in British possessions in America, 227 elsewhere in America, 203 in British possessions in Oceania, and 7 elsewhere. Many of the non-natives born in the Union of South Africa were 'poor whites'. Of the 13,846 Europeans 1,291

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 35–6.

[2] I estimate the number of native males employed outside the Protectorate in 1921 and 1931 at about 50,000, on 31 Dec. 1935 at over 75,000, and on 31 Dec. 1937 at over 80,000; see pp. 452, 456, 459, 466 above.

[3] The preponderance is probably accentuated somewhat by the fact that females are sometimes counted as adults at an age at which males are counted as non-adults.

[4] It will be remembered that from 1931 on the Reports upon Native Affairs complained of an understatement of the numbers of women. In 1933 the ratio of women to 100 men was only 117·9 (as against 129·8 in 1930). The so-called understatements came possibly nearer the truth than the more 'accurate' figures.

TABLE 9. *European Population by Country of Birth, Northern Rhodesia, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Country of birth	Europeans 1921	Europeans 1931	Country of birth	Europeans 1921	Europeans 1931
Northern Rhodesia	397	1,291	Spain	1	4
Southern Rhodesia	167	906	Sweden	6	19
Rhodesia (so returned)	26	—	Switzerland	14	26
Basutoland, Swaziland	1	11	Turkey	—	7
Bechuanaland	15	61	Yugoslavia	3	74
St. Helena, Mauritius	3	7	Elsewhere in Europe	2	3
South West Africa	—	17	Europe Total	1,534	5,017
Union of South Africa	1,321	5,776			
Other Br. Poss. in Africa	8	46	Ceylon	—	5
Portuguese Africa	6	19	India	28	60
Elsewhere in Africa	2	55	Other Br. Poss. in Asia	—	26
Africa Total	1,946	8,189	China	1	4
			Japan	—	1
England	966	2,797	Elsewhere in Asia	3	4
Wales	28	141	Asia Total	32	100
Scotland	246	983			
Ireland	75	257	Canada	14	82
United Kingdom (so returned)	2	41	Newfoundland	—	1
Other Br. Poss. in Europe	4	6	Other Br. Poss. in America	3	9
Austria	2	10	Argentina	2	6
Belgium	2	48	Brazil	1	3
Czechoslovakia	—	3	United States of America	24	192
Denmark	4	14	Elsewhere in America	1	26
Finland	—	4	America Total	45	319
France	40	53			
Germany	14	114	Australia	51	167
Greece	23	62	New Zealand	19	35
Holland	22	47	Other Br. Poss. in Oceania	3	1
Hungary	—	1	Elsewhere in Oceania	—	2
Italy	12	59	Oceania Total	73	205
Latvia	—	38			
Lithuania	—	58	Born at sea	1	5
Norway	1	18	Not stated	3	11
Poland	10	48			
Rumania	10	14	Total	3,634	13,846
Russia	47	68			

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 77–80.

TABLE 10. *Asiatic and Coloured Population by Country of Birth, Northern Rhodesia, 1931*[1]

Race	Africa: N. Rhodesia	S. Rhodesia	Union of S. Africa	Other Brit. possessions	Portuguese East Africa	Elsewhere	Total	Asia: India	Other Brit. possessions	Elsewhere	Total	West Indies	Not stated	Total
Asiatics	15	8	13	—	3	4	43	127	3[3]	3[4]	133	—	—	176
Coloured	255	39	88	21[2]	2	—	405	..	..	..	1	3	16	425

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 90, 93.
[2] 7 Bechuanaland, 11 Nyasaland, 1 South West Africa, 2 Tanganyika.
[3] 1 Ceylon, 2 Palestine. [4] 1 Afghanistan, 2 China.

were born in Northern Rhodesia, and 12,555 elsewhere. Of the Europeans who were neither born in Northern Rhodesia nor visitors, 7,403 had been resident under 3 years,[1] 2,974 for 3 to 9 years, and 1,981 for 10 years or more.

TABLE 11. *Non-Native Population born outside Northern Rhodesia by Length of Residence, 1931*[1]

Years	*Europeans*			*Asiatics*	*Coloured*
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Total*	*Total*
0	2,271	1,304	3,575	46	33
1	1,661	801	2,462	38	18
2	918	448	1,366	16	24
3	536	299	835	11	8
4	490	221	711	7	8
5	316	159	475	2	6
6	214	130	344	—	7
7	162	103	265	1	9
8	107	76	183	3	2
9	86	75	161	1	5
10–14	514	374	888	6	10
15–19	297	183	480	8	8
20–24	243	109	352	4	9
25–29	162	41	203	11	3
30–34	39	4	43	5	2
35–39	9	2	11	2	1
40–44	2	2	4	—	—
Not stated	2	1	3	—	1
Total	8,029	4,332	12,361	161	154

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 81, 92, 96. Visitors are not included in this Table.

Nationality. The distribution of the 13,846 Europeans by nationality was as follows:[2]

British by birth	12,249	German	78	Spaniard	1
British by annexation	180	Greek	62	Swede	14
British by naturalisation	205	Hungarian	2	Swiss	20
'South African'	394	Italian	62	Yugoslavian	75
Austrian	4	Latvian	25	U.S.A. citizen	185
Belgian	48	Lithuanian	35	North American	16
Czechoslovakian	3	Norwegian	12	South American	2
Dane	7	Pole	39	Not specified	11[1]
Dutch	36	Portuguese	1	Total	13,846
Finn	1	Rumanian	7		
French	47	Russian	25		

[1] Including '6 Hebrew Jewish'.

The number of Europeans returned as British was 13,028 in 1931. It was apparently smaller at the end of 1939. But the number of aliens had risen in the meantime from about 815 to approximately 1,160,[3] the increase being due largely to the immigration of German refugees.

[1] On 7 Mar. 1932 the Chief Secretary, in discussing the relief to be granted to unemployed Europeans, stated in the Legislative Council that according to the census 8,238 or '66 per cent. of the total European population' had 'been in the country under three years' (*Debates*, vol. xvi, p. 233). But this was a mistake; 8,238 had been in the country under four years and even these 8,238 persons represented only 60 per cent. of the total European population.

[2] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 76. [3] See Northern Rhodesia Police, *Report 1939*, p. 3.

Of the 144 male Asiatics enumerated in 1931 138 were British, 2 Portuguese, 3 Arabs, and 1 Chinese. The 32 female Asiatics were all of British nationality.[1] The Coloured with the exception of 1 Portuguese subject and 8 unspecified were returned as British subjects.[2]

Sex. Among the Europeans there were in 1921 61 females per 100 males and in 1931 only 58. But the number of females decreased much less in the economic crisis than the number of males and increased considerably thereafter. According to the estimate for 31 December 1938 (7,880 males, 5,275 females)[3] there were then 67 females per 100 males.[4] Among the Asiatics there is a great preponderance of males. In 1931 there were 32 females as against 144 males, on 31 December 1939 102 females as against 518 males.[5] Among the Coloured there were in 1931 slightly more females (217) than males (208). But for the end of 1939 the number of females is given as only 283 and the number of males as 431.[6]

TABLE 12. *Non-Native Population by Race, Sex, and Age, Northern Rhodesia, 1921 and 1931*[1]

	Europeans				*Asiatics*		*Coloured*		*Total*		
Age Years	*Males 1921*	*Females 1921*	*Males 1931*	*Females 1931*	*Males 1931*	*Females 1931*	*Males 1931*	*Females 1931*	*Males 1931*	*Females 1931*	*Total 1931*
0–4	213	211	625	629	7	12	32	39	664	680	1,344
5–9	145	143	518	478	4	1	37	44	559	523	1,082
10–14	96	103	366	329	—	3	26	25	392	357	749
15–19	112	97	411	332	9	2	24	27	444	361	805
20–24	133	73	1,098	551	36	3	26	32	1,160	586	1,746
25–29	259	178	1,516	684	14	7	14	10	1,544	701	2,245
30–39	510	304	1,790	1,078	27	3	19	17	1,836	1,098	2,934
40–49	533	180	1,303	596	24	1	10	7	1,337	604	1,941
50–59	196	62	879	298	18	—	7	4	904	302	1,206
60–69	52	16	217	88	5	—	4	3	226	91	317
70–79	11	4	32	15	—	—	1	1	33	16	49
80 and over	1	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	3	1	4
Not stated	2	—	8	1	—	—	8	8	16	9	25
Total	2,263	1,371	8,766	5,080	144	32	208	217	9,118	5,329	14,447

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 49, 89, 92.

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 29. [2] See ibid., p. 34. [3] See *Blue Book 1938*, Section O, p. 2.

[4] In 1932–6, when the total number of Europeans was apparently much smaller than in both 1931 and 1938, the number of females per 100 males varied between 70 and 75 (see ibid. *1932*, Section O, p. 2, to *1936*, Section O, p. 2). During the war the proportion of females was higher still. According to the estimate for 31 Dec. 1943 (10,026 males, 8,718 females) there were 87 females to 100 males (see ibid. *1943*, Section O, p. 2).

[5] See Northern Rhodesia Police, *Report 1939*, p. 6.

[6] See *Blue Book 1939*, Section O, p. 2. It should be noted, however, that the figures in the *Blue Books* are sometimes obviously wrong. Thus, ibid. *1936*, Section O, pp. 2–3, shows:

Asiatics			*Coloured*			*Asiatics and Coloured*			
Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Children*	*Total*
273	69	342	330	274	604	372	404	170	946

The same figures appear ibid. *1937*, Section O, pp. 2–3. It is obvious that the women cannot have numbered 404, if the total number of females was only 69 + 274 or 343.

TABLE 13. *Europeans born Within and Outside Northern Rhodesia, by Age and Sex, 1931*[1]

Age Years	Born in N. Rhodesia		Born outside N. Rhodesia		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	
0	110	129	35	30	304
1	67	63	52	51	233
2	66	68	65	58	257
3	44	52	67	66	229
4	39	43	75	60	217
5	40	30	79	62	211
6	28	34	68	87	217
7	37	32	75	72	216
8	30	17	60	62	169
9	35	23	59	56	173
10	14	18	79	58	169
11	19	27	65	43	154
12	15	15	56	51	137
13	13	12	41	48	114
14	15	14	44	40	113
15	22	6	56	45	129
16	8	13	65	42	128
17	10	10	67	62	149
18	4	11	66	73	154
19	5	5	108	65	183
20	9	4	113	88	214
21–24	12	12	964	447	1,435
25–29	3	5	1,513	679	2,200
30–34	1	—	996	555	1,552
35–39	2	—	791	523	1,316
40–44	—	—	675	340	1,015
45–49	—	—	628	256	884
50–54	—	—	562	179	741
55–59	—	—	317	119	436
60–64	—	—	158	62	220
65–69	—	—	59	26	85
70–74	—	—	19	11	30
75–79	—	—	13	4	17
80–84	—	—	3	1	4
Not stated	—	—	8	1	9
Total	648	643	8,118	4,437	13,846

[1] Computed from *Census Report 1931*, pp. 48, 81, 83. Figures for persons born outside Northern Rhodesia and for Total exclude Visitors and Railway Passengers under 15 years (5 boys and 9 girls under 5 years, 3 boys and 2 girls 5–6 years old, 4 boys and 1 girl 7–9 years old, and 5 boys and 3 girls 10–14 years old).

Age. In 1931 the proportion of children (under 15) among the European population was only 21·3 per cent., the proportion of women at child-bearing age (15–49) 23·4 per cent., and the proportion of old people (60 and over) only 2·6 per cent. Of the Europeans born in Northern Rhodesia 89 per cent. were children, of those born outside Northern Rhodesia 14 per cent. The ratio of females to 100 males in the various age-groups is rather puzzling:

0–18	*19–20*	*21–24*	*25–29*	*30–34*	*35–39*	*40–44*	*45–49*	*50–54*	*55–84*
94	69	47	45	56	66	50	41	32	39

TABLE 14. *Europeans by Sex, Age, and Conjugal Condition, Northern Rhodesia, 1931*[1]

Age Years	Males					Females				
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced or judicially separated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced or judicially separated*	*Total*
0–16	1,660	—	—	—	1,660	1,541	1[2]	—	—	1,542
17	77	—	—	—	77	60	11	1	—	72
18	70	—	—	—	70	68	15	1	—	84
19	111	2	—	—	113	40	29	—	1	70
20	120	2	—	—	122	51	41	—	—	92
21–24	855	115	2	3	976[3]	132	323	1	3	459
25–29	955	543	10	8	1,516	122	555	2	5	684
30–34	375	586	12	24	997	77	468	3	7	555
35–39	187	579	12	15	793	70	432	14	7	523
40–44	142	497	19	17	675	31	285	21	3	340
45–49	117	461	34	16	628	19	219	15	3	256
50–54	139	374	35	14	562	13	145	19	2	179
55–59	57	226	28	6	317	9	82	27	1	119
60–64	32	100	21	5	158	2	32	27	1	62
65–69	10	37	8	4	59	—	10	16	—	26
70–74	4	7	6	2	19	—	4	7	—	11
75–79	1	5	7	—	13	—	1	3	—	4
80 and over	—	3	—	—	3	—	—	1	—	1
Not stated	4	3	—	—	8[3]	—	—	—	—	1[2]
Total	4,916	3,540	194	114	8,766	2,235	2,653	158	33	5,080

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 48, 50.

[2] 15 years.

[3] Including 1 with conjugal condition unspecified.

TABLE 15. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Northern Rhodesia, 1930–41*[1]

Date 1 Jan.	15–19 years		20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
1930	1	1	16	7	70	3	74	9	46	15	42	6	43	1	16	2	7	3	84	14	399	61
1931	2	2	49	11	101	9	83	14	58	16	48	7	48	3	21	1	10	2	89	22	509	87
1932	6	5	74	20	157	16	98	21	75	22	48	11	51	3	22	1	11	2	109	40	651	141
1933	6	3	57	16	147	20	98	17	76	20	53	12	39	3	24	1	9	3	97	45	606	140
1934	4	1	26	13	118	19	89	17	70	18	40	12	23	5	24	—	2	1	79	42	475	128
1935	2	—	17	12	103	16	97	18	63	16	42	16	23	8	19	1	5	1	93	51	464	139
1936	—	—	13	8	94	17	96	16	72	16	46	16	27	7	19	2	7	1	98	69	472	152
1937	—	—	10	9	74	16	101	14	78	14	51	15	28	10	22	1	4	—	122	76	490	155
1938	—	—	15	3	58	19	112	13	79	16	52	15	32	14	15	1	10	—	135	74	508	155
1939	—	—	18	1	53	19	113	11	84	12	57	15	29	16	15	2	10	1	202	87	581	164
1940	—	—	16	—	53	4	105	11	91	7	57	7	27	13	16	3	5	—	223	78	593	123
1941	—	—	22	—	45	6	95	12	99	9	62	7	33	10	15	5	8	—	218	73	597	122

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials, 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.

The preponderance of males was particularly large among the persons aged 21 to 29 and over 40.

To-day the proportion of children and likewise that of women at child-bearing age is probably much larger than in 1931.

Conjugal condition. Of the male Europeans over 15 years 47·0 per cent. were bachelors, 48·8 per cent. husbands, and 4·2 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans over 15 years 21·9 per cent. were spinsters, 72·8 per cent. wives, and 5·3 per cent. widows or divorced. The number of husbands exceeded the number of wives by one-third.

VI. Native Birth and Death Registration

'The Births and Deaths Registration Regulations, 1908' of North Eastern Rhodesia provided optional registration of native births and deaths, but it is doubtful whether any use was made of this opportunity, and the 'Registration of Births and Deaths Proclamation, 1914' which repealed the Regulations of 1908 did not even provide voluntary registration of native births or deaths. The keeping of records, at least in selected villages, was apparently envisaged for the first time in the Medical Report for the years 1925 and 1926.

To obtain accurate figures on which to work out vital statistics for the native population would be a task of great magnitude, and would require much organisation and incur considerable expense.

Owing to the small size of native villages (the population as a rule not exceeding 100 persons each), and to the distribution of these villages over an immense area (the average density of population being about 3·5 of the square mile), and to the fact that the great majority are remote from Government Stations, the difficulties of inaugurating any satisfactory system of registration would be very great.

An accurate record of births and deaths in selected villages throughout the Territory might be expected to furnish figures reliably indicative of the general native birth and death-rates for the Territory, especially in years in which no severe local epidemics occurred.

It may be possible with the co-operation of the Native Department to obtain such figures in future years by the selection of villages in close proximity to each Government out-station, and keeping accurate records of such.[1]

A possible fallacy arising from such selection would be a slightly lower general and infantile mortality rate as the result of medical treatment and improved conditions. This, however, would not at present be considerable, and the figures obtained would be more accurate than if remote villages were selected for the purpose.

As schemes for native education advance, it may also be possible to obtain fairly accurate data in selected villages from native teachers or students who have received education and returned to their homes.[2]

The interest in vital statistics was focused from the outset on two questions: the influence of the large number of absentees on the birth-rate and the extent of infant mortality. No attempt, therefore, has been made so far to ascertain the number of deaths of older children or adults. The Report upon Native Affairs for 1928 relates:

It is important there should be accurate statistics for those districts which are the main sources of labour supply, as warnings have been given to the effect that

[1] *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 15.
[2] Ibid., p. 16.

lengthy absence from home of the males is likely to have an effect upon the birth-rate.[1]

It is for various reasons extremely difficult to obtain accurate statistics, but every effort is being made to obtain as full information as possible and it is hoped that each year the figures will become more reliable.

Annexure No. 'L' gives the result of the figures collected during the year. Unfortunately the instructions issued for the compilation of this annexure were in some instances misunderstood and the returns are therefore not quite complete. The reluctance of natives to discuss death has been found a serious obstacle to the compilation of statistics.

Two systems have been tried. One is to keep a careful check on all births and infant deaths in a group of villages. In this way it should be possible to obtain accurate figures in time. Another method which has been used in one district is to keep a check on a certain number of individual families. This latter system may result in greater accuracy though the process may present more difficulties than the check on whole villages.[2]

The villages under observation in 1928 had a total population of 30,457 and the data ascertained were the numbers of male births, female births, deaths under 1 year, and deaths over 1 but under 2 years. Similar data were obtained in the following six years.

1929. In every district some ten or more villages have been under observation with a view to the collection of statistics regarding the birth rate. Records have been kept in 579 villages, and the number of men, women and children resident therein shows a total of 46,479. . . . The figures obtained from last year's observation . . . were admittedly experimental. This year's results should be more accurate, as they have been obtained in a more uniform and methodical manner. There is still, however, much reason to doubt the reliability of statistics which are collected entirely from natives who do not understand the purport of the enquiry, and I do not attach any importance to the variation in results obtained in the first two years in which this method has been tried.[3]

[Infant Mortality.] The reasons for the inaccuracy in the figures, amongst which the most important are the reluctance of natives to talk about deaths and suspicion as to the objects of the enquiry, have as yet lost none of their weight. As time goes on and natives become accustomed to these investigations and appreciate the object therefor it may be anticipated that more valuable statistics will be available.[4]

1930. The method of compiling vital statistics adopted in 1929 was again used during the year . . . .

As stated in previous reports, these figures cannot be regarded as accurate, the method of enquiry is new to the native population and not well understood by them, and there is reason to believe that in many districts births are not reported.[5]

The comparative statistics for the two years [1929 and 1930] show that figures cannot at present be regarded as reliable. Real improvement cannot be expected until the native population—particularly the women—can realise how important vital statistics are.

[Infant Mortality.] Here again it cannot be claimed that the figures are accurate, and it is perhaps more probable that native mothers would fail to report deaths than they would fail to report births.[6]

1931. In order to arrive at the birth rate, statistics are kept in some ten or more villages in each district either by a Headman or Native Authority. . . .

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, p. 6. [2] Ibid., p. 7.

[3] Ibid. *1929*, p. 8. Some returns were obviously wrong. In the Mankoya District 112 births were reported in 1928 and 131 in 1929. Yet the total number of females in the villages under observation was only 144 and 192 respectively, and of these probably not more than one-half were of child-bearing age.

[4] Ibid., p. 9. [5] Ibid. *1930*, p. 11. [6] Ibid., p. 12.

These [birth] figures are not very easy to collect and must not be relied upon as definitely accurate as natives do not realise the purport of their collection and do not particularly care for the close investigation of their domestic affairs. . . .

The comparative statistics [for 1929, 1930, and 1931] cannot be relied upon nor will it be possible to obtain more accurate ones until the people are able to appreciate the value of figures of this nature.[1]

[Infant Mortality.] Again it must be repeated that these figures cannot be guaranteed as accurate, there is a general disinclination amongst natives to discuss deaths and they do not understand the motive for the enquiry.[2]

1932. The procedure adopted in 1931 for the collection of vital statistics was again used this year. . . .

The figures must not be accepted as reliable as natives do not favour the intimate enquiries necessary to obtain the information wanted and they are extremely vague regarding the ages of their children. Again, the statistics are collected in various ways; in some districts they are obtained by district messengers, in others from village headmen and by native court clerks attached to the chiefs who have been appointed native authorities. This latter method is probably the easiest and it is hoped that in course of time it will be in general use as these clerks should be able to keep reliable returns of births and deaths in their respective villages.[3]

[Infant Mortality.] . . . again it must be repeated that the figures cannot be guaranteed as accurate as there is a disinclination on the part of parents to discuss the deaths of their children.[4]

1933. The same methods as were employed in 1932 have again been adopted this year. . . . It must be remarked once more that too much reliance cannot be placed on the [birth] figures, owing to the disinclination of natives to answer intimate questions about their families and their very vague ideas on the subject of dates. Methods of collecting these statistics vary little from those recorded in last year's report, though it is correct to say that ever increasing use is being made of the services of the native court clerks for this work.[5]

In Lundazi District statistics have now been taken for five years in succession in one group formerly consisting of nineteen villages, which have now become twenty. The system of collecting the information required has been the same each year. Births, and deaths are reported to the Boma as they occur, and at each village also a man keeps a written record of them. At the end of the year these are compared with the Government records. Though they seldom agree, discrepancies can usually be explained and the two records tallied.[6]

1934. Vital Statistics. Figures relating to these are given with the reservation that implicit reliance cannot, as has been remarked in previous reports, be placed upon their accuracy. The reasons remain the same and are probably rendered more cogent by the increasing use of the clerks of native courts in their collection. These men have not yet, generally speaking, adequately realised the need for accuracy in such matters.[7]

The early reports are rather vague as to how the basic data were obtained. The 1929 report states that 'in every district some ten or more villages have been under observation with a view to the collection of statistics regarding the birth rate'. The 1930 report says that 'the method of compiling vital statistics adopted in 1929 was again used during the year'. But the 1931 report relates that 'in order to arrive at the birth rate, statistics are kept in some ten or more villages in each district either by a Headman or Native Authority'. As a matter of fact the native chiefs prior to 1930 had no legal power to collect vital statistics. But the Native

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 13.
[2] Ibid., p. 14.
[3] Ibid. *1932*, p. 15.
[4] Ibid., p. 16.
[5] Ibid. *1933*, p. 17.
[6] Ibid., pp. 17–18.
[7] Ibid. *1934*, p. 13.

Authority Ordinance,[1] which came into force on 1 April 1930,[2] made the following provisions for birth and death registration of natives:

12. Subject to the provisions of any law for the time being in force, a native authority may, subject to the general or special directions of the native authority, if any, to whom it is subordinate, issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the area of its authority for all or any of the following purposes—

(11) requiring the birth or death of any native within the area of its authority to be reported to him or such other person as he may direct.

This Ordinance was repealed in 1936 by 'An Ordinance to prescribe the powers and duties of Native Authorities'[3] which, however, made similar provisions for the birth and death registration of natives:

8. Subject to the provisions of any law for the time being in force, and to the general or special directions of the Governor, a native authority may, subject to the general or special directions of the native authority, if any, to which it is subordinate, issue orders to be obeyed by natives within the local limits of its authority—

(*l*) requiring the birth or death of any native within the local limits of its authority to be reported to it or such other person as it may direct.

The provisions of this Ordinance were not to apply to the Barotse Province, but the 'Barotse Native Authority Ordinance, 1936',[4] issued six months later, made similar provisions for this Province.

These Ordinances apparently did not lead to an expansion of the area covered by vital statistics. In 1929 the records had been kept in 579 villages. In 1930–4 such villages numbered 462, 459, 485, 449, and 411 respectively. They never comprised more than about 3 per cent. of the total population of the Territory. Moreover, from 1935 on, when the yearly 'censuses' of the native population were discontinued, most District Officers were no longer interested in collecting vital statistics. The Provincial Commissioners reported:

1935. [Central Province] No figures of infant mortality were taken except in the Mwinilunga District . . . .[5]

[Southern Province] No statistics have been kept in respect of vital statistics and infant mortality. Actually these were, in my opinion, always of uncertain value, as their accuracy was more than doubtful however carefully they were kept.[6]

[Eastern Province] No details are available from the District Reports and it appears that only in the Lundazi District have certain villages been kept under observation . . . . It is not known to what extent these figures may be regarded as accurate.[7]

[Barotse Province] Vital statistics are no longer collected by District Officers . . . .[8]

1936 [Eastern Province] No vital statistics have been kept . . . .[9]

1937 [Barotse Province] No reliable figures are available.[10]

[1] No. 32 of 1929 (28 Mar.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1929*, pp. 141–50, and in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force 1930*, vol. i, pp. 465–76 (cap. 57).

[2] See Government Notice No. 21 of 1930 (4 Mar.), reprinted in *Government Notices of Northern Rhodesia 1930*, p. 41.

[3] No. 9 of 1936 (16 May), 'Native Authority Ordinance, 1936', reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1936*, pp. 16–27, and in *1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 748–59.

[4] No. 25 of 1936 (9 Nov.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1936*, pp. 77–87, and in *1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 774–84.

[5] *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 15. [6] Ibid., p. 30. [7] Ibid., p. 69.

[8] Ibid., p. 86. [9] Ibid. *1936*, p. 65. [10] Ibid. *1937*, p. 95.

1938 [Barotse Province] The only district which has recorded approximate vital statistics is Kalabo . . . .[1]

All the time maternity and child welfare work had to be carried on without knowledge of the births that occurred. Finally, in December 1938, the Administration introduced a Bill with the purpose of authorizing the Governor to establish compulsory notification of native live- and still-births in certain municipalities and townships. At the Second Reading of the Bill, on 7 December 1938, the Director of Medical Services emphasized 'that this Bill refers to notification and not to registration'.

The essence of the Bill is that the Welfare Sisters, where such Sisters have been appointed, should know promptly that a birth has taken place. It is not intended that the Bill shall operate except where a Welfare Sister is working and has fully established herself in the confidence of the Native people amongst whom she works, and I anticipate that in practice the actual notification will be made verbally to the Welfare Sister herself in what perhaps I might call a friendly manner. Notice may be given in writing, as provided in the Bill, but I am sure that in the great majority of cases it will be verbal notice given to the Welfare Sister herself.[2]

The Bill, in conformity with the English Notification of Births Act, 1907, was to apply to any child born 'whether alive or dead'. But the inclusion of still-births met with strong opposition on the part of the (European) members of the Legislative Council.[3] The 'Member Nominated to represent Native Interests' argued that 'amongst our people certainly the birth of a dead child is taken as legal evidence of adultery'. The Member for the Livingstone and Western Electoral Area seconded by asking: 'Is there not some obligation laid upon us as to legislating in such a way as to not violate the ordinary laws and customs of the natives?' The Senior Provincial Commissioner, who is the Government's principal adviser on native matters, tried to convince the Council that they misjudged the situation.

I think the bill has been explained in a number of cases to natives in compounds who are most likely to be affected, and they have not expressed, as far as I know, any views against the Bill. In fact, in some cases they are pleased it has been introduced, and with that safeguard I don't think we need consider what would be the case in a village. They might in the village have an objection, but in townships where they have already expressed the view that they do like the Bill before it is passed, I don't think we need consider that point.

He also pointed out 'that it is rather important that in the compounds this type of birth should be definitely brought to the notice of the Welfare Nurse'. Finally the Attorney-General warned the Council that if still-births were to be exempted from notification, births of children who died a few hours after birth would likewise not be notified. But all was in vain. The Governor, forgetting that one object of the Bill was to facilitate maternity welfare work, declared: 'Actually, the objects and reasons of the Bill are to safeguard the lives of children born alive.' The Director of Medical Services himself stated: 'I should prefer that the Bill should apply to live children only in the first place, rather than that dead births should be included and offend native opinion.' The Bill, thereupon, was amended

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 89. [2] *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxxi, col. 50.
[3] See Council in Committee, 16 Dec. 1938, ibid., cols. 432–4.

so as to apply only to live-born children. The whole matter in itself is certainly not of great importance. But it illustrates the tendency prevailing among administrators, medical officers, and settlers to suspect an opposition against the ascertainment of facts based on some superstition among the Natives, even if, as was obvious in this case, the Natives affected, i.e. the Natives in municipalities and townships, were perfectly willing to disclose the facts.

The main provisions of the 'Notification of the Births of the Children of Africans Ordinance, 1938'[1] are as follows:

3. The provisions of this Ordinance shall have effect in such Municipalities constituted under the Municipal Corporations Ordinance and in such areas or places declared to be Townships under the Townships Ordinance or Mine Townships under the Mine Townships Ordinance, 1932, as the Governor in Council may, from time to time, declare by notice in the *Gazette*.

4. In the case of every child of an African[2] born in any area to which this Ordinance applies it shall be the duty of the father of the child, if he is actually residing in the house where the birth takes place at the time of its occurrence, and of any person in attendance upon the mother at the time of, or within six hours after, the birth, to give notice of the birth.

5. Notice under this Ordinance may be delivered in writing or given orally to the Medical Practitioner appointed by the Director of Medical Services under the Public Health Ordinance to act as Medical Officer of Health in the area in which the child is born or to any welfare sister appointed for such area and shall be so delivered or given within forty-eight hours of the birth of the child.

6. This Ordinance shall apply to any child of an African which has issued forth alive from its mother after the expiration of the twenty-eighth week of pregnancy.

7. Any person who fails to give notice of a birth in accordance with this Ordinance shall be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding five shillings: Provided that a person shall not be liable to a fine under this section if he satisfies the court that he had reasonable grounds to believe that notice had been duly given by some other person.

This Ordinance came into force on 6 January 1939. But nearly a year passed before any further action was taken. Finally, on 22 December 1939, the following Government Notice[3] was issued:

In pursuance of Section 3 of the Notification of the Births of the Children of Africans Ordinance, the Governor in Council has been pleased to apply the provisions of the said Ordinance to the areas or places set forth in the Schedule hereto with effect from the 1st day of February, 1940.

SCHEDULE

The Livingstone Municipal Area.
Lusaka Township.
Broken Hill Township.
Broken Hill Mine Township.

Similar Government Notices of 11 January and 30 December 1940[4] extended the application of the Ordinance to other townships.

[1] No. 43 of 1938 (24 Dec.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1938*, Part II, pp. 44–5 and in *1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 936.

[2] 'African' means any member of the aboriginal tribes or races of Africa and includes any person having the blood of any such tribe or race and living among and after the manner of any such tribe or race.

[3] No. 214 of 1939, reprinted in *Government Notices 1939*, p. 326.

[4] Nos. 12 and 270 of 1940, reprinted ibid. *1940*, pp. 19, 572.

The Medical Report for 1940 said:

The Notification of Births of Africans Ordinance was applied to a few districts. Figures for a full year are not available but notifications are readily made and the mothers like to have a copy of the notification which is called the child's 'Situpa'.[1]

Another attempt to secure native births and deaths records may perhaps be made before long. On 3 July 1945 the Bishop of Northern Rhodesia said in the Legislative Council:

. . . I find myself in complete agreement with the Director of Medical Services on the great need for vital statistics in this country. We have been presented during the last month or two with the Ten Year Plans of various departments. These have been made without much of the essential knowledge and information which Government should possess. . . . I therefore urge, Sir, that as soon as a statistician is available he should press forward with this very urgent need.[2]

The Director of Medical Services replied on the following day:

I was extremely glad to receive the support of the right reverend the Lord Bishop with regard to the need for vital statistics. That is becoming, I think, one of the gramophone records I turn on once a year, but I am sure it will go some way to satisfy the right reverend the Lord Bishop when I tell him that in 1939 an extremely experienced statistician who has specialised in the initiation of vital record keeping in backward countries was on the point of sailing for this country on a tour organised by this Government, but the shipping facilities were not available, and he did not come. I very much hope he will come as soon as possible, and I know he himself is willing to come.[3]

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration

On 15 July 1905 the High Court of Justice of North-Eastern Rhodesia issued the following Notice:[4]

The Public are reminded[5] that in the case of Births or Deaths of Europeans it is obligatory in the case of

Birth, on the parents, householder or person present at the birth to give or send notice to the Registrar within 42 days of the birth; and in case of

Death, on a relative, person present at the death, or finding or taking charge of the body, to give notice within 14 days.

In either case if the person who gives notice is not the proper person or the particulars given are not sufficient, the Registrar will ask for further particulars which must be given.

This duty is enforceable by law.

The Registrar will in such cases effect this Registration free of charge.

On 1 January 1907 the Administrator, under 'The Licence and Stamp Regulations, 1905',[6] introduced a fee of 2*s*. 6*d*. for the registration of a birth or death.[7]

In 1906 an Administrator's Notice[8] concerning registration of births and deaths of Europeans was published in North-Western Rhodesia. The

[1] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 3. [2] *Debates*, vol. 50, cols. 400–1. [3] Ibid., col. 448.

[4] *North-Eastern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 31 July 1905, p. 152.

[5] The reminder apparently refers to the obligation under English law (37 & 38 V. c. 88, Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1874).

[6] *North-Eastern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 31 May 1905, pp. 127–37.

[7] See 'Notice, The Licence and Stamp Regulations 1905', ibid., 15 Jan. 1907, p. 233.

[8] No. 4 of 1906 (21 Mar.), reprinted in *The Statute Law of North-Western Rhodesia, 1899–1909*, pp. 117–18.

wording was the same as in North-Eastern Rhodesia except for the omission of the last paragraph. A schedule attached to the 'Licenses and Stamp Duties Proclamation 1908'[1] fixed the fees for registering a birth or death at 2*s*. 6*d*.

While apparently no provisions were made in North-Western Rhodesia for the registration of Non-European births or deaths Regulations introducing compulsory registration of the birth of a child 'if either one or both parents are of European, American or Asiatic origin or descent, or, in the case of an illegitimate child not recognized by its father, if the mother is of European or American origin or descent', and 'of the death of any person of European or American or Asiatic race or origin' were passed in North-Eastern Rhodesia in 1908.[2] Birth and death registration of all other persons was to be voluntary, but according to section 20 (3):

> The Administrator may, by Order published in the *Gazette*, extend from a date to be named in the Order, the provisions of these Regulations relating to compulsory registration of births and deaths to all persons in the Territory of any particular race, class, tribe, or other group, or to all or some of the inhabitants of any particular town, district, or other area, and from and after the said date the registration of births and deaths shall, in such cases, be compulsory instead of being optional.

According to these Regulations, which came into force on 1 January 1909,[3] registration was free of charge.[4]

Three years after the amalgamation of the two territories the High Commissioner issued a new Proclamation which began as follows:

> Whereas it is expedient to make provision for the compulsory registration throughout the Territory of Northern Rhodesia (hereinafter referred to as 'the Territory') of the births of children and the deaths of persons of European American or Asiatic descent:
>
> Now Therefore under and by virtue of the powers in me vested I do hereby declare proclaim and make known as follows:
>
> General.
>
> 1. The North-Eastern Rhodesia Births and Deaths Registration Regulations, 1908, the North-Western Rhodesia Government Notice No. 4 of 1906, and such portion of the second Schedule to the North-Western Rhodesia Licenses and Stamp Duties Proclamation No. 34 of 1908 as concerns births and deaths respectively are hereby repealed but without prejudice to anything done thereunder.

The 'Registration of Births and Deaths Proclamation, 1914',[5] which came into force on 1 May 1914, has never been amended, but is now cited as the 'Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance'. In accordance with

[1] No. 34 of 1908 (3 June), Second Schedule, see ibid., p. 156.

[2] Regulations No. 3 of 1908 (31 Aug.), 'The Births and Deaths Registration Regulations, 1908', *North-Eastern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 3 Oct. 1908, pp. 305–7, reprinted in *The Statute Law of North-Eastern Rhodesia 1908–11*, &c., pp. 3–8.

[3] See Administrator's Notice of 12 Dec. 1908, *North-Eastern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 31 Dec. 1908, p. 318.

[4] See also 'Registration (Births and Deaths) Rules' of 30 Sept. 1908, ibid., 3 Oct. 1908, p. 308, and 'Notice, The Licence and Stamp Regulations, 1905' of 12 Dec. 1908, ibid. 31 Dec. 1908, p. 319.

[5] No. 2 of 1914 (13 Mar.), *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 20 Mar. 1914, pp. 17–19, reprinted in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force 1930*, vol. ii, pp. 847–51 (cap. 89).

this Ordinance the Administrator made Rules[1] which were supplemented and amended ten times.[2] These Rules consist of five parts:

(1) *Division of the Territory into Districts.* The Territory is divided for the purposes of the Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance into districts, the names and boundaries of which are identical with those of the administrative districts of the Territory.

(2) *Appointment of Registrars.* All District Commissioners are Registrars of Births and Deaths within their respective districts and all Clerks of the Courts of Resident Magistrates are Registrars of Births and Deaths within the districts in which such courts are situated.

(3) *General Regulations.*

1. Notice of a birth shall be given in accordance with the Form A in the First Schedule hereto and particulars furnished of the matters therein referred to.

2. Notice of a death shall be given in accordance with Form B in the First Schedule hereto and particulars furnished of the matters therein referred to.[3]

3. Any person under obligation to give notice of a birth or of a death to the Registrar of a district may send or hand such notice in the prescribed form or forms, as the case may be, either to such Registrar or to any District Officer of such district for transmission to such Registrar.

4. The onus of proving the sending of any such notice shall be on the person who alleges that he has so sent the same.

5. The Registrar-General shall keep alphabetical registers of births and deaths in accordance with the Forms D and E respectively in the First Schedule hereto.

6. The several fees specified in the Second Schedule hereto shall be payable in respect of the matters therein specified, but the Registrar of any district may in his discretion accept any notice without payment of the prescribed fee.

7. Notice of a birth or death respectively occurring on board ship while within the territorial waters of Lake Tanganyika shall be given to the Registrar of the Abercorn Registration District.

(4) *Schedules.* [See pp. 491–2 below.]

(5) *Fees.* [See also p. 492 below.]

NOTE.—No fees are chargeable for notice of Births if given within 3 months, or for notice of death given within one month.[4]

The main provisions of the Ordinance, ensuring registration of births and deaths of persons of European, American, or Asiatic descent, as they now stand, are as follows:

[1] See Government Notice No. 15 of 1914 (21 Mar.), *Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette*, 20 Mar. 1914, pp. 19–21.

[2] See Government Notice No. 96 of 1928 (23 June), ibid., 6 July 1928, p. 121; Government Notice No. 169 of 1928 (2 Nov.), ibid., 9 Nov. 1928, p. 240; General Notice No. 45 of 1930 (4 Feb.), ibid., 14 Feb. 1930, p. 27; Government Notice No. 52 of 1932 (25 May), Supplement to ibid., 27 May 1932, p. 170; Government Notice No. 62 of 1932 (2 July), Supplement to ibid., 8 July 1932, p. 177; General Notice No. 66 of 1935 (15 Feb.), ibid., 22 Feb. 1935, p. 39; Government Notices Nos. 117 and 118 of 1935 (30 Nov.), Supplement to ibid., 13 Dec. 1935, pp. 156–7; Government Notice No. 237 of 1943 (14 Oct.), Supplement to ibid., 22 Oct. 1943, p. 241; Government Notice No. 215 of 1945 (16 Oct.), Supplement to ibid., 26 Oct. 1945, pp. 245–6. The main rules as they stood after the issue of the Government Notice of 2 July 1932 are reprinted in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force 1934*, vol. iii, pp. 524–8. The amendments of 1935 are reprinted in *1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, p. 1288.

[3] Up to October 1945 Rule 2 read: 'Notice of a death shall be given in accordance with the Forms B and C in the First Schedule hereto, both forms being used and particulars furnished of the matters therein referred to.'

[4] According to the Rules made under Government Notice No. 15 of 1914 a fee of 2*s.* 6*d.* was chargeable in such cases. This fee was abolished by General Notice No. 66 of 1935.

Registration Districts, Registrar-General, District Registrars

3. The Governor may from time to time by notice in the *Gazette*

(1) Divide the Territory into districts for the purposes of this Ordinance or alter such districts;

(2) Appoint some person to be Registrar-General of Births and Deaths for the Territory and also some person to be Registrar of Births and Deaths for each district and may by notice in the *Gazette* declare that the holder of any other office for the time being shall by virtue thereof be Registrar of any district specified in such notice and may revoke any of such appointments.

Birth and Death Registration

5. (1) The registration of the birth of a child[1] born alive and of the death of any person dying[2] after the commencement of this Ordinance shall be compulsory.[3]

In case of a birth (1) the father and the mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred and each person present at the birth and the person having charge of the child shall within three months give notice to the Registrar or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £10 or to imprisonment not exceeding one month or to both fine and imprisonment.

In case of a death (1) every relative present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier and every inmate of the house in which the death occurred, and any person who has buried or caused to be buried the body shall within one calendar month give notice to the Registrar or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £10 or to imprisonment not exceeding one month or to both fine and imprisonment.

Burials

The custodian of any burial place shall furnish to the Registrar returns showing particulars concerning all persons buried in such burial place.

Headings of Registration Forms

Birth (Form A): No.; When Born and Where; Name (if any); Sex; Name and Surname of Father; Name and Maiden Surname of Mother; Rank or Profession of Father; Signature, Description and Residence of Informant; Signature of Registrar.

Death (Form B): No.; Place and Date of Death; Name and Surname; Sex; Age; Rank or Profession; Cause of Death; Signature, Description and Residence of Informant; Signature of Registrar.[4]

[1] 'Child' means a legitimate child whose parents or one of them are of European, American, or Asiatic origin or descent; and an illegitimate child whose mother is of European, American, or Asiatic origin or descent.

[2] 'Person dying' means a person dying who is of European, American, or Asiatic origin or descent.

[3] The Governor may extend the provisions of the Ordinance 'so as to include the births and deaths of all persons in the Territory of any particular race class tribe or other group or of all or some of the inhabitants of any town district or area', but he has never done so.

[4] Up to October 1945 there was still another Form used for every death (Form C): 1. Name of deceased; 2. Occupation; 3. Where born; 4. Age at death—years, months; 5. (*a*) Father's name, (*b*) Mother's name; 6. (*a*) Whether single, married, widower (or widow) or divorced, (*b*) Name of surviving spouse, (*c*) Name or names and approximate date of death of previous spouse or spouses;

The Registrar-General[1] and the District Registrars receive no compensation for their work in this capacity. Registration of births and deaths in due time is free of charge. But fees have to be paid for registration of a birth after three months or of a death after one month (10*s.*), for registration of name subsequent to registration of birth or registration of alteration in name (2*s.* 6*d.*), for inspection of register (2*s.* 6*d.*), for every search of a period of ten years at the office of the Registrar-General or of a Registrar (2*s.* 6*d.*), and for a certified copy of an entry in the Alphabetical Register of Births and Deaths respectively (2*s.* 6*d.*). All fees apparently are to be paid into the Public Treasury. The receipts, including fees in connexion with marriages, amounted in 1935–9 to £136. 5*s.*, £34. 0*s.*, £59. 12*s.*, £88. 0*s.*, and £87. 18*s.* 6*d.* respectively.[2] In 1938, 352 certificates were issued, 6 alterations of names registered, and 4 searches made in the registers.

The Proclamation of 1914, now called the 'Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance', was supplemented by a Schedule on 'Registration of Births of Legitimated Persons' which was attached to the 'Legitimacy Ordinance, 1929',[3] and was identical with the Schedule attached to the English Legitimacy Act, 1926.[4] The Ordinance was amended by the Legitimacy (Amendment) Ordinance, 1930,[5] which added the following clause to the Schedule:

7. If any parent—

(*a*) refuses or neglects to comply with or acts in contravention of any of the provisions of this Schedule or any regulations made thereunder; or

(*b*) being a person required under this Schedule or any regulations made thereunder to make, sign or deliver any document, makes, signs or delivers, or causes to be made, signed or delivered a false document; or

(*c*) refuses to answer, or wilfully gives a false answer to any question necessary for obtaining the information required to be obtained under this Schedule;

such parent shall be guilty of an offence against this Ordinance and shall for each offence be liable to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds.

Although registration of Asiatic births and deaths has been compulsory throughout Northern Rhodesia since 1914, it is doubtful whether such

7. Date of death; 8. At what house or place the death occurred; 9. Names of children of deceased and whether of full age or minors (*State separately those born of different marriages*); 10. Whether deceased left any property, and of what kind; 11. Whether deceased left a will; 12. Cause of death (if known).

[1] See Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 299–300: 'The Registrar has a number of responsibilities. As Master of the High Court he hears sundry applications and as Registrar he hears petitions and applications in bankruptcy. As Sheriff he deals with all civil executions and arranges for the carrying out of death sentences. He also deals with all probate matters and taxation, looks after correspondence and supervises generally. He sits in court when the Sessions are held in Livingstone. Finally he is Registrar of Companies, of Patents and Trade Marks and of Co-operative Societies, and Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages. The list of his duties is imposing, but some of them involve little work.'

[2] See Judicial Department, *Report 1935*, Schedule H; *1936*, Schedule F; *1938*, p. 11; *1939*, p. 10.

[3] No. 40 of 1929 (21 Nov.), 'An Ordinance to amend the law relating to children born out of wedlock', reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1929*, pp. 177–82, and in *Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force 1930*, vol. ii, pp. 869–74 (cap. 103).

[4] 16 & 17 Geo. 5, c. 60.

[5] No. 22 of 1930 (21 Nov.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia 1930*, pp. 155–6, and in *1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 146–7.

events have ever been recorded. The Medical Reports for 1925–7 state that the numbers of births and deaths among Asiatics are unknown.[1]

As to the registration of events among Europeans the Medical Department seems to doubt the completeness of birth registration.[2] Death registration probably is complete, but as no medical certificate of death need be produced to the Registrar before a burial certificate is issued the entries concerning the cause of death are particularly defective. On 4 July 1945 the Director of Medical Services said in the Legislative Council:

> I do not consider that the present state of affairs with regard to the registration of deaths is satisfactory, and to that end, with the assistance of the Registrar-General, a complete re-draft of the Registration of Deaths Ordinance was made as long as 18 months ago, and is ready. The only reason that it has not been introduced is the general agreement that legislation would be restricted as far as possible during the period of the war, but I very much hope it will be introduced at a comparatively early date.[3]

VIII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. A sample study made in 1925 or 1926 by the Department of Native Affairs at seven Government Stations with a view to ascertaining infant mortality showed incidentally that the 387 women questioned had borne 1,045 children and that 48 of the women questioned were 'apparently sterile'.[4] The number of children per woman seems small and the proportion of childless women seems large, but as nothing is said about the ages of the women questioned no conclusions can be drawn from the results of this investigation.

The birth-rate ascertained in selected villages declined from 71 in 1928 to 64 in 1929 and 56 in 1930. The Secretary for Native Affairs thereupon stated that 'there is reason to believe that in many districts births are not reported'.

> I do not think that any importance need be attached to the apparent decrease in the birth rate. One aspect of the question should not be overlooked: natives in settled employment now tend more and more to take their wives with them to centres of employment. No doubt numbers of children are born in locations and other places in the settled areas. These children are not counted in any statistical returns until the parents return to their homes.[5]

In 1931–4 the birth-rate oscillated between 56 and 60. No data are available for later years. A birth-rate of something like 60 is, of course, enormous even in a country with a large excess of women, and it is surprising that the Administration all the time has been afraid that the

[1] See *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 49; *1927*, p. 37. See also *Census Report 1931*, p. 27: 'Births and deaths of Asiatics are so few in number that they are not dealt with in the Registrar-General's Annual Report, and consequently statistics on these points have not been obtained.' Finally, see in this connexion the statement of the Pim Commission concerning the Registrar (quoted p. 492 above, footnote 1): 'The list of his duties is imposing, but some of them involve little work.'

[2] See *Medical Report 1936*, p. 6: 'European births during 1936 (on the assumption that even these are fully and correctly registered) numbered 313 . . . .'

[3] *Debates*, vol. 50, cols. 406–7.

[4] See *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 16.

[5] *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 11.

birth-rate would decline owing to the absence from their villages of so many able-bodied men. In fact, as soon as data were available a comparison was made of the birth-rates in the Provinces from which native labour is mainly drawn with those of the Provinces into which native labour mainly flows. The tables published in this connexion in the Reports upon Native Affairs[1] contain so many arithmetical errors that it would be useless to reproduce them here. The correct results for the two groups of Provinces are as follows:[2]

	1929	*1930*	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*
			Population			
A[1]	30,984	28,569	23,409	23,323	25,221	26,320
B[2]	15,495	17,066	23,905	19,800	18,856	16,448
			Births			
A[1]	1,906	1,561	1,409	1,333	1,370	1,508
B[2]	1,068	993	1,411	1,265	1,141	905
			Birth-rate			
A[1]	62	55	60	57	54	57
B[2]	69	58	59	64	61	55

[1] Labour-supply areas: East Luangwa, Awemba, Tanganyika, Barotse, and Kasempa Provinces.
[2] Pastoral, peasant farmer, and industrial areas: Mweru-Luapula, Kafue, Luangwa, and Batoka Provinces.

It appears that on the whole the birth-rate in the labour-supply Provinces was slightly lower than in the other Provinces, but the basic data are very small and both the population and the birth figures are most uncertain. Some comments on fertility in the Reports upon Native Affairs read as follows:

1928. . . . the District Commissioner of the Tanganyika District states that from 40 to 50 per cent are normally absent. In the Tanganyika District it is further reported that there has been a falling off in the number of births and that there is a greater number of deaths among male children than among female children; but these allegations are by no means conclusive as the Medical Officer, Abercorn reported last year that the physique of natives from that area is improved by good food, regular work, cleanliness, and proper medical attendance while at work; and that he did not consider that their absence affected the birth rate in any way. Most of the labour contracts entered into by Abercorn natives do not exceed six months.[3]

1929. The Provincial Commissioner of the Tanganyika Province stated in his 1928 report that there was a definite falling off in the number of births in his Province, and that more deaths occurred amongst male than among female children. He was requested to take careful notes during 1929 in this connection and his report for this year shows an increase of 309 in the total number of children over last year.[4] He alleges that, while a count of children cannot be accurate, it was found in villages which were checked in both years that there was a falling off in 1929. He gives his

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 9; *1930*, p. 12; *1931*, p. 13; *1932*, p. 15; *1933*, p. 17; *1934*, p. 13.
[2] Computed from ibid. *1929*, p. 36; *1930*, p. 43; *1931*, p. 54; *1932*, p. 50; *1933*, p. 55; *1934*, p. 46.
[3] Ibid. *1928*, pp. 6–7.
[4] The fact that in 1929 43,609 children were returned as against 43,300 in 1928, is, of course, absolutely irrelevant.

TABLE 16. *Recorded Native Births and Infant Deaths, Northern Rhodesia, 1928–34*[1]

Year	Number of villages	Population			Births			Deaths			Birth-rate	Infant mortality rate
		Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Under 1 year	1 year	Under 2 years		
1928	..	13,632	16,825	30,457	1,128	1,044	2,172	467	562	1,029	71	215
1929	579	21,165	25,314	46,479	1,370	1,604	2,974	624	482	1,106	64	210
1930	462	21,675	23,960	45,635	1,281	1,273	2,554	514	354	868	56	201
1931	459	22,101	25,213	47,314	1,378	1,442	2,820	534	417	951	60	189
1932	485	20,846	22,277	43,123	1,304	1,294	2,598	603	396	999	60	232
1933	449	21,246	22,831	44,077	1,210	1,301	2,511	449	248	697	57	179
1934	411	20,584	22,184	42,768	1,194	1,219	2,413	419	285	704	56	174

[1] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, Appendix L; *1929*, pp. 8, 36; *1930*, p. 43; *1931*, p. 54; *1932*, p. 50; *1933*, p. 55; *1934*, p. 46.

opinion that the decrease in the juvenile population in his Province is serious, and is due to the prolonged absence at work of a large proportion of the adult males. His report shows that roughly 44 per cent. of the taxable males of the Province have been away at work during the year . . . .[1]

1930. Reference was made in reports for the years 1928 and 1929 to the possibility of a decrease in population in the Tanganyika Province owing to the absence of an unduly large proportion of the able-bodied males at centres of employment. A comparison of population figures for the Tanganyika Province in this report with similar figures for 1929 reveals the following increase:

	%
Total Population: Increase . . .	2·6
Male Children ,, . . .	5·4
Female Children ,, . . .	6·1

. . . it is safe to draw a general conclusion that the situation in the Tanganyika Province is by no means unsatisfactory, and gives no cause for anxiety.[2]

Effect [of exodus to work] on birth-rate. Careful enquiry in the Senga Country from which emigration to work has been consistent for many years, has resulted in the following conclusions:

(1) A married native almost always chooses as the time for his going to work the period when he first notices his wife's pregnancy. From the point of view of birth-rate, therefore, the absence of the husband for nine or ten months would be immaterial. This applies only to the monogamist however; in the case of the polygamist, the birth-rate may be retarded by prolonged absences.

(2) The classes most affected by the absence of men are the young widows, and girls who have reached puberty. Normally, these should either be inherited as wives, or married by young men reaching maturity. Nowadays, the young men go to work at the time when they used to marry, and the age of marriage of the young girls is later than it used to be. Similarly the young widows may have to wait sometime before re-marriage. Eugenically this may be advantageous, but the birth-rate is probably retarded.

(3) Where morals are lax there is usually an increase in the use of abortifacients. If this becomes common in any tribe the birth-rate will sooner or later be affected.

The above notes refer to one tribe only but contain some information which must be of general application.

. . . It has already been stated that wives often accompany their husbands to work. It is also true that a certain number of unattached women go with their relations to labour centres and there find husbands. The birth-rate in labour centres must compensate to some extent for any reduction which may be experienced in tribal areas. Thus, although the birth-rate in certain observed villages may show a decrease, the number of children in the district may show a steady increase.[3]

1931. Some Provincial Commissioners are inclined to think that the exodus has affected the birth rate, but the population statistics show that the inhabitants of the Territory are steadily increasing and that the birth rate is still satisfactory. It has been observed that where men proceed to work women invariably follow and many unmarried men in industrial areas contract alliances at the place of their employment. It is believed that, so long as no unreasonable restrictions are placed upon the movement of women by Native Authorities, there is no great risk of a decline in the birth rate.[4]

1932. . . . although it is considered that the increase in population during the year is probably greater than appears in the schedule [the census returns] it may be that

[1] *Report upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 8.

[2] Ibid. *1930*, p. 11. It is impossible that the number of children could actually have increased so much in one year.

[3] Ibid., pp. 23–4.

[4] Ibid. *1931*, p. 32.

the people are not increasing as rapidly as formerly owing to the exodus of large numbers of males during the past few years to industrial centres. No reliable evidence however, has yet been produced to prove that the birth rate has materially altered.[1]

1933. In the Abercorn District a lady missionary, who for purposes of her work made a census of two villages, remarked, 'It surprises me there are so few children.'[2]

1934. The Ila tribe in the Southern Province is stated to be gradually decreasing in numbers, an unfortunate state of things the causes of which are said to be sexual promiscuity and venereal disease.[3]

. . . in the Balovale District it [the birth-rate] is only 26·1[4] and in the Chinsali District 29·5.[5] In the former District the prevalence of venereal disease and the wide use of abortifacients by women who are unwilling to put up with the inconvenience of bearing and rearing children are blamed for the low birth rate.[6] No cause is assigned in respect of the Chinsali District.[7]

1935. The District Commissioner, Mkushi, reports an increase in the numbers of children under the age of 3 years, which he attributes to the fact that there have been fewer adult males away from the villages at work during the last three years.[8]

1936. [Southern Province] . . . there is no reason to suppose that there has not been a normal increase, except among the true Baila, who are said to be decreasing, largely owing to venereal disease.[9]

[Eastern Province] No vital statistics have been kept but it may be stated that the population is practically stationary and that this may be accounted for by the large number of absentee males.[10]

[Barotse Province] Attention is again directed to the low birth rate in the Balovale District, which is believed to be the lowest in the Territory, due largely to congenital syphilis.[11]

1937. [Southern Province] Attention is again drawn to the diminishing birth-rate among the Baila. The District Commissioner, Namwala, who has made a careful analysis of the population in certain areas, reports that the number of children per 1,000 women is only 610. This low figure compares with the following ratios from other districts in the Province.

Livingstone	1,558 children per thousand women.
Mazabuka	1,645 children per thousand women.
Mumbwa	1,008 children per thousand women.

In the Mumbwa District there are domiciled a large number of Baila, and the whole tribe of Sala, whose moral habits are not less disgusting. The low proportion of children among the Baila is usually ascribed to the high incidence of venereal infection and the low standard of morality. It has been suggested that this would be an appropriate subject for investigation by the anthropologists attached to the Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.[12]

Owing to the small number of Natives employed outside the Territory and the return to their homes at frequent intervals of those employed locally, the problem of emigrant labour is not a serious one in the Southern Province. The outstanding

[1] Ibid. *1932*, p. 14.

[2] Ibid. *1933*, p. 17. Yet in the Abercorn District the birth-rate in the villages for which it was ascertained averaged 50 in 1929–33 (and was 126 in 1934).

[3] Ibid. *1934*, p. 12.

[4] The average for 1929–34 was 32, i.e. lower than in any other District.

[5] The average for 1929–34 was 43.

[6] As far back as 28 Feb. 1887 the French missionary François Coillard noted: 'A very remarkable fact, which I can only indicate here, is that the Barotsi in general have small families. It is true, though, that the mortality among children is very great.' (*On the Threshold of Central Africa*, p. 284.) Gluckman (1941) states (p. 51) that Adolf Jalla of the Paris Evangelic Mission told him that the Lozi 'say they breed less than the Wiko' who have immigrated since 1919 into Barotseland.

[7] *Report upon Native Affairs 1934*, p. 13. [8] Ibid. *1935*, p. 15. [9] Ibid. *1936*, p. 30.

[10] Ibid., p. 65. [11] Ibid., p. 86. [12] Ibid. *1937*, p. 41.

facts are that the birth rate has not been arrested and the production of produce locally has vastly increased.[1]

[Northern Province] Commenting on population statistics in Luwingu, the District Commissioner writes that:

> 'The Bemba and Mukulu go abroad to earn money and the Bisa and Unga stay at home. Though the exodus to find work is always assumed to be detrimental to the birth rate, it is the two home-staying tribes who give cause for concern. In 5 years the Bemba have increased by approximately 10 per cent., and the Bisa by 7 per cent.'[2]

Statistics given in the Luwingu report indicate that it is debatable whether the population can be said to be decreasing as a result of emigrant labour. Only the minority of men at present remain away for long periods. The District Commissioner, Isoka, observes that, 'judging from the number of adultery cases now persisting, it is doubtful whether immorality could increase to any great extent.'[3]

[Barotse Province] The birth rate is probably unusually low owing to the high incidence of venereal disease.[4]

The exodus to work appears to have little effect on the agricultural needs of the country but it tends to increase prostitution and is liable to weaken the marriage and other family ties and obligations.

To remain faithful for two or more years is more than the average Native woman is capable of and to hide traces of her guilt, abortion is freely practised.[5]

1938. [Southern Province] The birth rate amongst the Baila proper continues to diminish and now becomes approximately 518 children per 1,000 women as against the figure of 610 for last year,[6] a dreadful state of affairs when compared with Livingstone District which shows 1,630 children per 1,000 women which is an increase of 72 per 1,000 over the figure given in the last Annual Report.

The District Commissioner, Namwala, is probably right in his contention that venereal disease is largely responsible, and matters are unlikely to improve under existing conditions. It is thought a matter of great urgency that a careful survey of the position should be made by the Medical Department with a view to ascertaining the real cause of what would appear to be nothing short of race suicide and making efforts to arrest the present state of affairs if possible.[7]

[Northern Province] With regard to the effect on tribal life of the exodus to seek work, this is not great in those districts where the labour goes mainly for short-term contracts. It is, however, more marked in the Mpika and parts of the Kasama Districts, where, it is reported, gradual depopulation is taking place, huts are in disrepair, and there is a decrease in the acreages of land under cultivation. The District Commissioner, Kasama, deplores the fact that the cream of the manhood of the district is usually away at work and remarks: 'The local labour supply is of the poorest.' He goes on to point out that from the population point of view, it must be remembered that Bemba women are as a rule unwilling to bear children at a greater rate than one every two years and that as long as the period of absence does not exceed eighteen months, no great effect of the exodus will be felt.[8]

[1] *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, p. 48. See also ibid. *1938*, p. 37.

[2] Ibid. *1937*, p. 59. See also Richards, *Bemba Marriage*, p. 17: 'To produce and possess children is one of the strongest ambitions of Bemba life.'

[3] *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, pp. 64–5.

[4] Ibid., p. 95. See also ibid., p. 102: 'It is believed that nearly 90 per cent. of the Natives of the Province are infected with some form of venereal disease . . . .'

[5] Ibid., p. 101. For lax morals as a consequence of the exodus, see also ibid. *1934*, p. 28; *1935*, p. 8; *1936*, p. 72; *1938*, pp. 75–76.

[6] The decrease from 610 to 518 children per 1,000 women within a year must, of course, be due to the varying accuracy of the estimates. Even if not a single child had been born in 1938 the ratio could not possibly have fallen as much as that.

[7] Ibid., p. 32.

[8] Ibid., p. 54. See also Richards, *Bemba Marriage*, p. 90: 'After the birth the father must refrain from normal sex intercourse with his wife until the child is weaned, although after some months . . . *coitus interruptus* can be resumed.'

The Pim Commission rightly says that opinions as to the effects of emigration on the birth-rate differ,[1] and that 'whether the increasingly large proportion of the adult males who are normally absent from their villages has affected the population is still uncertain'.[2] It emphasizes, on the other hand, the demographic effect of venereal disease.

Above all syphilis is a scourge, and the proportion of infection is extraordinarily high, especially in particular areas such as Barotseland and the Ila country. The disease is not of recent origin, as Livingstone remarked on its prevalence in Barotseland, but its effects are very serious and among the Ila it is thought to be causing a decrease in the population.[3]

Conditions among the Ba-Ila were discussed in the Legislative Council on 28 and 29 August 1945. I must confine myself to giving a few extracts.

Dr. Fisher (Native Interests): . . . The story about the Ba-Ila being afflicted with venereal disease and that their fertility rate has fallen off has been raised again and again in this House,[4] and we have rather got used to the sound of it, but I am sure when Members of this Council appreciate the seriousness of the situation they will agree with me that the matter calls for immediate action.

The facts are these: In the Namwala District we have a very virile intelligent tribe living under very good conditions of nutrition and so forth, and yet instead of having the usual noisy crowds of children one normally sees in African villages almost all over this Territory their children are so few that they are literally a curiosity. Those who have lived there have told me that friends have walked 20 miles to look at a new-born babe because it is such a curiosity these days.

To get down to actual statistics I am indebted to the Reverend James who conducted a very painstaking survey in that area, in the Ma-Ala District, and I have before me the details village by village giving actual names of households and so forth and the statistics about them. I will give you the details of four of the villages as samples of this area:

Shingwe's Village, 16 families with 23 women; 7 children in all.
Shakalemamushi's Village, 17 families with 21 women; 7 children in all.
Navambwele's Village, 22 men with 32 women; 11 children in all.
Ushamuleti's Village, 17 men with 16 women; 6 children in all.

The total for this area is: 356 men, 446 women, and 236 children of both sexes. The Reverend James took as his criterion of a child anyone who had not yet married or gone to work, so we will admit that there is no faking of figures here, and that the criterion brings in everybody who can be classified as a child. If you look at those figures and remember that approximately half the children are girls it means that there are about a quarter of the number of women maturing as exist to-day.[5] I think you will agree with me that means this tribe faces the prospect of extinction within two or three generations.

Government figures on the census on a larger scale are very little better than this. Taking the larger area, compared with 8,450 adult women there are only 2,728 female children of all ages. That shows that even taking the area as a whole the position is acute in the extreme.[6]

The Bishop of Northern Rhodesia (Native Interests): . . . I have visited the Ba-Ila country, and I do know something about conditions among the Ba-Ila people.

[1] See Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 39. [2] Ibid., p. 7.

[3] Ibid., p. 292. See also Report of Provincial Commissioner for Barotseland, *Native Affairs, Report 1935*, p. 91: 'The commonest disease is syphilis. So long ago as 1875, Serpa Pinto described it as one of the plagues of Barotseland, ascribing its introduction to the slave caravans from the West Coast.'

[4] See, for example, *Debates*, vol. xlvi, cols. 400–1, 427–8, 535; vol. 50, cols. 398, 441–2.

[5] This conclusion, of course, is wrong as adult children of old women are counted as adults.

[6] Ibid., vol. li, cols. 86–7.

In October of last year I spent 10 days travelling through some of the villages of this district, and I can corroborate the evidence which the hon. Mover produced. The position in these villages is indeed most alarming. As you visit village after village, great or small, you find but a handful of children. The schools in those parts have a struggling existence. The normal minimum number of children in any school is 20, but in the Ba-Ila country that regulation has to be waived, because if it was insisted upon it would be impossible to have any school among the Ba-Ila at all. As other speakers have already mentioned this problem is not one which is confined to the Ba-Ila tribe, although it is probably worse there than in any other part of the country, but there is evidence to show that the disease is widespread throughout Northern Rhodesia.[1]

The Acting Director of Medical Services (Dr. Bell): . . . With regard to the situation among the Ba-Ila, I entirely agree with the hon. Mover that the situation there is one of very real gravity. The hon. Mover gave certain figures by which he showed that in that part of the world there is only one child or young adolescent to every four adults. That we must all agree is an exceedingly serious state of affairs, and I can assure the hon. Mover that the urgent need for early action is very fully appreciated by Government.

To deal in rather more detail with venereal disease among the Ba-Ila, the latest medical report I have on the subject was dated December, 1944, and shows that the venereal disease which is far and away the most common among the Ba-Ila is syphilis. The other two common venereal diseases are uncommon there.[2]

Colonel Sir Stewart Gore-Browne (Native Interests): . . . It is no new story, this story of the Ba-Ila. That is what makes me so bitter about it. We talk now as though it were, and as though the present shortage of staff, which the Acting Director of Medical Services has described to us so fully and forcibly, had brought about this state of affairs. It has been known for years and years. In 1938 the elderly peer who came out here as Chairman of the Royal Commission did what was actually I think a disservice to us by overstating the case when, addressing a meeting in Johannesburg, he said he had just come down from Northern Rhodesia where 95 per cent. of the Native population suffered from venereal disease. That sort of statement does no good to anybody, but I am quoting it to show you how well we knew the state of affairs in the old days. . . .

Not long ago I was in a large Ila village, one of the largest I have seen in this country, and my servant, a Wemba, told me he had only counted six children in the whole village: He went on to say that there would have been 60 in a far smaller village in the Wemba country. Of course that kind of guess is no use to anybody, but I would be grateful if the hon. Mover would compare the situation among the Ba-Ila with a tribe that is normal in this respect.[3]

Dr. Fisher: . . . The question of comparable statistics was raised. When I was discussing this Motion early in this month the hon. Chief Secretary mentioned to me that the Angoni were another tribe who were giving reason for concern by their low fertility, and it so happens I have comparable statistics of the Angoni who are admittedly in quite a serious plight themselves. The figures are taken from a very comprehensive census carried out by the then District Commissioner and they show 1·9 children per adult male in an Angoni village. Calculated on that basis the group I considered in my speech would have had instead of 236 children, as they in fact have, 635 children. That is to say the birth rate amongst this tribe which has a very low fertility rate is nearly three times as high as the group of Ba-Ila under consideration. This points very clearly to a serious state of affairs.

If we were to compare them with another tribe like the Lamba for which unfortunately I have not the figures we would find the average to be three to four children per adult. But I have not got definite statistics on that point.[4]

[1] *Debates*, vol. li, col. 141. [2] Ibid., col. 144. [3] Ibid., cols. 151–2.

[4] Ibid., cols. 153–4. It would in fact be difficult to find any tribe in the world where the children are more numerous than the adults.

The birth-rates ascertained in 1928–34 suggest an extraordinarily high fertility, even for Barotseland, though 'it is believed that nearly 90 per cent. of the Natives of the Province are infected with some form of venereal disease'. The area in which birth records were kept was, to be sure, too small to permit the drawing of final conclusions. But there is no evidence that fertility in the Protectorate as a whole is not very high.

General Mortality. The number of deaths has so far not been ascertained in any village of the Protectorate. But there is now a consensus of opinion that the standard of health is low.[1]

> The [Medical] Department has to deal with a country in which the general standard of health is low and a great variety of diseases are found.[2]
>
> Considering now the actual conditions of life in the village, two sinister elements are conspicuous—under-nourishment and disease.[3]
>
> It is only necessary to contrast the condition of the African labour on the Copperbelt and of the Askari on leave from the Forces, with that of the population remaining in rural areas to realise that one of the fundamental needs is for a large increase in the health services available in rural areas.[4]
>
> Government officials have for long been aware in a general way that over considerable parts of the Territory the nutrition of the Native population left something to be desired even at the best and at the worst there have been periods of grave under-nourishment amounting sometimes to actual famine.[5]
>
> At present the native population, in the main, limits its economic activities to the production of sustenance crops, and these within a very narrow range, which at best does not provide a very nutritious diet. Requirements other than food are met by income obtained from the migrant labour army. Far-reaching changes have taken place during the past 30 or 40 years, changes which have deprived the natives of customary and valuable food items. Game is not available as once it was, and tribes that at one time maintained large herds of cattle are no longer able to do so. Tsetse fly and animal disease have destroyed herds over wide areas and have impoverished the natives and contributed to their marked physical deterioration.[6]
>
> There is good evidence to suggest that, even before the primitive economy of Northern Rhodesia was disturbed by the immigrant Europeans, there was recurrent hunger; it is certain that the present disproportion of population in many rural areas has increased it. With only about twenty per cent of the young men under thirty-five to assist them, eighty or so per cent of the rest of the population cannot feed itself as adequately as before . . . .[7]

[1] When the low standard of health was first discovered it seems to have been attributed to the impact of European civilization. See *Report upon Native Affairs 1926*, pp. 38–9:

> 'It has been contended by some observers that when native wars, famine and pestilence reduced the population the physique of the individual native was splendidly developed since the fittest alone survived, and that to-day our efforts directed towards shielding the people from the very consequences which formerly produced a virile stock, from disease, insanitary conditions of life, war and internal strife are having the effect of lowering the general standard of bodily fitness and powers of resistance to disease.
>
> 'The peace which has been enforced upon the people for a generation must without doubt have preserved the lives of a vast number of weaklings, and the usual prophylactic measures against small-pox and sleeping sickness those of many more, but apart from this no one could seriously maintain that the work as yet done either by Government or by the few Missionary Societies who include qualified Medical men on their Staffs can have had any very serious effect whether for good or ill upon the general health and physique of the widely scattered native population.'

[2] Pim Commission, *Report*, pp. 291–2. See also Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 167.

[3] Orde Browne, p. 6.

[4] *Memorandum on Post War Development* (1945), p. 7.

[5] *Report of the Committee appointed to make a Survey of the Position of Nutrition in Northern Rhodesia*, p. 1.

[6] 'Note by Mr. W. H. Mainwaring', Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 255.

[7] Wilson, Part I, p. 51.

1941. There was food shortage in several areas, more severe than the 'hunger period' which occurs every year in most areas.[1]

Complaints about housing conditions, especially for labourers employed by Europeans, have likewise been frequent in recent years.

1940. The housing in Mine locations is for the most part good, though there is room for improvement in some directions, and on some mines improvements are being made as new locations are being constructed. A new and improved location is being built at Nkana Copper Mine. At the Broken Hill Mine some 2,700 mine employees with their families are housed on five acre residential plots which, though in many respects admirable, leave much to be desired in the standard of housing and sanitation. The Management has been approached with a view to the necessary improvements being effected without undue delay.

Housing in Government and Local Authority locations is fair on the whole and is improving. . . .

Some of the worst Native housing in the Territory is that provided by the Rhodesia Railways for their employees and strong representations have been made to the Management to improve conditions in this respect without delay.

On the farms the housing is for the most part rudimentary and Native agricultural labourers usually erect their own quarters in the traditional Native style, though some farmers provide good brick locations. The housing of labourers on farms presents special problems which can only be tackled gradually during inspections.[2]

1941. Much more urgent than the provision of increased welfare and recreational facilities is the provision of more and better Native housing for Native workers everywhere and there is here important development overdue. Unfortunately, Native housing programmes have been held up owing to the difficulty of obtaining the necessary building materials in war time but in spite of the difficulties much can be done to improve existing conditions if serious efforts are made.

In the Copperbelt mining locations there was a steady advance in the standard and number of houses provided during the year though at most mines the housing is still inadequate. This is in part due to increasing labour strengths and to the increasing proportion of married to single men.

At the Broken Hill mine the housing position still remains most unsatisfactory in spite of the exertion of continued pressure. A programme of improvement was however approved during the year and it is hoped that there will be no undue delay in carrying it out.

The bad Native housing provided by the Rhodesia Railways was referred to in my report for the year 1940. The necessity for drastic improvement was brought to the notice of the Company by the Government and although little progress was made during the year action in the desired direction is being taken and it is hoped that it will be possible to report results shortly.

As mentioned the slowness of the improvement in housing conditions is partly due to war conditions and this applies equally to Native housing provided by the Government and by local authorities which is still far short of requirements. Unless the position is watched carefully slums will become established in the neighbourhood of urban areas. Housing in contractors' compounds has improved but there is room for much further improvement and pressure in that direction is being maintained.

Housing on farms remains rudimentary for the most part . . . .[3]

There is a large amount of bad and indifferent housing of Europeans in Northern Rhodesia and an overwhelming amount of shocking housing of Africans. The Labour Department has co-operated cordially with the Health Department in an attempt to improve conditions and some progress has been made. Under extreme pressure, Rhodesia Railways have now made financial provision for extensive

[1] *Medical Report 1941*, p. 1.
[2] Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 3.
[3] Ibid. *1941*, pp. 2–3.

improvements but war-time difficulties about materials are stated to be hindering the work. Experience shows that the pressure must be maintained.[1] At Broken Hill mine, complete lack of provision by the employer of any form of housing for over 1,000 employees has been the difficulty rather than bad existing housing. The Directors of the Company have carried through part of a building programme and have agreed to do more but what has been done and what is planned, together come very far short of meeting the urgent, present need and here again, it has been necessary to ask Government to exert and to maintain great pressure upon the Company's directorate.[2]

1942. At Broken Hill Mine many single quarters were built during the year, and a start was made with the provision of round huts on the farm plots. As a result of steady pressure by Government, a building scheme has been arranged for the year 1943 which should result in all Native employees being reasonably housed.

. . . There appears to be an unfortunate tendency for the standard of housing on some of the [copper] mines to fall rather than rise, and it was regrettable to notice that one-roomed houses were, in some instances, being built for married people. . . .

There was some improvement in the contractors' compounds and the powers to condemn unsuitable housing were freely used.

The poor housing provided by the Rhodesia Railways for their Native servants was the subject of much correspondence[3] and discussion, but very little progress can be recorded, although there is reason to believe that the position will have improved considerably by the end of the year 1943. Orders have been made condemning some

[1] On 12 Dec. 1941 the Director of Medical Services said in the Legislative Council:

'I have been as severe a critic of certain Government housing as anybody has been, but I have never found it necessary to have words for Government housing which I should use, and which I have used, with regard to a large amount of the Railway Company's housing of its African employees.' (*Debates*, vol. xli, col. 233.)

'It may be of some interest and perhaps of some importance, Sir, for me to give this Council a clear idea of the way in which the housing of which hard things have been said offends. There are certain things which are called "A-" houses. In my own department it is customary to refer to them as the "dog-kennel" type. They consist of two, or may be three or four sheets of corrugated iron put at an angle like the letter "A", they are many of them whose height from the ground is about 4 feet. They have mud floors, they have the ends closed by such things as pieces of petrol tin, corrugated iron, or something else that may be available. These things are used all over East Africa as temporary housing for gangs that are moving from here to there, and there is some justification for using them in that way. I suppose they were described as temporary when they were first put up in this country, but they have certainly become permanent. These things were in use, and some are still in use, in the possession of this Government, and I am glad to be able to say that the money to replace these by proper housing has been voted and a beginning is being made, and it is worthwhile adding that it was only when I felt assured that that step had been taken by Government that I began to put pressure on others to get rid of these things. No one could defend such things as suitable housing for any living thing. They are intolerably hot in the hot season and abominably cold in the winter.

'There are also other types of huts. There is a square hut with iron sides, and an iron roof. It is all iron. It is equally intolerably hot in the hot season and equally intolerably cold in the winter, and like its friend the "dog-kennel" type it actually offends against the law which says that walls of plain iron or iron with matchwood lining will not be approved.

'In nearly all the compounds, alongside these things, there will be found ramshackle huts, some of grass, mud and wattle, petrol tin, biscuit box, any old thing, and they spring up like mushrooms in the night. . . .

'I would sum up by saying that there is grossly insanitary housing of Natives in the Railway Company's compounds, that this has existed for a long time, that consistent pressure has been maintained upon the Company to improve their conditions for a long time past, and that the Local Authorities concerned should in my opinion now take the legal action which is open to them under the law.' (Ibid., cols. 234–6.)

[2] *Medical Report 1941*, pp. 2–3.

[3] See, for example, 'Written Reply of General Manager of Rhodesia Railways', *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xliii, cols. 81–6.

of the worst housing and requiring its destruction. The Kitwe and Luanshya Compounds will be destroyed early in 1943 and the Railway Company is being prosecuted for failing to provide proper housing at Mufulira.[1] Building in the Livingstone Railway Compound is proceeding very slowly.

A few good new married quarters were built in the Zambesi Saw Mills Compound at Livingstone, but the rebuilding programme there is progressing far too slowly and there are still many insanitary hovels.

New types of houses designed for Native employees of Government have proved popular but there is still much leeway to be made up before all Government Native employees are properly housed.

The Native housing in town compounds has shown some improvement, but nearly everywhere considerable building programmes are urgently necessary.[2]

1943. If Government expects private employers to provide adequate and improved housing we must lead the way ourselves. . . .[3]

The inadequacy of the medical services, which apparently was not fully realized in the 1920s, has attracted a great deal of attention in recent years.

1928. It is impossible to over-estimate the value of the medical work done for the natives by various Missionary Societies.[4]

1930. Valuable work is being done for the natives by qualified medical officers

[1] On 2 Dec. 1942 the Director of Medical Services, Dr. Haslam, said in the Legislative Council:

'. . . with regard to the housing of African employees I am advocating no counsel of perfection, no Utopian state of affairs, no homes fit for heroes to live in. What I am asking for is only decency, protection from the weather, sufficiency of light and air, reasonable sanitary arrangements and the opportunity to wash. All of these are lacking in a great proportion of the housing provided by the Railway Company for its African employees. . . . At Luanshya and Mufulira the houses are a collection of miserable, ill-conceived, ill-constructed, ill-maintained hovels. They are the sort of agglomeration to which, were they in a Native village, a vigorous minded District Officer would set a match and seek the degradation of the chief and headman. The quarters at Nkana though perhaps more modern in that they are made of iron are hardly less abominable. Those at Lusaka, they are well hidden behind a euphorbia hedge, are little better. Those at Kafue, hidden in the bush, are nearly as bad as any. Taking at random 8 gangers compounds, Nos. 169–176 inclusive, what do we find there? They are all overcrowded, they have no washing facilities, in not one of them are there any latrines, in none of them is there any window in a hut and there is obviously no provision for married couples. Such accommodation is supplemented by the boys with tumble-down structures of their own building and so on. Many of the huts built by the Company are not more than 5 feet in height, some less.

'. . . I usually prefer persuasion to prosecution, but my own enquiries and my own experience have convinced me that there is lacking the will to improve conditions and there is lacking also that interest in the conditions which might perhaps inspire the will. I wish to be fair but when one finds that at the onset of the rains they have done nothing to give some of their employees protection from the weather although that could be done at trifling cost, one is then driven to the damning conclusion that both the interest and the will are lacking. God knows, Sir, that the stipulations of the law regarding temporary buildings are lenient enough. The Director of Public Works has provided housing for hundreds of temporary employees working on the building of evacuee camps. This housing was all constructed of local materials and at very small cost. These houses are to those of Mufulira and Luanshya compounds as those of Carlton House Terrace to those of Commercial Road East. I have, therefore, changed my attitude and, as a start, as Your Excellency knows, I have issued an order under the Employment of Natives Regulations on the Manager of the Railway Company prohibiting the habitation of the Nkana compound after December 31st. I have also invited the District Commissioner, Mufulira, forthwith to prosecute the Railway Company and I was able to send him a nice selection of alternative charges and to remind him that under Section 65 of the Public Health Ordinance the obligation rests upon him to take legal steps against any person responsible for the continuation of a nuisance.' (*Debates*, vol. xliv, cols. 125–7.)

[2] Labour Department, *Report 1942*, p. 2.

[3] Ibid. *1943*, p. 3.

[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, p. 21.

and qualified Mission doctors, and dispensaries, wherever they exist, are largely patronized and thoroughly appreciated.

At present, however, only the fringe of medical work for natives is being touched.[1]

1931. There are, of course, large areas which are never visited by Government Medical Officers or Medical Missionaries . . . .[2]

The Medical Report for 1936 stated:

The European population may be said to have been adequately provided with medical attention . . . . Of the medical care of the native population one can write with less satisfaction. With only twelve medical officers' stations in an area bigger than Kenya (bigger indeed than France) and 10 of these sited primarily in European interests, there are inevitably very large numbers of natives, and some very considerable aggregations of them, totally out of reach of medical aid,[3] and this situation is not very greatly relieved by the maintenance of 23 rural dispensaries staffed by very imperfectly trained native assistants.[4] Some relief is provided by various missions doing medical work (about 3 have doctors) which are subsidised by Government to a total of £3,050 and without which medical provision for natives would be even poorer.[5]

The Pim Commission's report was likewise most unfavourable as regards medical services.

In the year 1912–3 there was a medical staff of 15 . . . . Between that time and 1921–2 the number of the staff fluctuated between 14 and 17. . . .[6]

No change worthy of note appears to have taken place between 1921–2 and 1931, and the medical service as organized and conducted under the Chartered Company and for sometime after the Imperial Government assumed control has been aptly described by the Chief Medical Adviser to the Secretary of State as a 'garrison service'. In 1931 the sanitation side of the Department was created by the appointment of a Deputy Director mainly concerned with health work, two Health Officers and three Health Inspectors. The depression of two years later caused the abolition of the post of Deputy Director on the transfer of its holder, and two Health Officers and one Medical Officer were retrenched.[7] The whole Department has been described as doing little more than tick over until 1937 when some increases of staff and activity became possible.[8]

The Medical Officers at nine of the 12 stations find themselves so tied by the claims of the European population that they rarely get out among the natives of the districts, so that only those employed in and around the European townships obtain

[1] Ibid. *1930*, p. 26.

[2] Ibid. *1931*, p. 32.

[3] See also the statement of the Director of Medical Services in the Legislative Council, 15 Dec. 1938: 'A little while back a former Chief Secretary complained to me that there was a station which had not been visited by a medical officer for, I think, five years. I told him of the time when a medical officer recently visited certain areas and found he was the first doctor since David Livingstone.' (*Debates*, vol. xxxi, col. 373.)

[4] See also in this connexion *Memorandum on Post-War Development Planning in Northern Rhodesia* (1945), p. 7: 'The Director of Medical Services estimates that if the needs of the rural community are to be fully met somewhere about 2,000 rural dispensaries (1,600 rural village dispensaries and 400 larger dispensaries with some in-patient accommodation sited near central village schools) will be required, in order that curative treatment for such debilitating diseases as venereal disease, ankylostomiasis, bilharzia and other worms and malaria may be made available to the population within reasonable distance of their homes'.

[5] *Medical Report 1936*, p. 1. But see also *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 65 (Eastern Province): '. . . it must be reported with regret that the medical work of some of the missions has deteriorated considerably and it is incumbent upon Government to make good these deficiencies.'

[6] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 288.

[7] See also ibid., p. 291: '. . . the embryo public health service started in 1931 had to be reduced in 1933.'

[8] Ibid., p. 289.

medical attention.[1] . . . In the whole vast area west of the railway line there are two Government doctors and one medical missionary.[2]

Moreover of the 12 Government hospitals for Natives, only two, those of Ndola and Livingstone, are good, while three, at Fort Rosebery, Mongu and Balovale, are primitive, especially as regards the operating theatre, but fairly adequate.

Of the remaining seven, five are bad.[3] Choma was not visited. The position at Broken Hill is unusual. . . . By far the greater part of the staff's activities is devoted to the care of the mining company's employees . . . . The hospitals, both European and Native, are in buildings belonging to the mining company, which are now unsatisfactory.[4]

[1] See also Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 92: 'In Northern Rhodesia, as in Southern Rhodesia, the provision of medical services for natives was in the past limited for the most part to the areas of European settlement.' See finally the memorandum of the Principal Medical Officer of 29 Apr. 1930: 'The demands of a rapidly increasing European population on the limited number of Medical Officers available in the territory, the advent of the motor-car, and the necessity for adopting the quickest method of transport in order to meet the altered conditions, have lessened the opportunities of the few available District Medical Officers visiting villages and learning the needs of the native people from headmen and chiefs.' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 100–1.)

[2] See also, for example, the 1937 report of the Commissioner of the Eastern Province (250,000 native inhabitants): 'With only one Medical Officer in the Province extensive touring is not possible' (*Native Affairs, Report 1937*, p. 81). Yet, when on 1 June 1943 the Member for the North-Eastern Electoral Area complained in the Legislative Council that 'there is only one Medical Officer stationed in the whole Province by the Government' (*Debates*, vol. xlv, col. 257), the Director of Medical Services replied the following day (ibid., cols. 266–7): 'A good deal was said, Sir, about the iniquity of there being only one Medical Officer at present in the Eastern Province, and some contempt was poured on the statement in the reply to the question that it was anticipated that a Medical Officer would be available within the next few months. The Hon. Member knows as well as I do that the reason for the shortage of Medical Officers in the Territory at the moment is simply and solely because not less than nine out of 24 have been released for military service. We cannot help the war, Sir, it is there, and we said at one time in this Council that our main object was to win the war and to put our full weight into it. We tried to do that by releasing these Medical Officers and it is unnecessary and unfair of the Hon. Member to use their absence on military service as a whip with which to castigate the Government.'

[3] See also in this connexion *Medical Report 1936*, p. 12: 'The native hospital at Abercorn still remains housed in a building condemned as a gaol 7 years ago; that at Fort Jameson is semi-ruinous and urgently requires replacement. That at Lusaka is old, dark and unsuitable in many ways; its water supply by pump from a well is precarious and its situation is most inconvenient to most patients and the staff.' The hospitals at Abercorn and Fort Jameson were replaced in 1939 (see ibid. *1939*, p. 9), but the hospital at Fort Jameson with accommodation for 35 beds proved to be far too small (see *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. li, cols. 202–3, 238). As to the construction of a new native hospital in Lusaka, I shall quote a few statements made in the Legislative Council:

16 Apr. 1928. Governor's Address: 'At Lusaka the existing native hospital is unsatisfactory and is badly sited in relation to the European hospital and provision is being made for a new hospital on another site' (*Debates*, vol. viii, col. 9).

14 Nov. 1929. The Chief Secretary: 'The building of a native hospital at Lusaka has now been placed on the Schedule of the Loan Programme and it is hoped the construction will commence during the next financial year' (ibid., vol. x, col. 58).

5 Dec. 1935. The Director of Medical Services: 'I do not want it to be thought that I am trying to . . . say that the native hospital at Lusaka is a good one. As you know, Sir, I have resisted any considerable expenditure on that hospital. It has been improved somewhat by taking advantage of the vacation of the old European wards, but I have resisted any considerable expenditure on the old hospital because we are planning to have a new one. The site, as you know, has been actually selected and the plans are in course of preparation, and we are going on with it.' (Ibid., vol. xxv, col. 375.)

15 Dec. 1938. The Director of Medical Services: 'The new native hospital will not be completed for approximately twelve months . . .' (ibid., vol. xxxi, cols. 416–17).

20 Nov. 1940. The Governor: 'The new Hospital in Lusaka . . . was opened this year (ibid., vol. xxxviii, cols. 14–15).

[4] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, pp. 290–1. The Administration proposed to make

The public health service is very inadequate and practically no maternity or child welfare work has been done, except in a few urban areas including the mines and in the neighbourhood of some mission schools . . . .[1]

During the second World War the public health service became still more inadequate.

Throughout 1941 the Department has worked with a heavily depleted staff, over 33 per cent. of the medical officers and also the Deputy Director, having been released for military service.[2]

In his most instructive Report on Health Services Development Plans, 1945–55, the Director of Medical Services said:

The Health Department has not and never has had an efficient hygiene and sanitation branch, and I do not wish to see this important preventive part of my Department's work continue to be neglected, or to see it confined to a few special centres. The whole Territory needs it. Staff additions and new buildings are most urgently required if *existing* work is to be efficient and to cope with the annual increase of demands upon the *existing* organisation. None could suggest that a Medical Officer can give full value to Government or to his patients in the squalid places called hospitals now to be found at Balovale, Fort Rosebery, Mongu, Choma, Broken Hill and Mazabuka.[3]

Infant Mortality. The Medical Report for 1925 and 1926 contained figures from seven Government Stations provided by the Department of Native Affairs. It appears that of 1,045 children born to 387 women 452 or 43 per cent. had died.

[The figures] should be taken as only roughly indicative of and lower than the rate throughout the Territory. They are influenced in this comparison by the following considerations, viz., better sanitary conditions, including precautions to prevent the fouling of water used for domestic purposes, better housing, regular food supplies. The conditions arising from famine can be eliminated, and there is provision of medical treatment of some sort.

It is assumed that these figures refer only to infants under one year of age.

Of these stations all except Feira are in cattle country, where cows milk is available if required. They are also exceptional in that the water supply is in all cases derived from the Zambesi or its tributaries, and is therefore less likely than the usual shallow well or waterhole or swamp to be a source of water-borne disease.

It is generally thought, though it is difficult to get evidence in support, that the infantile mortality throughout the Territory is considerably higher than these figures would indicate. It has been estimated as high as 700 per 1,000.[4]

provision for a new European hospital at Broken Hill in the draft Estimates for 1941 (see *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxxvi, June 1940, col. 137; see also ibid., vol. xxxi, Dec. 1938, cols. 362, 375–6), but the Governor, in his Address to the Legislative Council, on 30 Nov. 1940, stated: 'Proposals for a new European and Native Hospital at Broken Hill have been under consideration, but we cannot proceed with the scheme in 1941 owing to the demands it would make on staff and material' (ibid., vol. xxxviii, col. 15; see also ibid., cols. 262–3, 290–1). The position was still the same four years later (see ibid., vol. xlviii, cols. 293–4). However, the Bledisloe Commission, which visited Broken Hill in July 1938, stated: 'Conspicuously efficient and well-equipped medical, hospital and welfare services are provided by the mining companies for their employees at Luanshya, Nkana, Mufulira and Broken Hill . . .' (*Report*, p. 93).

[1] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 294.

[2] *Medical Report 1941*, p. 1. See also ibid. *1942*, p. 1.

[3] *Health Services Development Plans 1945–55*, p. 6.

[4] See also *Report of East Africa Commission (1925)*, p. 97: 'The native population would seem to be increasing, in spite of the widespread incidence of disease and the very high rate of infant mortality, which we were informed amounts in many districts to 75 per cent., due largely to ignorance and superstition.'

No reliable information is available as to the causes of this mortality. It may, however, be taken that in the majority of cases diarrhœa and enteritis are the most prominent symptoms. This is far from surprising, owing to the conditions of life and diet which obtain, but as malarial infection is one of the earliest acquisitions of every native infant, and is untreated, it is evident that whatever other diseased condition may be superadded this must prove a very important factor in mortality, and it is difficult to conceive of any very substantial improvement in this respect until means are available for either the limitation of this infection or for its treatment.[1]

The 1927 Medical Report stated that 'no further statistics on the subject of native infantile mortality have been available since those included in the Report for 1925–26'.[2] But from 1928 to 1934 the Reports upon Native Affairs contained figures of infant deaths for the same selected villages from which birth figures were collected. It appears that the infant mortality rate in those seven years was 215, 210, 201, 189, 232, 179, and 174 respectively, while the ratio of deaths under 2 years to 1,000 births was 474, 372, 340, 337, 385, 278, and 292 respectively.[3] Some comments in the Reports upon Native Affairs read as follows:

1928. Some persons with a sound knowledge of natives give it as their opinion that the dangerous age is after and not before weaning: it will be noted that the figures in the schedule are higher for the later than for the earlier period. This is said to be due to the difficulty of assimilating the foodstuffs of the country, which are unsuitable for young children.[4]

1929. It is . . . probably safe to say that the infant mortality rate is lower than it was commonly supposed to be.[5]

1930. . . . it is perhaps more probable that native mothers would fail to report deaths than they would fail to report births. Such other evidence as is available, however, does point to the fact that the infant mortality rate is decreasing.[6]

The infant mortality rate is steadily decreasing and will continue to decrease as education in hygiene and medical services in tribal areas are developed.[7]

1931. The death rate is heavier during the first year of life than the second (18·9 per cent. as against 14·8 per cent.), and natives say that if a child passes safely through its first two years it usually survives to adolescence.[8]

1935. [Barotse Province] For the last year in which data on this subject was collated [1934], the infant mortality for the whole Province was 39 per thousand.[9] The principal causes are malnutrition and congenital syphilis. Epidemics of measles and influenza have accentuated infant mortality which in the past year has been appreciably higher than in the previous year.[10]

[1] *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, pp. 16–17.

[2] Ibid. *1927*, p. 12.

[3] Computed from *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, Appendix L; *1929*, p. 36; *1930*, p. 43; *1931*, p. 54; *1932*, p. 50; *1933*, p. 55; *1934*, p. 46. *Blue Books 1928–34*, Section O, p. 3, give as 'death rate amongst infants' for 1928–33 40–50, 38, 20, 20, 23·29, and 27·75 per cent. respectively, and for 1934 as 'percentage of deaths to births for infants under two years' 11·8. Obviously the rates for 1928, 1929, and 1933 refer to deaths under two years, the rates for 1930, 1931, and 1932 to deaths under one year, and the rate for 1934 to deaths between one and two years!

[4] *Report upon Native Affairs 1928*, p. 8. It seems, however, that in 1928 many deaths of children over 2 years were erroneously included among the deaths of children between the ages of 1 and 2 years.

[5] Ibid. *1929*, p. 9. See also *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 98, 102–3.

[6] *Report upon Native Affairs 1930*, p. 12.

[7] Ibid., p. 24.

[8] Ibid. *1931*, p. 14; see also ibid. *1932*, p. 16.

[9] Should read '39 per cent' and refers to deaths under 2 years.

[10] Ibid. *1935*, p. 86.

1938. [Barotse Province] The only district which has recorded approximate vital statistics is Kalabo, and there it would appear that the birth rate is about 200 per thousand adult women, and that infant mortality is about 22 per cent. of children under one year and 56 per cent. of children between one and three years. It is thought that these figures do not include children who die at birth.[1]

Godfrey Wilson, in his otherwise very instructive study, says: 'In Northern Rhodesia the infant mortality rate among Africans is at least 50%.'[2] But it is hardly an exaggeration to say that nothing is known concerning infant mortality in Northern Rhodesia.[3]

Adult Mortality. The only important group of adult Natives for whom death figures are available are the labourers at the mines. 'The period of construction was marked by a high rate of sickness and mortality.'[4] But in some recent years mortality was extraordinarily low. The Director of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Sir Malcolm Watson, after having shown the decrease in the death-rate of the European employees states:[5]

The death-rate of African employees has improved in a no less remarkable manner. The Roan Antelope mine provides the most complete figures, for Mufulira was shut down in the slump.

Death-rate per 1,000 from all causes, including Accidents

1930	*1931*	*1932*	*1934*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*
34·6	18·8	9·9	15·6	5·9	8·7	6·6

Remarkable figures when we remember that the African generally lives in an insanitary village, on a diet defective only too often in quantity and quality, and when he arrives on the mines his health is much below par, as a year's care and good feeding on the mines demonstrates. Maternity work and child welfare are well organized and appreciated more and more by the Africans—a great advance.

It should be noted, however, that conditions at Roan Antelope mine are not typical.[6] Mortality there was much higher than in other mines in 1928–30 and has been much lower than in other mines in all subsequent years. The improvement achieved in the copperbelt was great, but it was not so spectacular as the figures for Roan Antelope mine indicate.

To what extent the decrease in mortality was due to a reduction in the incidence of malaria it is impossible to tell, because no data on morbidity

[1] Ibid. *1938*, p. 89. It is, of course, out of the question that the mortality rate of the children between 1 and 3 years should actually have been 56 per cent.

[2] *Essay on Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia*, Part I (1941), p. 50.

[3] This is true not only of the amount but also of the causes of infant mortality. As shown above, the Principal Medical Officer, in his report for 1925 and 1926, suggested that malaria, diarrhoea, and enteritis were the main causes. His successor, in a memorandum of 29 Apr. 1930, said: 'I estimate the causes of the infantile mortality rate in the following order:—1. Chest complaints. 2. Malaria and complications. 3. Improper feeding and bowel complaints. 4. Venereal disease.' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 99.) For Barotse Province the principal causes were stated to be malnutrition and congenital syphilis (see p. 508 above).

[4] Hailey, *An African Survey*, p. 675.

[5] Watson, 'A Conquest of Disease, Hygiene in North Rhodesia', *The Times*, 10 Feb. 1940.

[6] The Roan Antelope Copper Mines Ltd. was formed in 1927 with a preponderance of American capital; see Davis, p. 142.

TABLE 17. *Mortality of Native Mining Employees, Northern Rhodesia, 1925–39*[1]

Mines	*1925*	*1926*	*1927*	*1928*	*1929*	*1930*	*1931*	*1932*	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*	*1939*
							Average Number of Employees								
Roan Antelope	—	—	1,448	2,460	4,859	5,563	5,823	2,317	3,147	4,763	4,515	4,456	6,743	7,644	6,870
Other . .	4,935	4,502	6,045	6,166	7,282	16,684	12,384	4,612	5,847	10,594	11,450	10,094	14,797	16,957	17,556
Total . .	4,935	4,502	7,493	8,626	12,141	22,247	18,207	6,929	8,994	15,357	15,965	14,550	21,540	24,601	24,426
							Deaths								
Roan Antelope	—	—	55	56	86	165	99	22	30	72	34	26	55	46	32
Other . .	77	58	100	113	84	386	350	59	84	205	127	69	163	185	122
Total . .	77	58	155	169	170	551	449	81	114	277	161	95	218	231	154
							Death-Rate								
Roan Antelope	—	—	38·0	22·8	17·7	29·7	17·0	9·5	9·5	15·1	7·5	5·8	8·2	6·0	4·7
Other . .	15·6	12·9	16·5	18·3	11·5	23·1	28·3	12·8	14·4	19·4	11·1	6·8	11·0	10·9	6·9
Total . .	15·6	12·9	20·7	19·6	14·0	24·8	24·7	11·7	12·7	18·0	10·1	6·5	10·1	9·4	6·3

[1] Computed from *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, pp. 30–1; *1927*, pp. 18–19; *1928*, pp. 26–8; *1929*, pp. 22–6; *1930*, pp. 23–8; *1931*, pp. 78–83; *1932*, pp. 36–40; *1933*, pp. 35–8; *1934*, pp. 37–40; *1935*, pp. 41–4; *1936*, pp. 16–17; *1937*, p. 28; *1938*, p. 29; *1939*, pp. 14–15. The data in the *Medical Reports* do not cover all mines. According to Mines Department, *Report 1927*, p. 6, and *Reports upon Native Affairs 1929*, p. 20, *1930*, p. 27, *1934*, pp. 27, 31, the death-rate on all mines in 1927 and 1929–34 was 18·1, 15·4, 21·1, 24·7, 12·1, 11·8, and 16·2 respectively. Davis, p. 66, gives as death-rates on the Roan Antelope Mine in 1928–31, 25·97, 28·05, 31·8, and 17 respectively.

seem to have been published since 1935 and because the diagnoses were apparently defective in the early years.

Mine	Disease	Cases of Sickness									
		1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935
Broken Hill . .	Malaria	—	1	—	—	37	15	2	11	102	271
	Influenza	245	481	530	435	274	154	36	67	133	72
Bwana Mkubwa[1] .	Malaria	306	381	437	541	192	53	13	..	..	..
	Influenza	—	147	106	229	257	19	—	..	..	..
Roan Antelope .	Malaria	..	142	144	74	18	13	30	45	42	50
	Influenza	..	—	—	1	153	312	79	61	313	107
Nchanga[1]. . .	Malaria	..	30	1	2	7	3	..	..	..	..
	Influenza	..	26	76	23	130	56	..	..	..	..
Nkana . . .	Malaria	..	..	92	148	173	108	45	44	26	55
	Influenza	..	..	78	75	154	255	112	141	339	97
Mufulira . . .	Malaria	..	..	..	..	248	68	7	15	140	85
	Influenza	..	..	..	..	77	144	—	4	169	186

[1] The Bwana Mkubwa Company, the Rhodesian Congo Border Concession, and the Nchanga Copper Mines were amalgamated in 1931 under the title of Rhokana Corporation; see Davis, p. 143.

The Medical Reports commented upon these puzzling returns as follows:

1927. The comparison between the sickness incidence from Malaria at Broken Hill and at Bwana M'Kubwa is remarkable, i.e., 0·28 as against 271 per 1,000. The figures for 1926 differed to an approximately similar extent, i.e., Nil as against 240 per 1,000.

. . . at Bwana M'Kubwa the incidence rate of Influenza went up from Nil in 1926 to 104·5 per 1,000 in 1927.[1]

1928. During 1928 Broken Hill returned no cases of Malaria, while at Bwana Mkubwa 437 with 3 deaths were shown. On the other hand, Broken Hill shows 530 cases of Influenza, Bwana Mkubwa returning only 106, and the Roan returning none.

The personal factor of the Medical Officer has some bearing on these statistics, some considering all attacks of Pyrexia to be due to Influenza, and others attributing such attacks, unless accompanied by catarrhal symptoms, as being due to Malaria. . . .

The need for more accurate diagnoses in the Mine Health and Mortality must be emphasized. As at present compiled they are of little value.[2]

It is difficult, furthermore, to tell how much tuberculosis has spread among mine labourers in recent years. The number of notifications in the whole Territory was 241 in 1938 as against 15, 45, 63, 84, 93, and 71 respectively in 1932–7. The Director of Medical Services thereupon reported:

1938. Enquiry showed that 124 of the total notifications came from Mufulira and that all rested on diagnosis by the microscope . . . . neither the Chief Medical Officer of the mine nor myself was satisfied that a full explanation of events had been found, and further study was demanded by the fact that the tubercle bacillus was reported to have been found microscopically in the sputum of strong, well nourished, afebrile employees admitted to hospital for slight bronchial catarrh. Investigations are not yet complete but it appears that a non-pathogenic bacillus, both acid-fast and alcohol-fast has been mistaken, in some cases at least, for the morphologically identical *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*.[3]

[1] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 20. [2] Ibid. *1928*, p. 24. [3] Ibid. *1938*, p. 4.

1939. Subsequent careful studies have shown this to have been the case and the non-pathogenic organism was found to be present in tap water. Accordingly the figure (231) for notifications of tuberculosis in 1938 must be ignored. The figure for 1939 is 144 and is the highest ever recorded. . . . a steady and possibly rapid tuberculisation of the native population is to be expected.[1]

In 1940–4 the notifications numbered 108, 147, 136, 164, and 199 respectively.[2] But these figures, of course, do not convey an adequate picture of the spread of the disease,[3] and the incidence both at the mines and elsewhere (particularly among the Lunda of the Mwinilunga District) has caused much concern.[4]

Finally, it should be noted that the absence of many able-bodied labourers may affect the mortality rate of men within the Protectorate. There is a consensus of opinion that those seeking employment outside the Territory are on the whole more healthy than those staying at home. As mentioned above, 'the District Commissioner, Kasama, deplores the fact that the cream of the manhood of the district is usually away at work' and that 'the local labour supply is of the poorest'.[5] The Member for the Eastern Electoral Area said on 7 July 1937 in the Legislative Council:

It is the pick of the native manhood who leave this territory for work in the South, leaving behind mostly the weedy, the diseased, old men, women and children to carry on the village life, and I think I would not be very far wrong if I say that, of all the male natives who are left behind in villages in some parts of the Eastern Province, 75 per cent. would probably be rejected at a medical examination as being physically unfit for hard work.[6]

Officials in the Eastern Province have indeed already expressed the opinion that there is a 'physical deterioration of the tribes owing to the preponderance of the aged and infirm remaining at home'.[7]

It should be realized, however, that all statements concerning the effects of internal and external migration are quite uncertain.

The evils of this uncontrolled emigration of males have been recognised by all impartial observers. Unfortunately statistics are completely lacking, so that the effects of the exodus have never yet been measured in terms of population growth, or health, or food supply. What these effects must be we are left, in uneasiness, to speculate.[8]

What proportion of the Native male population can safely be permitted to absent itself from the tribal areas without endangering the life of the villages is uncertain, and what steps can reasonably and effectively be taken to stem the exodus, if this is

[1] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 2.

[2] See ibid. *1940*, p. 1; *1941*, p. 1; *1942*, p. 2; *1943*, p. 3; *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. li, col. 147.

[3] See Acting Director of Medical Services, 30 Aug. 1945, ibid.: '. . . there can be very little doubt that tuberculosis is on the increase in Northern Rhodesia. The only criterion we have on that point is the number of cases notified to us each year. Tuberculosis is a notifiable disease, and it is the duty of every medically qualified practitioner to notify every fresh case of tuberculosis that he recognises. I am afraid that that duty is not always carried out so conscientiously as it might be, or as it ought to be.' It should be realized, moreover, that even if the medically qualified practitioners notified each case within their observation the majority of the actual cases would not be notified.

[4] See, for example, ibid., cols. 88–92, 139–40, 144–5.

[5] *Native Affairs, Report 1938*, p. 54.

[6] *Debates*, vol. xxviii, col. 223. See also the statement of the Member for the Ndola Electoral Area, ibid., cols. 227–8.

[7] *Native Affairs, Report 1936*, p. 72.

[8] Rita Hinden, *Plan for Africa* (1941), p. 90.

considered to be desirable, is a matter for study. These are two problems of considerable importance which will receive constant attention. Assuming that fifty per cent. absent from the villages is the reasonable limit it is likely that that limit has now been reached in many areas.[1]

Accurate figures are not available. There is, however, little doubt that few males can be taken from the villages without imperilling to a dangerous degree the food supplies and social life of the rural areas. Steps must therefore be taken to conserve man-power in every possible way.[2]

The general man-power position did not materially alter during the year and the drain on rural areas continued to cause some concern. The African Labour Advisory Board advised that an investigation should be made into the effects of this drain on the tribal structure and society.[3]

Mortality of Absentees. Data covering the whole of the Northern Rhodesia Natives working outside the Protectorate are, of course, not available. But the mortality statistics of those employed at the mines in Southern Rhodesia are most valuable. I have summarized the results in Table 18. It appears that the mortality of the immigrants from Northern Rhodesia has been all the time much higher than that of the local labourers. The 1912 Medical Report for Southern Rhodesia makes the following instructive comment:[4]

This is the first year that this return has been available, and therefore comparisons with former years are not possible. It will be noted that the death rate amongst the Northern Rhodesian natives is out of all proportion to that of natives from Southern Rhodesia and Portuguese territories, and is in excess, though not to the same extent, of the death rate amongst natives from Nyasaland or British Central Africa. It might naturally be assumed from these figures that natives from Northern Rhodesia are from some cause or other unsuited for work on the mines of Southern Rhodesia. This, however, is not altogether true, as other factors exist which tend to raise the death rate amongst this class, and these have to be taken into account. Natives from Southern Rhodesia are, as a rule, locally recruited, and for short periods of service, rarely, if ever, extending over six months at a time, and often for much less. They are not far distant from their own homes, and, engaging as they do as monthly servants, can leave the mine when they find they are unfit or disinclined for further work. Natives from north of the Zambesi, on the other hand, are engaged for longer periods, and cannot, nor do they desire to, leave before the termination of their contract, nor undertake the long and wearisome journey to their own homes before accumulating sufficient money to recompense them for the labour involved in getting to and from the mines; whilst natives engaging themselves through the agency of the Labour Bureau are, as a rule, contracted for one year.

Natives from Portuguese possessions are practically on the same footing as natives belonging to Southern Rhodesia, coming, as they do, largely from districts just over the border, whilst among them, as with natives from Nyasaland, are included a large proportion of labourers permanently resident on mines, or who return again and again after short holidays, and who may therefore fairly be classed as habitual labourers.

. . . from Northern Rhodesia comes the bulk of the raw labour, and it must be accepted that in the first few months of service, or even the first year of service, the native mine labourer is undeveloped for the work he has contracted to perform, is less inured to its hardships, and is more inclined to succumb to the various vicissitudes associated with change of climate and the nature of work to which he is exposed. This must be the inevitable result of the formation of an industry which at all times, and in all climes, is classed as one of the dangerous trades.

[1] Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 2.
[2] Ibid. *1942*, p. 4.
[3] Ibid. *1943*, p. 6.
[4] Southern Rhodesia, *Report on Public Health 1912*, pp. 5–6.

TABLE 18. *Mortality of Native Mine Labourers by Country of Origin, Southern Rhodesia, 1912–44*[1]

Year	Average of the actual numbers employed at the end of each month						Deaths						Death-rate					
	S.R.	N.R.	Nyasa-land	Port. East Africa	Other	Total	S.R.	N.R.	Nyasa-land	Port. East Africa	Other	Total	S.R.	N.R.	Nyasa-land	Port. East Africa	Other	Total
1912	12,943	9,062	5,078	6,008	978	34,669	235	593	208	168	32	1,236	18·1	65·4	41·0	25·4	32·7	35·7
1913	11,977	8,773	5,921	6,197	895	33,763	166	440	188	133	19	946	13·9	50·2	31·7	21·5	21·2	28·0
1914	11,817	9,587	7,471	6,727	912	36,514	171	420	270	155	16	1,032	14·5	43·8	36·1	23·0	17·5	28·3
1915	12,044	8,937	9,018	7,260	1,154	38,413	161	215	421	162	32	991	13·4	24·1	46·7	22·3	27·7	25·8
1916	13,090	7,494	10,513	8,026	1,626	40,749	211	223	441	167	21	1,063	16·1	29·8	42·0	23·3	12·9	26·6
1917	14,052	7,440	9,434	7,094	1,138	39,158	218	195	278	137	21	849	15·5	26·2	29·5	19·3	18·5	21·7
1918	11,251	6,619	7,953	6,024	937	32,784	1,051	847	1,183	556	80	3,717	93·4	128·0	148·7	92·3	85·4	113·4
1919	10,348	6,219	8,199	5,562	771	31,099	151	162	195	82	7	597	14·6	26·0	23·8	14·7	9·1	19·2
1920	9,746	9,361	12,869	5,203	711	37,890	93	196	310	67	8	674	9·6	20·9	24·1	12·9	11·3	17·8
1921	8,240	10,246	13,942	4,678	588	37,694	77	273	347	76	10	783	9·3	26·6	24·9	16·2	17·0	20·8
1922	9,329	8,748	13,409	4,261	542	36,289	94	181	395	88	9	767	10·1	20·7	29·4	20·6	16·6	21·1
1923	10,792	9,247	13,275	4,126	496	37,936	114	168	255	64	8	609	10·6	18·2	19·2	15·5	16·1	16·1
1924	11,133	10,967	14,649	4,069	554	41,372	95	226	356	67	10	754	8·5	20·6	24·3	16·5	18·0	18·2
1925	10,572	11,349	13,458	3,796	469	39,644	91	188	259	64	8	610	8·6	16·6	19·2	16·9	19·2	15·4
1926	11,442	12,498	13,718	3,788	601	42,047	125	218	279	65	2	689	10·9	17·4	20·3	17·2	3·3	16·4
1927	12,062	12,422	13,321	3,704	537	42,046	119	234	256	65	15	689	9·9	18·8	19·2	17·6	27·9	16·4
1928	12,669	12,555	14,015	3,741	723	43,703	163	228	346	82	31	850	12·9	18·2	24·7	21·9	42·9	19·4
1929	12,645	13,875	15,156	4,055	1,080	46,811	143	321	380	104	37	985	11·3	23·1	25·1	25·6	34·3	21·0
1930	11,644	13,213	15,687	3,980	818	45,342	108	251	327	78	19	785[2]	9·3	19·0	20·9	19·6	23·2	17·3
1931	8,305	9,611	13,555	3,060	671	35,202	78	127	265	56	5	531	9·4	13·2	19·6	18·3	7·5	15·1
1932	9,443	9,074	13,404	3,391	738	36,050	93	92	199	43	10	437	9·8	10·1	14·8	12·7	13·6	12·1
1933	14,390	11,966	16,206	4,658	1,045	48,269	119	113	252	62	6	552	8·3	9·4	15·5	13·3	5·7	11·4
1934	19,265	15,769	20,007	5,938	1,360	62,339	144	201	297	76	7	725	7·5	12·7	14·8	12·8	5·2	11·6
1935	21,942	20,057	25,582	7,137	1,508	76,226	222	319	466	67	14	1,088	10·1	15·9	18·2	9·4	9·3	14·3
1936	23,597	23,204	28,030	7,919	1,342	84,092	154	304	435	96	3	992	6·5	13·1	15·5	12·1	2·2	11·8
1937	23,770	26,364	29,576	9,534	1,356	90,600	182	335	370	118	2	1,007	7·7	12·7	12·5	12·4	1·5	11·1
1938	22,824	24,613	29,349	9,817	1,244	87,847	184	338	390	140	7	1,059	8·1	13·7	13·3	14·3	5·6	12·1
1939	21,882	22,018	28,232	9,877	1,750	83,759	162	222	272	103	14	773	7·4	10·1	9·6	10·4	8·0	9·2
1940	22,591	22,359	28,168	11,409	1,233	85,760	121	169	258	92	9	649	5·4	7·6	9·2	8·1	7·3	7·6
1941	22,423	21,849	26,286	12,280	1,177	84,015	173	196	259	96	12	736	7·7	9·0	9·9	7·8	10·2	8·8
1942	22,018	21,393	25,619	11,501	1,331	81,862	142	199	269	90	11	711	6·0	9·3	10·5	7·8	8·3	8·7
1943	20,979	21,161	23,301	11,518	1,538	78,497	144	187	230	78	12	651	6·9	8·8	9·9	6·8	7·8	8·3
1944	19,446	20,197	22,404	11,630	1,478	75,155	104	228	215	85	17	649	5·3	11·3	9·6	7·3	11·5	8·6

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report on the Public Health 1912*, p. 5; *1913*, p. 37; *1914*, p. 7; *1915*, p. 32; *1919*, p. 22; *1920*, p. 4; *1923*, p. 9; *1924*, p. 7; *1925*, p. 5; *1926*, p. 7; *1927*, p. 8; *1928*, p. 20; *1929*, p. 26; Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, *Report 1930*, p. 49; *1931*, pp. 36–7; *1932*, p. 34; *1933*, pp. 38–9; *1934*, p. 29; *1935*, pp. 29–30; *1936*, p. 29; *1937*, pp. 30–1; *1938*, p. 35; *1939*, pp. 39–40; *1940*, pp. 29–30; *1941*, pp. 26–7; *1942*, pp. 33–4; *1943*, pp. 30–2; *1944*, pp. 33–5. Totals include Natives from other sources.

[2] Including 2 cases with unknown country of origin.

The death-rate of the labourers from Northern Rhodesia was as high as 65 per 1,000 in 1912. It dropped to 50 in 1913, to 44 in 1914, and oscillated in 1915–17 between 24 and 30. Owing to the influenza epidemic it jumped in 1918 to 128. It never again reached 27. From 1930 onwards it has always been below 20, and in 1939–44 it averaged 9. A comparison with the death-rate at the mines in Northern Rhodesia in 1925–39 shows that mortality of the Northern Rhodesia native miners in Southern Rhodesia was lower than mortality of the native miners in Northern Rhodesia only in 1927 and 1930–4.

The mortality of Northern Rhodesian labourers on the Rand Mines was also much lower in the 1930s than before the First World War, but it was still unsatisfactory in 1938.

> The 1,500 natives recruited for employment on the Rand were taken there as an experiment approved in 1936. Former recruiting from this country for work in the mines of the south proved disastrous, the rate of mortality being some 60 per thousand; it was therefore discontinued, and the employment of natives from north of 22° South latitude was prohibited [in 1913]. That experience is now many years old, and conditions on the Rand have been so much improved that a fresh experiment was felt to be justifiable. . . .
>
> The experimental employment of tropical natives commenced on the gold mines in January, 1934, and during the fifty-one months to 31st March, 1938, the average number employed was 2,968, the death-rate from disease 15·54 per 1,000 per annum, and, including accidents, 17·52 per 1,000 per annum. The natives were mainly from Barotseland, Bechuanaland, Nyasaland, and Southern Rhodesia. They were all employed underground.[1]
>
> The relatively high mortality ratio amongst Barotse natives employed in the gold mines on the Witwatersrand is . . . a matter which calls for continuous observation.[2]

But mortality of Northern Rhodesia natives on the gold mines has decreased considerably since. The death-rate dropped from 22·75 in 1938 to 8·81 in 1940.[3] In 1941 it was 9·41.[4]

Population Growth. Whether births exceed deaths or not it is impossible to tell. There are no data concerning the general mortality of the natives, all available population figures are untrustworthy, and migration to and from the Territory has been so large that even where a population increase or decrease seems likely it may have been brought about by immigration or emigration. Moreover, the reports published by the Administration throw very little light on the subject. The Secretary for Native Affairs, in his report for the year 1926, after having quoted the official population estimates for 1921 and 1926, said:

> These numbers do not pretend to be more than approximate, but they are, it is submitted, sufficiently accurate to justify the conclusion that the native population may be expected to double itself in about 30 years.[5]

[1] Orde Browne, pp. 52–3. In the 34 months to 31 Oct. 1936 the death-rate from disease had been 11·76, and, including accidents, 13·52 (for Northern Rhodesians alone 15·19); see Abraham, *Report on Nyasaland Natives*, p. 6. It seems, therefore, that mortality was greater from 1 Nov. 1936 to 31 Mar. 1938 than from 1 Jan. 1934 to 31 Oct. 1936.

[2] Bledisloe Commission, *Report* (1939), p. 182.

[3] See Northern Rhodesia, Labour Department, *Report 1940*, p. 5.

[4] See ibid. *1941*, p. 5.

[5] *Report 1926*, p. 33.

But the Medical Report for 1925 and 1926, in commenting upon the apparently large population increase in the Territory, said:[1]

While it is probable that there may be an excess of births over deaths, this must, in so far as it might otherwise bring about an increase in population, be greatly counterbalanced by an excessively high rate of infant mortality.[2] It is shown in this report that on the lowest computation the infant mortality rate is probably in the neighbourhood of 40%. . . . It will probably be correct to attribute the increase in Northern Rhodesia as shown by the above figures for the most part to immigration, which is known to be taking place to some considerable extent, rather than to natural causes.

In 1930 the Principal Medical Officer stated:

Statistics compiled with great care by District Administration Officers show a steady and most satisfactory annual increase of the native population, and that the birth-rate is 63·9 per 1,000. Also, from records compiled in respect of certain villages, the infantile mortality rate is only 38 per cent., a much lower rate than has been previously estimated.[3]

The more recent Reports upon Native Affairs discuss the ratio of deaths to births only in a few specific cases.

1937. The permanent population in the Luangwa Valley in the Petauke District, particularly in the unhealthy and known sleeping sickness areas, is much less than it was. Not only does the mortality exceed the birth rate but absentees at the work centres are stated to refuse to return home unless their villages are moved.[4]

1938. The depopulation of the Kasama District which was reported in 1937, is commented upon by the District Commissioner in these words:

'The Kasama District is an immense area of watered plateau to give livelihood to a mere 50,000 Bemba. Yet the conditions of life are so hard that it is extremely doubtful if the population is maintaining its numbers. The poor return from the soil means harder toil for the women, and less chance of survival for the children. The infantile mortality remains at a fantastic height. Every first child can be written off before it is born.'

This I consider is rather an exaggerated view.[5]

The Pim Commission stated:

The prevalence of debilitating diseases and especially of venereal disease is a powerful factor in preventing any substantial [population] increase, while a high general death rate, and in particular a heavy infantile death rate, are other factors of importance.[6]

[1] *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 19.

[2] This statement is incomprehensible. An excess of births over deaths cannot be counterbalanced by an excessively high rate of infant mortality since infant deaths are included in deaths.

[3] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 98. The Secretary for Native Affairs, who likewise quoted these birth and infant mortality rates ascertained in 1929 for a population of 46,479, said (ibid., p. 102): 'Statistics compiled by District Officers show that the native population is steadily increasing year by year. It is fully realized that the figures are not absolutely accurate, but they are collected with great care by visiting each village and counting the inhabitants as far as possible, and the result conclusively proves that there is a general increase of population throughout the Territory of three per cent. per annum, including births, immigration, and emigration. The population at 31st March, 1911, was estimated to be 824,756. At 31st December, 1919, it was 938,383, and at 31st December, 1929, it was recorded as 1,298,651.' But the figures were by no means 'collected with great care by visiting each village' (see pp. 402–3 above), and though in view of the very large immigration the population, no doubt, increased between 1911 and 1929 it is impossible to tell how much it rose.

[4] *Native Affairs, Report 1937*, p. 77.

[5] Report of Commissioner for Northern Province, ibid. *1938*, p. 48.

[6] Pim Commission, *Report Northern Rhodesia*, p. 7. See also p. 499 above.

Major Orde Browne says:

> The view is occasionally expressed that the native is well and happy in his own surroundings, and that it is a mistake to introduce him to modern ideas as to sanitation, diet, and so forth. Even a superficial investigation of conditions will show this to be a disastrous fallacy; birth-rate, infantile mortality, physique, and general health, all indicate a population subjected to a perpetual drain only partially offset by sun, fresh air, and the African's natural vitality.[1]

However, the reader should realize that all opinions on fertility, morbidity, mortality, and population growth are based on impressions rather than on facts. The Medical Director, in his report for 1938, rightly said:

> The lack of reliable population figures is a matter for regret. Without vital statistics it is difficult to frame and impossible to assess a public health policy. Further, to so great an extent does Northern Rhodesia's prosperity depend upon African labour and to so great an extent is the Protectorate's labour being sought by neighbouring countries, that it seems to me to be of the highest importance that we should know, beyond any doubt, whether the African population is increasing, stationary or decreasing.[2]

After another five years he stated:

> It is a serious handicap to those who are responsible for planning health policy that we are without essential statistics. We have no exact knowledge of what are the diseases which most seriously affect our people whether by way of causing mortality or by way of producing chronic ill-health. We do not really know whether, in the production of chronic ill-health, actual disease or lifelong malnourishment is the more important factor. We do not know at what period of life disease in general or any particular disease strikes its most damaging blows. The African labour of Northern Rhodesia is one of the few assets which we know the country to possess, but we do not know whether the African population is increasing or decreasing. We do not know whether we can afford to part with the thousands of labourers who voluntarily leave the country. We do not know whether we should resist or yield to, or encourage the demands from other countries for facilities to recruit our labour. In the study of the public health with a view to improving it, vital statistics provide an important means of diagnosis of what is wrong in the same way as the thermometer, the stethoscope and the microscope provide means of diagnosis of an individual's complaint; and accurate diagnosis is as essential for intelligent treatment in the one case as in the other.[3]

IX. Non-Native Birth and Death Statistics

Introduction. The available vital statistics for non-natives are quite inadequate.

(1) The Office of the Registrar-General of Births, Deaths, and Marriages reports 'the total number of births registered' and 'the total number of deaths registered', but these figures are practically always identical with those published for Europeans in the Blue Books and in the Medical Reports.[4] It may be assumed, therefore, that all data refer to Europeans exclusively and it is doubtful whether even the figures for births among Europeans are complete.[5]

[1] Orde Browne, p. 6. [2] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 2. [3] Ibid. *1943*, p. 1.

[4] The figures differ sometimes. Thus the number of births in 1937 is given in the Registrar's report (Judicial Department, *Report 1938*, p. 9) as 308, in the *Medical Report* (*1937*, p. 7) as 296, and in the *Blue Book* (*1937*, Section O, p. 2) as 313, the latter figure being evidently taken by mistake from the 1936 records.

[5] See p. 493 above.

(2) The intercensal estimates of the European population are most unreliable.

(3) The official birth- and death-rates are computed in such a manner as to convey a wrong picture of the actual trend. Thus the birth-rates for 1931 and 1932 are given as 24·05 and 31·46 respectively.[1] These rates were obtained by relating the births of 1931 to the population on 5 May 1931 and the births of 1932 to the population on 31 December 1932. Assuming that the mean population in 1932 was the mean of the population at the beginning and at the end of that year, i.e. 11,929, the birth-rate of 1932 would have been 26·5 (instead of 31·5). I have computed the rates in Table 19 by relating the numbers of births and deaths to the mean of the population at the beginning and the end of the corresponding years[2] (in 1931, however, to the census population).

Births. The number of European births registered in 1920 was 80.[3] It rose to 333 in 1931, oscillated in 1932–7 between 283 and 318, and increased to 355 in 1938, to 378 in 1939, to 520 in 1940, and to 576 in 1942. The birth-rate averaged 26 in 1924–32 and 29 in 1933–9. This rise was probably due to an increase in the proportion of adult females among the European population. But the jump to 35 in 1940–3 is probably to be explained by more complete registration.

TABLE 19. *Registered European Births and Deaths, Northern Rhodesia, 1924–43*[1]

Year	Births	Deaths Total	Deaths under 1 year	Birth-rate	Death-rate	Year	Births	Deaths Total	Deaths under 1 year	Birth-rate	Death-rate
1924	107	40	..	25	9	1934	315	107	15	28	9
1925	139	63	15	31	14	1935	283	100	15	26	9
1926	142	62	7	28	12	1936	313	78	6	31	8
1927	144	72	18	22	11	1937	296	115	11	28	11
1928	195	97	15	26	13	1938	355	131	10	30	11
1929	211	92	21	24	11	1939	378	108	7	29	8
1930	273	163	28	24	14	1940	520	108	15	34	7
1931	333	210	28	24	15	1941	517	142	13	35	10
1932	316	119	24	26	10	1942	576	135	17	35	9
1933	318	103	13	29	9	1943	526	136	17	28	7

[1] For births and deaths, see *Blue Book 1924*, Section O, pp. 2–3, to *1943*, Section O, pp. 2–3; *Colonial Reports 1927*, p. 28; *Medical Report 1937*, p. 7; *1943*, p. 3.

At the 1931 census married women were asked to state (1) the number of years the present marriage has lasted, (2) the number of children born alive to this marriage, (3) the number of children of the present marriage still living. The results were shown for 2,608 wives, the 45 wives not included in the tables being visitors to the Territory and a few women residents concerning whom no data were given.[4] It appears that of the 2,608 women 817 had borne no child, 647 one child, 443 two children, 245 three, 177 four, 107 five, and 172 more than five, the average number of

[1] *See Medical Report 1932*, p. 8.

[2] See Table 1 above.

[3] See Registrar, *Report 1930*, p. 10. The numbers for 1922 and 1923 were 103 and 104 respectively; see Court Registrar, *Report 1923–4*, p. 7.

[4] *See Census Report 1931*, p. 14.

children born being 1·86.[1] Considering only the 1,143 wives who had been married for 10 years or more to their present husbands the average number of children born was 3·07. Of the 473 women whose age exceeded 45 years, 115 had borne no child, 70 one child, 68 two children, 48 three, 46 four, 35 five, 24 six, 24 seven, and 43 eight or more. The average number of children born to these 473 women in their present marriage was 3·1. The average for the 194 women who had married before attaining the age of 25 was 5·0.

TABLE 20. *Duration of Marriage and Children born, Europeans, Northern Rhodesia, 1931*[1]

	Duration of marriage (years)									
	0	*1–4*	*5–9*	*10–14*	*15–19*	*20–24*	*25–29*	*30 and more*	*Not stated*	*Total*
Wives . .	217	729	513	465	244	186	139	109	6	2,608
Children .	15	509	813	1,071	671	620	555	589	2	4,845
Average .	0·1	0·7	1·6	2·3	2·8	3·3	4·0	5·4	..	1·86

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 52.

TABLE 21. *Number of Children born to European Wives whose Age at Census exceeded 45 years, Northern Rhodesia, 1931*[1]

Age of wife at marriage	*Number of wives*	*Number of children born alive to present marriage*													
		0	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12 and more*	*Total*	*Average*
Under 20	57	—	2	3	7	2	5	6	7	3	8	5	7	2	401	7·0
20–24	137	8	14	22	20	25	16	11	8	2	1	2	4	4	560	4·1
25–29	112	22	23	20	11	11	10	4	7	3	—	1	—	—	297	2·6
30–34	54	14	10	10	6	7	4	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	116	2·1
35–39	57	28	14	9	3	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	62	1·1
40–44	34	22	7	3	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	23	0·6
45 and more	20	19	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0·1
Not stated	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	473	115	70	68	48	46	35	24	24	8	9	8	12	6	1,460	3·1

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 53.

The proportion of wives who had borne no child in their present marriage was

31 per cent. among all 2,608 wives;

23 per cent. among the 1,507 wives who had married under 25;

24 per cent. among the 473 wives over 45;

4 per cent. among the 194 wives over 45 who had married under 25.

Infant Mortality. The ratio of deaths under one to births was rather high in the 1920s, and the 1930 Medical Report stated: 'The greater number of these deaths occur amongst what may be termed the "poor white" class. Many of these infants received no medical attention, and the cause of deaths is certified by ignorant relatives.'[2] Since 1930 infant mortality has declined and has dropped in recent years to so low a level as to arouse suspicion concerning the accuracy of registration. According to

[1] See ibid., p. 51.

[2] *Medical Report 1930*, p. 16.

the official statistics for 1936–43 births totalled 3,481 and deaths under one year of age 96. This indicates an infant mortality of only 28 per 1,000 births.

Total Deaths. The number of registered deaths was 50 in 1920[1] and 40 in 1924. It rose to 210 in 1931 and oscillated in 1932–43 between 78 and 142. The death-rate averaged 12 in 1924–32 and 9 in 1933–43.[2] It seems particularly low considering that malaria and blackwater fever still claim many victims.[3] But while mortality in general is low the state of health of European children is not satisfactory.

There is in the European community a deal of malnutrition and under-nourishment and poor health in children ready to start the vicious circle. Under-nourishment bringing poor health, poor health retarding education, retarded education leading to lack of efficiency and this to poverty and so again through the tragic round in another generation.[4]

Mortality of European officials has been low in every year since the Crown assumed the administration of the Territory.

During the Second World War health conditions among Europeans deteriorated.

The signs of strain, referred to in my last report,[5] resulting from shortage of staff, long hours, curtailment of leave and a multiplicity of small annoyances inseparable from work under war-time conditions, are very apparent and sickness rates are rising. In this connection it is worth while to note that very many members of the civil community have for years been working for much longer hours under conditions of much greater stress, and with appreciably less leave than a larger number of members of His Majesty's Forces.[6]

[1] See Registrar, *Report 1930*, p. 11. The numbers for 1922 and 1923 were 51 and 50 respectively; see Court Registrar, *Report 1923–4*, p. 7.

[2] According to the official statistics the death-rate averaged 28 in 1907–15 and 17 in 1916–23. See *Medical Report 1927*, p. 14; *1928*, p. 21; *1935*, p. 5.

[3] Out of 739 deaths occurring in 1933–9, 146 were due to malaria or blackwater fever. See ibid., p. 5; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 8; *1939*, pp. 5–6. See also ibid., p. 2: 'Among the European population malaria continues to be the chief cause of illness, and with blackwater, the commonest cause of death.' On the other hand, the Director of Medical Services said in the Legislative Council on 2 June 1939: 'There have occurred in the last six years, from malaria and blackwater combined, only 33 deaths. It is true that about 20 per cent. of all deaths are due to malaria and blackwater combined, but it is to be remembered that this is a malaria country. While we have that proportion of malaria deaths we escape from a large number of diseases—respiratory diseases—which temperate countries have to suffer from, and we must, of course, take the rough with the smooth.' (*Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xxxiii, col. 351. The statement concerning the 33 deaths in the last six years was, of course, an error. A table in *Medical Report 1938*, p. 5, shows 33 deaths from malaria and blackwater fever combined, but these were the deaths occurring in Government hospitals in the five years 1934–8.)

On 26 May 1925 the Principal Medical Officer had stated in the Legislative Council: 'I think malaria is the only hindrance to the full and complete European settlement of this country . . .' (*Legislative Council Debates*, vol. ii, col. 177).

At the beginning of this century deaths from tropical diseases were so frequent that even an enormous mortality was not considered excessive. See Report by the Principal Medical Officer, 1900–2 (British South Africa Company, *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia 1900–2*, p. 428): 'The Public health of North-Eastern Rhodesia during this period has on the whole been satisfactory, although the mean annual death rate for the two years is high, viz.—5½ per cent. of the population . . . . Taking into consideration climatic diseases only, the death rate was 4·25 per cent., which is not high for this part of Africa. The greatest mortality has been from blackwater fever, which was responsible for nearly half the deaths.'

[4] Director of Medical Services, 9 Dec. 1942, *Legislative Council Debates*, vol. xliv, col. 226.

[5] See *Medical Report 1942*, p. 1.

[6] Ibid. *1943*, p. 1. There was at the same time an increase in the incidence of malaria; see ibid. *1941*, p. 1, *1942*, p. 1, *1943*, p. 1.

TABLE 22. *Deaths of European Officials, Northern Rhodesia, 1924–43*[1]

Year	Number		Deaths	Year	Number		Deaths
	Total	Average			Total	Average	
1924	312	268	2	1934	540	452	—
1925	330	275	4	1935	552	466	2
1926	369	308	1	1936	611	536	—
1927	429	372	4	1937	616	547	4
1928	446	372	2	1938	687	566	1
1929	515	429	4	1939	751	619	—
1930	621	558	1	1940	779	674	2
1931	678	554	5	1941	848	747	5
1932	750	598	5	1942	913	795	5
1933	650	525	1	1943	969	828	4

[1] See *Medical Report 1925 and 1926*, p. 23; *1927*, p. 15; *1928*, p. 22; *1929*, p. 16; *1935*, p. 10; *1938*, p. 9; *1940*, p. 3; *1943*, p. 3.

CHAPTER XII

NYASALAND[1]

I. Census-taking

1. *1911–1931*[2]

The first census of Nyasaland, taken in 1911, had been authorized by an enabling ordinance *ad hoc*,[3] but in 1921 the following general Census Ordinance[4] was placed among the statutes:

1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Census Ordinance.

2. Subject to the provisions of this Ordinance it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council from time to time to make rules directing that a census shall be taken for the Nyasaland Protectorate or for any part thereof and any rules under this section may prescribe—

(*a*) the date on which the census is to be taken; and

(*b*) the persons by whom and with respect to whom the returns for the purpose of the census are to be made; and

(*c*) the particulars to be stated in the returns:

Provided that no particulars shall be required to be stated other than particulars with respect to such matters as are mentioned in the Schedule to this Ordinance.

3. (1) The Governor shall appoint a Superintendent of Census whose duty it shall be to make such arrangements and do all such things as are necessary for the taking of a census in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance and of any rules made thereunder, and for that purpose to make arrangements for the preparation and issue of the necessary forms and instructions and for the collection of the forms when completed.

(2) The Superintendent of Census in the exercise of his powers and in the performance of his duties under this Ordinance or under any rules made thereunder shall be subject to the control of and comply with any directions given by the Governor.

4. For the purpose of enabling any direction by the Governor for a census to be taken to be carried into effect the Superintendent of Census may issue instructions—

(*a*) providing for the division of the Protectorate into districts for the purpose of the census and the appointment of persons to act in those districts in connection with the census;

(*b*) requiring District Commissioners, Assistant District Commissioners, Principal Headmen, Village Headmen and such other persons as may be employed for the purpose of the census to perform such duties in connection with the taking of the census as may be prescribed;

(*c*) requiring information to be given to the persons liable to make returns by the persons with respect to whom the returns are to be made;

[1] The Protectorate of Nyasaland was founded in 1891. In 1893 the name of the Protectorate was changed to 'The British Central Africa Protectorate', but the old name 'Nyasaland Protectorate' was revived in 1907 by the Order in Council which amended the Constitution. (See *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 455.)

[2] The first copies of the report on the census taken in 1945 reached London in Aug. 1946. I, therefore, deal with this census separately.

[3] No. 1 of 1911 (18 Jan.), reprinted in *Orders in Council, &c., 1911*, Part B, pp. 1–2.

[4] No. 1 of 1921 (17 Jan.), 'An Ordinance to make provision for the taking from time to time of a Census for Nyasaland or any area therein and for otherwise obtaining statistical information with respect to the population of Nyasaland', reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1921*, pp. 1–4, and in *Laws of Nyasaland in Force 1933*, vol. i, pp. 117–19 (Cap. 17).

(*d*) with respect to the forms to be used in the taking of a census; and

(*e*) making provision with respect to any other matters with respect to which it is necessary to make provision for the purpose of carrying into effect the provision of any rules made by the Governor in Council under this Ordinance.

5. (1) The Superintendent of Census shall, as soon as may be after the taking of a census, prepare reports on the census returns.

(2) The Superintendent of Census may, if he thinks fit, at the request and cost of any persons, cause abstracts to be prepared containing any such statistical information, being information which is not contained in the reports made by him under this section and which in his opinion it is reasonable for that person to require, as can be derived from the census returns.

6. It shall be the duty of the Superintendent of Census from time to time to collect and publish any available statistical information with respect to the number and condition of the population in the interval between one census and another, and otherwise to further the supply and provide for the better co-ordination of such information and the Superintendent of Census may make arrangements with any Government Department or any person for the purpose of acquiring any materials or information necessary for the purpose aforesaid.

7. (1) If any person—

(*a*) refuses or neglects to comply with or acts in contravention of any of the provisions of this Ordinance or any rules made or instructions issued thereunder; or

(*b*) being a person required by this Ordinance or any rules made or instructions issued thereunder to make, sign, or deliver any document, makes, signs or delivers, or causes to be delivered a false document; or

(*c*) being a person required by this Ordinance or any rules made or instructions issued thereunder to answer any question, refuses to answer or gives a false answer to that question;

he shall for each offence be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding ten pounds.

(2) If any person—

(*a*) being a person employed in taking a census, without lawful authority publishes or communicates to any person otherwise than in the ordinary course of such employment any information acquired by him in the course of his employment; or

(*b*) having possession of any information which to his knowledge has been disclosed in contravention of this Ordinance, publishes or communicates that information to any other person:

he shall be guilty of an offence, and shall on conviction be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years or to a fine not exceeding £100 or to both such imprisonment and fine.

Schedule

Matters in respect of which particulars may be required.

1. Name, sex, age.
2. Occupation, profession, trade or employment.
3. Nationality, birthplace, race, language, religion.
4. Place of abode and character of dwelling.
5. Condition as to marriage, relation to head of family, issue born in marriages.
6. Any other matter with respect to which it is desirable to obtain statistical information with a view to ascertaining the social or civil condition of the population.

Censuses in accordance with this Ordinance were taken on 24 April 1921,[1]

[1] See Government Notice No. 13 (31 Jan.), reprinted in *Orders in Council, &c., 1921*, Part C, p. 4.

25 April 1926,[1] and 26 April 1931.[2] For the census of 1931 the Governor in Council made the following Rules:[3]

1. A census shall be taken of all persons alive in the Nyasaland Protectorate at midnight on the night of Sunday, the 26th April, 1931.

2. All European, Asiatic and other non-native persons within the boundaries of the Nyasaland Protectorate shall supply particulars with respect to themselves, their families and households relating to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

3. All District Commissioners shall supply particulars of the native population with respect to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

4. Owners and occupiers of land shall supply to the District Commissioner of the District in which the land is situated particulars of the natives resident thereon with respect to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

5. The Officer Commanding Troops shall supply particulars as in rule 3 with respect to the military native population including followers.

The Senior Provincial Commissioner was on each occasion appointed Superintendent of Census.

'The method of taking the census introduced in 1921 and followed in 1926 was again adhered to strictly, in order to ensure the maximum value of the statistics for comparative purposes.'[4]

'The forms for non-natives were delivered either by post or by hand from the administrative headquarters of each of the twenty districts and were returned by same means when duly completed.'[4] The Superintendent of the 1926 census made the following comment:[5]

In existing circumstances, it is possible to reach the whole of the European and Asiatic population by such a simple method, and there is not much risk of missing any but the most casual visitors living in the open country. It would be an improvement, however, if each form were numbered on future occasions, so that a Census officer could check off on his list each return as it came in and thus obviate all risk of any form being overlooked if it were not returned at the proper time.

It is possible that a census of non-natives evidently based on the assumption that all the addresses where non-natives live are known to the authorities was fairly complete in the case of the Europeans. But I doubt whether it was possible to reach by this method all the Asiatics, who were mostly traders without families. The Superintendent of the 1931 census said:

The numbers involved in the non-native statistics are so small that the margin of error is proportionately negligible.[6]

He was apparently not aware of the fact that the smaller the numbers involved the greater the probability of a proportionately large margin of error.

[1] See Government Notice No. 6 (12 Jan.), reprinted in *Orders in Council, &c., 1926*, Part C, p. 1.
[2] I shall deal separately with the census of 29 Apr. 1945 which was taken after this section had been written.
[3] Government Notice No. 11 (12 Feb.), reprinted in *Ordinances 1931*, Appendix, p. 23.
[4] *Census Report 1931*, p. 5.
[5] Ibid. *1926*, p. iv.
[6] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6.

The method used for counting the Natives was described as follows:[1]

As regards the native population, no attempt was made nor would it have been possible to deal with individual natives or even with individual families. The method adopted, which is somewhat similar to that employed in India, was to sub-divide each administrative district into enumeration areas, each in charge of a native enumerator specially instructed in his duties. On private estates the returns were rendered by the occupiers. During the period of two or three weeks preceding the date of the census, the native enumerators visited every village in the areas assigned to them and counted every native permanently domiciled therein, whether in fact that native was actually present, or whether he was away abroad or even in another part of the Protectorate. . . . A separate form was used in respect of each village and the native enumerators were instructed to enter the numbers on the village form under the following simple categories; children under 5 years by sexes, children from 5 to marriageable age by sexes, adults by sexes and by the divisions of single, married, and widowed. There were also spaces for dividing the population by religious belief, Christian, Mohammedan or Pagan, and finally for enumeration by tribes. At the foot of the form was a space in which were entered the numbers, if any, of natives in the village who were blind, deaf mutes, or totally infirm. A space was also provided in which to record the total number in each village able to read and write, and speak English.

The 1921 census report says that 'it was considered worth while incurring some expenditure in order to obtain figures more reliable and detailed than those previously furnished, which were merely estimates based on the numbers of hut taxes collected'.[2]

It can only have been at the expense of great trouble on the part of the District Staff that the census has been so successfully accomplished. Only for Upper Shire and part of Marimba were incomplete returns made, owing to the backward state of the population generally, and the lack of educated natives to act as enumerators.[3]

The 1926 census report contains the following comment:[4]

The enumerators doubtless had their special difficulties, but it is perhaps not too much to state that the returns, within the limits required, are probably as accurate and reliable as those for large tenement houses in the poorer and less law-abiding parts of a large city in Europe.

Finally, the 1931 census report states:[5]

With regard to the native population the enumerators had their peculiar difficulties. In one district enumeration was delayed by the untimely activities of a

[1] Ibid., pp. 5–6.

[2] Ibid. *1921*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1911*, p. 4:

'The system followed was that the District Resident counted the actual number of natives residing in a certain area and so found the average number of natives per hut. The number of hut taxes paid was then multiplied by the average number (usually about 2·8 to 3) and an allowance made for aged and infirm people or persons otherwise exempt from payment of hut tax. The result is the native population of the District. The respective numbers of males and females is arrived at by an estimate based on the numbers actually counted.

'The estimated native population (male and female) in the various districts is given in Schedule 10. It may be taken as substantially accurate as the system has been checked and found to give good results.'

[3] Ibid. *1921*, p. 7. Of the total charges of £217 incurred 'for the pay of the native enumerators and for certain overtime allowances to the native clerks in the Residents' offices for checking the figures of the enumerators and doing the other clerical work involved in the scheme' £3. 15*s*. was spent for Marimba (65,000 inhabitants). As the returns from part of Marimba were apparently considered complete, it cannot be said that the whole £3. 15*s*. was wasted.

[4] Ibid. *1926*, p. vi.

[5] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6.

man-eating lion, elsewhere small-pox necessitated quarantine of villages at the date of the census so that enumeration had to be postponed. In the northern areas enumeration was complicated by the fact that in April most of the people are living in their gardens scaring beasts and birds away from their crops. Numerous clerical errors were made by the enumerators. All their returns, however, were carefully scrutinised and checked by administrative officers who made such corrections as were possible locally where the conditions were well known before the forms were sent to headquarters where again they were submitted to the closest checking prior to tabulation of the results. Consequently, it is believed that simple mathematical errors have been eliminated so far as is humanly possible.

The greatest care was taken to adhere strictly to the methods employed in former censuses; the same forms were used, in many cases the native enumerators were the same, the information asked for was the same simple almost irreducible minimum embodied in questions the significance of which could be easily and quickly understood, the season at which the census was taken was the same, consequently it is not unreasonable to suppose that the errors whatever they may be were also the same. The degree of error thus being constant, the value of the statistics for comparative purposes is proportionately enhanced.

Not that the degree of error is admitted to be considerable. . . . In regard to the native statistics, comparative analysis of the results under a variety of classifications shows such a close approximation of the percentage figures that the possibility of coincidence must be ruled out and the substantial accuracy of the totals upon which they are based must be admitted. . . .

Both the reports for 1926 and 1931 contain an elaborate attempt to prove the completeness and accuracy of the returns for natives by showing that the ratios of females to males and the distribution of the population by age and conjugal condition were very similar in 1921, 1926, and 1931, and that the results of the counts agreed very closely with the results of tax assessment. It does not seem necessary to discuss these arguments here in detail, and I shall confine myself to three remarks:

(1) The similarity between the sex ratios is not as great as the Superintendent of the 1931 census thought them to be. The number of adult females per 1,000 adult males was 1,320 in 1926 and 1,256 in 1931. The difference may at first sight seem small. But the number of adult females increased from 429,349 to 513,827 or by only 19·7 per cent., while the number of adult males rose from 325,280 to 408,799 or by 25·7 per cent. The sex ratio for adults had actually changed considerably in the short period of five years.

(2) The proportion of children under 5 years among the total population was 276·3 per 1,000 in 1926 and 276·6 per 1,000 in 1931. The approximation is indeed amazingly close. But the conclusion to be drawn is simply that at both counts the number of young children was overstated grossly, yet to the same extent.

(3) If the claim that 'corroboration of the accuracy of the total figures of the native census is also to be found in statistics derived from native taxation'[1] were justified, the population estimates based on native taxation ought to agree pretty closely with the totals of the native counts. Actually, the estimate for the end of 1925 was 7 per cent. lower than the total of the

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 7; see also ibid. *1926*, p. vi.

1926 count[1] and the estimate for the end of 1930 13 per cent. lower than the total of the 1931 count.[2]

There is, on the other hand, some strong evidence that either the totals for 1921 and 1926 are an understatement or that the totals for 1931 are an overstatement. The results for the Southern Province, to be sure, may be accepted. In view of the large immigration into this Province from Portuguese East Africa it is possible that the population increased by 63,000 in 1921–6 and by 149,000 in 1926–31. It is possible also that the population of the Northern Province increased by 28,000 in 1921–6. But I do not see how it can have increased in 1926–31 by 160,000. The Northern Province is inhabited mostly by indigenous tribes, and the scanty information available does not indicate that immigration exceeded emigration.[3] If the population of the Northern Province was not overstated at the 1931 count, it was probably understated by at least 100,000 both in 1926 and 1921.[4]

The Nyasaland counts do not compare unfavourably as to completeness and accuracy with the counts of some other British Dependencies in Africa, and I doubt whether much better results would be obtained if the same method as in Nyasaland were used in enumerating the population of 'large tenement houses in the poorer and less law-abiding parts of a large city in Europe'. But the authors of the Nyasaland census reports are apparently not aware of the fundamental defects of this method used in Nyasaland. In a European city the particulars for each person are entered on a separate line and all the counting is done in an office by special clerks trained for this purpose. In Nyasaland the native enumerators have the functions of

[1] The Superintendent of the 1926 census was probably not aware of this fact when he wrote: 'Throughout East Africa a hut or poll tax is in force, and in order that revenue may be collected the number and situation of the taxpayers must be known. On this account alone, the Government has approximately accurate knowledge, and a formal census would be quite unnecessary if its object was to ascertain the total population, with no attempt to gain, at least in part, the information usually obtained by such means in modern times.' (Ibid., p. v.)

[2] See p. 535 below.

[3] This, of course, is putting things very mildly. Since there was a continuous exodus of males, many of whom never returned, I have no doubt that outward migration exceeded inward migration. But let us suppose that the balance of migration was nil. According to the 1926 count there were in the Northern Province 293,275 persons under marriage age and 388,988 of marriage age. Let us assume that as many as one-quarter of those under marriage age were less than 5 years under marriage age and that none of them died in 1926–31. Let us further assume that none of those who in 1926 were of marriage age died before 1931. Even under these fantastic assumptions the number of persons of marriage age in 1931 would have been only 73,319 + 388,988 = 462,307, while the 1931 count revealed 481,397 persons to be of that age. A reasonable though probably still too favourable assumption would be that 20 per cent. of those under marriage age were carried over to marriage age in 1931 and that 10 per cent. of those of marriage age in 1926 died before 1931. In this case the number of persons of marriage age in 1931 would have been 58,655 + 350,089 = 408,744. (That such an assumption would be very favourable may be inferred from the fact that if it is applied to the figures of the 1921 count the population of marriage age would have increased between 1921 and 1926 from 377,183 to 394,891 while it actually increased only to 388,988.)

[4] No attempt was made in the census reports to show the increase by Provinces. This is probably due to the fact that the subdivision into Provinces was changed in 1922 and again in 1925 and 1931. But the data given in ibid. *1931*, Table W, render it possible to recompute the results of 1921 and 1926 for the areas constituting in 1931 the Southern and Northern Province (see Table 3 below).

a statistician. They have to prepare a table showing for each village of their enumeration area the number of (1) boys under five, (2) girls under five, (3) boys from five to marriage age, (4) girls from five to marriage age, (5) single male adults, (6) single female adults, (7) husbands, (8) wives, (9) widowers, (10) widows, (11) Christians, (12) Mahommedans, (13) Pagans, (14) male blind, (15) female blind, (16) male deaf mutes, (17) female deaf mutes, (18) male totally infirm, (19) female totally infirm, (20) males who read English, (21) females who read English, (22) males who write English, (23) females who write English, (24) males who speak English, (25) females who speak English, and finally the distribution of the population by tribes. This is a task which probably very few native enumerators in Nyasaland can perform adequately, and certainly one which not many of the enumerators employed in European cities could carry out properly.[1] The census reports emphasize that the returns of the enumerators 'were carefully scrutinised and checked', but this could at best eliminate some of the most obvious mistakes. The 1926 census report shows in an Appendix covering 165 folio pages for each of the 10,523 villages on Crown Land and for each of the 240 private estates the population by sex and age. The table concerning the villages starts as follows:

Principal Headman	*Village*	*Under 5*		*Between 5 and age of marriage*		*Marriageable age*		*Total*		*Grand Total*
		M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	
Mlolo	Mlolo . .	45	41	24	10	120	123	189	174	363
	Mpaso .	11	5	6	3	17	20	34	28	62
	Jonasi .	13	16	7	6	28	38	48	60	108
	Penumlungu	11	14	4	6	21	30	36	50	86

Suppose the enumerator had entered all males as females and all females as males or had omitted in his count one-quarter of the females in Mlolo village, how could such mistakes have been discovered? Actually even quite obvious blunders were not detected. It may suffice to mention here that in 1926 in 28 villages in Central Shire District 459 boys under 5 were returned, but not a single male between 5 and marriage age![2]

There is no getting around the fact that at the Nyasaland native counts the basic tables are prepared on the spot by persons who nearly all have no qualifications whatsoever for performing such a task and that after a necessarily quite perfunctory check by administrative officers a clerk in the Census Office does nothing more than to add the totals found in those tables. This method has only one advantage, namely that of reducing expenses to a minimum. The Superintendent of the 1931 census says:[3]

> It is difficult to state precisely the exact cost of taking the Census since much of the work has been done by administrative officers and others in conjunction with

[1] It may be mentioned incidentally that the average compensation paid to an enumerator was less than 5*d*. for each village. The 1926 census report rightly says (p. iii) that the native staff 'performed the task of counting the population for small, probably inadequate, gratuities'.

[2] See *Census Report 1926*, Appendix, pp. 11–12. (For 1921 and 1931 the results have not been published by villages.)

[3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 32.

their ordinary duties. They have taken the census in their stride, so to speak. The direct expenditure is comprised of two items, namely £196 paid to the native enumerators[1] and a portion of the salary, say £200, of Mr. Reed, Relief Clerk, to whom was entrusted the compilation from the village statistics of the tables which form the census. This expenditure had already been incurred before the financial situation became so difficult in the latter half of 1931, so that it was not necessary, as has been the case elsewhere e.g. in the Union of South Africa, to abandon the native census on grounds of economy. The final figures were not available until the end of January last, since when the preparation of this Report has occupied my spare moments over the week ends. Taking the direct expenditure at £400 the cost works out at about 5*s*. per 1,000 natives enumerated. For purposes of comparison it may be stated that the 1924 Native Census of Zanzibar with a population of 200,000 cost £1,000 and that of the Gold Coast in 1924[2] cost £4,118 for a population of 2,000,000. The Nyasaland Census at a cost of £400 for almost 1,600,000 natives is but another example of the Protectorate practice of making bricks without straw. This economy has been attained at the cost of some delay, due to the fact that the tabulation of the statistics has all been done by 'hand' without the aid of Hollerith or other machines which are available in other countries, and, as has been stated, much of the work has had to be done out of the office hours. Without this economy, the taking of the census under the existing financial conditions would probably not have been justified.

It lies outside the scope of this survey to discuss whether Nyasaland could not afford the expense necessary for an adequate census. If this was so the next best alternative would have been to take every year a count similar to that of 1931.[3] But to make such a count in 1931 and make no other count for ten years or more was no solution. What Nyasaland made in 1931 without straw were no bricks, and the structure erected could at best serve as a temporary makeshift.

2. *1945*

'The census due in 1936 was postponed on the grounds of economy.'[4] It was postponed till 1941 when it was not taken owing to the war. But before hostilities ceased, the Acting Chief Secretary issued the following Notice:[5]

1. A Census of the whole population of Nyasaland will be taken during the months of March and April, 1945.

2. The Census of Europeans, Asiatics and other Non-Africans will be conducted on a date in April to be advertised later.

3. The Census of the African population will be conducted by African Enumerators working under the District Commissioners.

Enumerators detailed for work on privately owned or leased land will be instructed to report, before starting work, to the owners or occupiers of the land whose co-operation in the matter would be appreciated.

[1] According to *Blue Book 1931*, Section B, p. 6, *1932*, Section B, p. 6, the expense for the census was £248. 4*s*. 3*d*. (£196. 1*s*. 0*d*. in 1931, and £52. 3*s*. 3*d*. in 1932). [2] Should read '1921'.

[3] The legal basis for making such annual counts has been provided by the 'Statistics Ordinance, 1935' (No. 15 of 1935, 5 Oct., reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1935*, pp. 18–21), which says:

'3. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Ordinance and to the directions of such officer as the Governor may appoint, statistics may be collected annually in relation to all or any of the following matters:—

'(c) Population.'

[4] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 28.

[5] General Notice No. 36 (26 Jan. 1945), *The Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 15 Feb. 1945, p. 23.

Another Notice[1] fixed the date of the African population count.

It is notified for information that the Census of the AFRICAN population will commence on Monday the 19th March, 1945.

Finally, the Governor's Deputy in Council made the following Rules:[2]

1. A census shall be taken of all persons alive in the Protectorate at midnight on the 29th day of April, 1945.

2. All persons within the boundaries of the Protectorate shall supply particulars with respect to themselves, their families and households relating to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

3. Village Headmen shall supply particulars of the native population resident in their villages with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

4. Owners and occupiers of land shall supply particulars of the native population resident thereon with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

5. The Officer Commanding Troops shall supply particulars of the military native population, including followers, and the families and households of such military population and followers, with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

The Acting Labour Commissioner was appointed Superintendent of Census.[3] He reports with regard to the non-African census:

The census of the non-African population was taken on the night of the 29th April, 1945. . . .

The non-African Census was conducted as on previous occasions. Forms were distributed by District Commissioners, either by post or by hand. In the townships of Limbe and Blantyre most valuable assistance was given by the Indian Chamber of Commerce. Leading members of the Indian community undertook a house to house visit to ensure correct completion of the forms by persons with a limited knowledge of the English language.[4]

The method of counting the Africans was described as follows:

The African census began on the 19th March and was not finally completed until the first week in July. . . .

The count of the African population was undertaken by 167 African enumerators, working under the immediate direction of the District Commissioner in each administrative area. Each enumerator had to visit, on an average, 72 villages and had to count approximately 12,250 persons—a not inconsiderable task.[5] In the weeks immediately preceding the census, every administrative area, except Karonga, was visited by the Superintendent. Experimental counts were conducted in 16 Districts of the Protectorate with the objects of discovering the simplest and best methods of conducting the count and of instructing enumerators in person in order to ensure the maximum of uniformity. As on previous occasions, it was not possible

[1] General Notice No. 49 (19 Feb.), *The Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 28 Feb. 1945, p. 29.

[2] Government Notice No. 33 (21 Mar.), *The Nyasaland Gazette Supplement*, 29 Mar. 1945, p. 20.

[3] See Government Notice No. 32 (17 Mar.), ibid., p. 19. The Superintendent was assisted by the Labour Commissioner's lady clerk. 'The Census staff has had no previous training or experience in Census duties. This report is, therefore, an amateur production and is in no way the work of a statistician.' (*Census Report 1945*, p. 1.) However, the report is much more judicious than the preceding census reports.

[4] Ibid.

[5] See also ibid., p. 18: 'Acknowledgements are . . . due to the Chiefs of the Native Administration who, by sending their own messengers to precede the enumerators, lent the stamp of their prestige and authority and, thereby, materially assisted with the conduct of the census.'

to deal with individual Africans separately. Each village was treated as a separate entity and a return entered for that village. The 1945 census departed from the methods adopted on former occasions in certain important respects. In the first place the count was a *de facto* count of the persons actually living in any given District (in previous censuses the *de jure* method was adopted whereby all persons domiciled in a village were recorded, whether in fact they were actually present, or whether they were abroad) and a record of those absent abroad was taken separately. . . . Secondly there have been two important variations in the method of recording the distribution of the population by age groups. For the first time an attempt has been made to classify children under one year of age, while the age group 5 years to marriage age adopted formerly has been varied to 5 years to the taxable age of 18 years. . . . The form used required the enumerator to break down the village population by sexes and into four age groups, namely, infants under 1 year, children from 1 to 5 years, children from 5 years to 18 years and adults over 18 years. In addition, tribal distribution had to be recorded and a return of literates, divided into those who could read and write a simple letter in English or the vernacular. Finally a record was required of the totally blind by age groups.[1] No attempt was made, as in 1931, to keep a record of deaf-mutism or of the totally infirm;[2] neither was there any attempt made to record the occupations and industries of Africans. In the present census the record of absentees, referred to above, was shown at the bottom of the form. It is as well to remember that this information was obtained by examining every village headman in the country, and a clear distinction should be drawn between the estimate of absentees obtained in this manner, and the figures for the *de facto* population which have been obtained from an actual count.[3]

The counting of the *de facto* population was a great improvement, and the reduction of the number of columns in the form was a step in the right direction.[4]

As regards the accuracy of the returns the Superintendent of Census says:

The non-African population of the Protectorate is so small that the margin of error is negligible.[5] The accuracy of the African census is another matter. In the first place the onus for rendering returns is upon the enumerator and not upon the individual. The skill, energy and conscientiousness of each separate enumerator has, therefore, been the important factor. Every effort was made to recruit men of the best type and the rate of pay was made as attractive as possible with the limited funds available. Yet temporary employment is not popular and it must be admitted that it was not possible to enrol men with a uniformly satisfactory standard of intelligence, with the result that certain areas have been less skilfully handled than others. Furthermore, the staff position in the District Administration was such that field supervision by Europeans was not feasible.[6]

Certain physical difficulties have also had to be overcome: in two Districts, large areas were under flood and the census could not be taken at the proper time. For

[1] Furthermore, the conjugal condition was ascertained.

[2] The question concerning religion was apparently also omitted.

[3] Ibid., pp. 1–2.

[4] The more detailed classification by age at the 1945 count proved to be a failure. 'Whether the information asked for was too elaborate is open to question. Although it may be desirable to obtain certain information, the limiting factor must be the capacity of the worst enumerator and not that of the average or the best.' (Ibid., p. 2.)

[5] See in this connexion p. 524 above. How great the margin of error is in the case of a *small* population may be inferred from the fact that the number of Asiatics was put for 31 Dec. 1941 at 1,370 males and 647 females while the count of 1945 showed 1,776 males and 1,028 females; see p. 594 below.

[6] *Census Report 1945*, p. 2.

these reasons the tables of statistics should only be treated as a useful and, in the aggregate, a fairly accurate estimate of the African population, based on a count.[1]

The cost of the enumeration was again very small.

The actual expenditure incurred in the taking of the census has been just under £1,000. Of this sum £812 was spent in salaries of the 167 enumerators and their transportation and carriers, and £140 was paid to lady clerks, who assisted with the compilation of the records at headquarters. The balance of £46 represents the part cost of waterproof capes loaned to enumerators. This does not take into account the salaries of the District Commissioners, who did so much of the work, or of the Superintendent of Census or of the Labour Commissioner's lady clerk. In terms of actual expenditure the cost works out at ·107 pence per head of the total population. No Hollerith or other mechanical devices were available and tables for all the 12,000 villages of the Protectorate had to be compiled by hand.[2]

II. Total Population

The population ascertained at the various enumerations was as follows:[3]

Year	*Natives*	*Non-Natives*	*Total*
1921	1,199,934	2,049	1,201,983
1926	1,290,885	2,506	1,293,391
1931	1,599,888	3,566	1,603,454
1945	2,178,013	5,207	2,183,220

According to the most recent survey the land area of Nyasaland is 37,374 square miles and the water area 10,575 square miles.[4] The census reports for 1926 and 1931 reckoned with a land area of 37,596 square miles.[5] But the census report for 1945 put the land area at 36,829 square miles.[6] The average density in 1931 was given as 43 inhabitants per square mile, 62 in the Southern and 33 in the Northern Province. The density varied between 11 in Kasungu District and 297 in Chiradzulu District. In 1945 the average density was 56, 83 in the Southern Province, 53 in the Central Province, and 27 in the Northern Province. The density varied between 12 in Kasungu and 310 in Chiradzulu.

Some sections of the country are very sparsely inhabited. According to the 1926 census report the density in the Mwenewenya section with 608 square miles was only 2·8 per square mile.[7] But the density in the Shire Highlands is very high.

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 11. Referring to the marked difference between the sex ratios ascertained in 1945 and at the earlier counts, the Superintendent says (p. 2): 'The figures quoted do not, of course, prove the accuracy of any of the censuses, for there is no evidence to show that any one census has been more accurately compiled than any other.' [2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] See ibid. *1926*, pp. x, xxvi; *1931*, pp. 9, 12, 15; *1945*, pp. 4, 8, 10, 13. Non-natives comprise for 1921–31 only Europeans and Asiatics, but for 1945 also 'Other Non-Africans' (455); see p. 596 below.

[4] See *The Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 455. See also *An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire* (*1937*), p. 62; *Blue Book 1938*, Section 15, p. 2.

[5] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxix; ibid. *1931*, Table X. In the Introductions to the Reports, however, the land area is given as 'about 37,890 square miles' (see ibid. *1926*, p. iv; *1931*, p. 5). *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 3, estimates the area at 'approximately 38,000 square miles'. [6] See *Census Report 1945*, p. 1.

[7] See ibid. *1926*, p. xxxi. Comprehensive data by smaller sub-divisions than Districts seem not to have been published since 1926, but there is not the least doubt that there are even

TABLE 1. *Population Density, Nyasaland, 1931*[1]

District	*Land area sq. miles*	*Native population*	*Non-native population*	*Total population*	*Density per sq. mile*
Lower Shire	747	81,410	141	81,551	109·2
Chikwawa	1,897	35,892	33	35,925	18·9
Central Shire	951	15,492	11	15,503	16·3
Cholo	624	59,154	277	59,431	95·2
Mlanje	1,531	134,431	240	134,671	88·0
Blantyre	860	73,650	1,332	74,982	87·2
Chiradzulu	270	80,129	121	80,250	297·2
Zomba	903	104,965	461	105,426	116·8
Upper Shire	2,045	60,934	34	60,968	29·8
South Nyasa	2,468	111,484	153	111,637	45·2
Southern Province	12,296	757,541	2,803	760,344	61·8
Ncheu	1,132	78,355	82	78,437	69·3
Dedza	1,818	138,273	125	138,398	76·1
Lilongwe	2,334	121,153	199	121,352	52·0
Fort Manning	1,453	34,105	52	34,157	23·5
Dowa	2,145	138,151	145	138,296	64·5
Kota Kota	1,962	66,108	31	66,139	33·7
Kasungu	3,948	43,226	30	43,256	11·0
Momberas	3,458	106,282	15	106,297	30·7
West Nyasa	2,572	59,384	23	59,407	23·1
North Nyasa	4,478	57,310	61	57,371	12·8
Northern Province	25,300	842,347	763	843,110	33·3
Total	37,596	1,599,888	3,566	1,603,454	42·6

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Tables A, H, X.

In some Districts of the Southern Province, notably in the Shire Highlands, the density rates for a population engaged almost exclusively in agriculture are startling. Chiradzulu with 309·77 [Africans] to the square mile, Cholo with 191·90, Zomba with 152·38, Mlanje with 138·66 and Blantyre with 118·85 all record densities of over 100 to the square mile. All these Districts lie in the Shire Highlands and it is interesting to note that this heavy concentration of population is of comparatively recent date. Observers in the nineties of the last century recall that the Highlands were but sparsely populated and that the Cholo District in particular was covered by virgin forest and heavy bush and, to all intents and purposes, uninhabited. At least one main slave route passed through the Highlands so that settlement of these fertile lands did not take place until after the establishment of ordered Government. There are indications that the density of the population in the Shire Highlands is already leading to a land hunger.[1]

in the Northern Province areas which are very densely settled. Thus the population density of the small Likoma Island is reported to be 420 per square mile (see *Report of the Agricultural Survey of the five most Northerly Districts*, p. 67). See also *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1936*, p. 33: 'At the request of the Bishop of Nyasaland, a visit was paid to Likoma Island in order to suggest, if possible, some means of reviving its long-exhausted fertility. A detailed survey simply served to confirm the opinion long held by others that the high infertility is due solely to intense and prolonged over-population. Nothing short of the enforced removal of at least half the population will effect any lasting improvement.'

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 17. See also *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1942*, p. 15: 'The result (i.e. of uncontrolled immigration) has been an extraordinary congestion of population in certain districts, amounting often to as many as 600 persons per square mile, or more. Since this overcrowding is most marked in the hilly areas, where the land requires the most careful treatment, the results are very alarming.' See, furthermore, *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 111: 'The facts of rapidly increasing population and rapidly declining soil

25 April 1926,[1] and 26 April 1931.[2] For the census of 1931 the Governor in Council made the following Rules:[3]

1. A census shall be taken of all persons alive in the Nyasaland Protectorate at midnight on the night of Sunday, the 26th April, 1931.

2. All European, Asiatic and other non-native persons within the boundaries of the Nyasaland Protectorate shall supply particulars with respect to themselves, their families and households relating to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

3. All District Commissioners shall supply particulars of the native population with respect to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

4. Owners and occupiers of land shall supply to the District Commissioner of the District in which the land is situated particulars of the natives resident thereon with respect to such matters referred to in the schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

5. The Officer Commanding Troops shall supply particulars as in rule 3 with respect to the military native population including followers.

The Senior Provincial Commissioner was on each occasion appointed Superintendent of Census.

'The method of taking the census introduced in 1921 and followed in 1926 was again adhered to strictly, in order to ensure the maximum value of the statistics for comparative purposes.'[4]

'The forms for non-natives were delivered either by post or by hand from the administrative headquarters of each of the twenty districts and were returned by same means when duly completed.'[4] The Superintendent of the 1926 census made the following comment:[5]

In existing circumstances, it is possible to reach the whole of the European and Asiatic population by such a simple method, and there is not much risk of missing any but the most casual visitors living in the open country. It would be an improvement, however, if each form were numbered on future occasions, so that a Census officer could check off on his list each return as it came in and thus obviate all risk of any form being overlooked if it were not returned at the proper time.

It is possible that a census of non-natives evidently based on the assumption that all the addresses where non-natives live are known to the authorities was fairly complete in the case of the Europeans. But I doubt whether it was possible to reach by this method all the Asiatics, who were mostly traders without families. The Superintendent of the 1931 census said:

The numbers involved in the non-native statistics are so small that the margin of error is proportionately negligible.[6]

He was apparently not aware of the fact that the smaller the numbers involved the greater the probability of a proportionately large margin of error.

[1] See Government Notice No. 6 (12 Jan.), reprinted in *Orders in Council, &c., 1926*, Part C, p. 1.

[2] I shall deal separately with the census of 29 Apr. 1945 which was taken after this section had been written.

[3] Government Notice No. 11 (12 Feb.), reprinted in *Ordinances 1931*, Appendix, p. 23.

[4] *Census Report 1931*, p. 5.

[5] Ibid. *1926*, p. iv.

[6] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6.

The method used for counting the Natives was described as follows:[1]

As regards the native population, no attempt was made nor would it have been possible to deal with individual natives or even with individual families. The method adopted, which is somewhat similar to that employed in India, was to sub-divide each administrative district into enumeration areas, each in charge of a native enumerator specially instructed in his duties. On private estates the returns were rendered by the occupiers. During the period of two or three weeks preceding the date of the census, the native enumerators visited every village in the areas assigned to them and counted every native permanently domiciled therein, whether in fact that native was actually present, or whether he was away abroad or even in another part of the Protectorate. . . . A separate form was used in respect of each village and the native enumerators were instructed to enter the numbers on the village form under the following simple categories; children under 5 years by sexes, children from 5 to marriageable age by sexes, adults by sexes and by the divisions of single, married, and widowed. There were also spaces for dividing the population by religious belief, Christian, Mohammedan or Pagan, and finally for enumeration by tribes. At the foot of the form was a space in which were entered the numbers, if any, of natives in the village who were blind, deaf mutes, or totally infirm. A space was also provided in which to record the total number in each village able to read and write, and speak English.

The 1921 census report says that 'it was considered worth while incurring some expenditure in order to obtain figures more reliable and detailed than those previously furnished, which were merely estimates based on the numbers of hut taxes collected'.[2]

It can only have been at the expense of great trouble on the part of the District Staff that the census has been so successfully accomplished. Only for Upper Shire and part of Marimba were incomplete returns made, owing to the backward state of the population generally, and the lack of educated natives to act as enumerators.[3]

The 1926 census report contains the following comment:[4]

The enumerators doubtless had their special difficulties, but it is perhaps not too much to state that the returns, within the limits required, are probably as accurate and reliable as those for large tenement houses in the poorer and less law-abiding parts of a large city in Europe.

Finally, the 1931 census report states:[5]

With regard to the native population the enumerators had their peculiar difficulties. In one district enumeration was delayed by the untimely activities of a

[1] Ibid., pp. 5–6.

[2] Ibid. *1921*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1911*, p. 4:

'The system followed was that the District Resident counted the actual number of natives residing in a certain area and so found the average number of natives per hut. The number of hut taxes paid was then multiplied by the average number (usually about 2·8 to 3) and an allowance made for aged and infirm people or persons otherwise exempt from payment of hut tax. The result is the native population of the District. The respective numbers of males and females is arrived at by an estimate based on the numbers actually counted.

'The estimated native population (male and female) in the various districts is given in Schedule 10. It may be taken as substantially accurate as the system has been checked and found to give good results.'

[3] Ibid. *1921*, p. 7. Of the total charges of £217 incurred 'for the pay of the native enumerators and for certain overtime allowances to the native clerks in the Residents' offices for checking the figures of the enumerators and doing the other clerical work involved in the scheme' £3. 15*s*. was spent for Marimba (65,000 inhabitants). As the returns from part of Marimba were apparently considered complete, it cannot be said that the whole £3. 15*s*. was wasted.

[4] Ibid. *1926*, p. vi.

[5] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6.

man-eating lion, elsewhere small-pox necessitated quarantine of villages at the date of the census so that enumeration had to be postponed. In the northern areas enumeration was complicated by the fact that in April most of the people are living in their gardens scaring beasts and birds away from their crops. Numerous clerical errors were made by the enumerators. All their returns, however, were carefully scrutinised and checked by administrative officers who made such corrections as were possible locally where the conditions were well known before the forms were sent to headquarters where again they were submitted to the closest checking prior to tabulation of the results. Consequently, it is believed that simple mathematical errors have been eliminated so far as is humanly possible.

The greatest care was taken to adhere strictly to the methods employed in former censuses; the same forms were used, in many cases the native enumerators were the same, the information asked for was the same simple almost irreducible minimum embodied in questions the significance of which could be easily and quickly understood, the season at which the census was taken was the same, consequently it is not unreasonable to suppose that the errors whatever they may be were also the same. The degree of error thus being constant, the value of the statistics for comparative purposes is proportionately enhanced.

Not that the degree of error is admitted to be considerable. . . . In regard to the native statistics, comparative analysis of the results under a variety of classifications shows such a close approximation of the percentage figures that the possibility of coincidence must be ruled out and the substantial accuracy of the totals upon which they are based must be admitted. . . .

Both the reports for 1926 and 1931 contain an elaborate attempt to prove the completeness and accuracy of the returns for natives by showing that the ratios of females to males and the distribution of the population by age and conjugal condition were very similar in 1921, 1926, and 1931, and that the results of the counts agreed very closely with the results of tax assessment. It does not seem necessary to discuss these arguments here in detail, and I shall confine myself to three remarks:

(1) The similarity between the sex ratios is not as great as the Superintendent of the 1931 census thought them to be. The number of adult females per 1,000 adult males was 1,320 in 1926 and 1,256 in 1931. The difference may at first sight seem small. But the number of adult females increased from 429,349 to 513,827 or by only 19·7 per cent., while the number of adult males rose from 325,280 to 408,799 or by 25·7 per cent. The sex ratio for adults had actually changed considerably in the short period of five years.

(2) The proportion of children under 5 years among the total population was 276·3 per 1,000 in 1926 and 276·6 per 1,000 in 1931. The approximation is indeed amazingly close. But the conclusion to be drawn is simply that at both counts the number of young children was overstated grossly, yet to the same extent.

(3) If the claim that 'corroboration of the accuracy of the total figures of the native census is also to be found in statistics derived from native taxation'[1] were justified, the population estimates based on native taxation ought to agree pretty closely with the totals of the native counts. Actually, the estimate for the end of 1925 was 7 per cent. lower than the total of the

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 7; see also ibid. *1926*, p. vi.

1926 count[1] and the estimate for the end of 1930 13 per cent. lower than the total of the 1931 count.[2]

There is, on the other hand, some strong evidence that either the totals for 1921 and 1926 are an understatement or that the totals for 1931 are an overstatement. The results for the Southern Province, to be sure, may be accepted. In view of the large immigration into this Province from Portuguese East Africa it is possible that the population increased by 63,000 in 1921–6 and by 149,000 in 1926–31. It is possible also that the population of the Northern Province increased by 28,000 in 1921–6. But I do not see how it can have increased in 1926–31 by 160,000. The Northern Province is inhabited mostly by indigenous tribes, and the scanty information available does not indicate that immigration exceeded emigration.[3] If the population of the Northern Province was not overstated at the 1931 count, it was probably understated by at least 100,000 both in 1926 and 1921.[4]

The Nyasaland counts do not compare unfavourably as to completeness and accuracy with the counts of some other British Dependencies in Africa, and I doubt whether much better results would be obtained if the same method as in Nyasaland were used in enumerating the population of 'large tenement houses in the poorer and less law-abiding parts of a large city in Europe'. But the authors of the Nyasaland census reports are apparently not aware of the fundamental defects of this method used in Nyasaland. In a European city the particulars for each person are entered on a separate line and all the counting is done in an office by special clerks trained for this purpose. In Nyasaland the native enumerators have the functions of

[1] The Superintendent of the 1926 census was probably not aware of this fact when he wrote: 'Throughout East Africa a hut or poll tax is in force, and in order that revenue may be collected the number and situation of the taxpayers must be known. On this account alone, the Government has approximately accurate knowledge, and a formal census would be quite unnecessary if its object was to ascertain the total population, with no attempt to gain, at least in part, the information usually obtained by such means in modern times.' (Ibid., p. v.)

[2] See p. 535 below.

[3] This, of course, is putting things very mildly. Since there was a continuous exodus of males, many of whom never returned, I have no doubt that outward migration exceeded inward migration. But let us suppose that the balance of migration was nil. According to the 1926 count there were in the Northern Province 293,275 persons under marriage age and 388,988 of marriage age. Let us assume that as many as one-quarter of those under marriage age were less than 5 years under marriage age and that none of them died in 1926–31. Let us further assume that none of those who in 1926 were of marriage age died before 1931. Even under these fantastic assumptions the number of persons of marriage age in 1931 would have been only 73,319 + 388,988 = 462,307, while the 1931 count revealed 481,397 persons to be of that age. A reasonable though probably still too favourable assumption would be that 20 per cent. of those under marriage age were carried over to marriage age in 1931 and that 10 per cent. of those of marriage age in 1926 died before 1931. In this case the number of persons of marriage age in 1931 would have been 58,655 + 350,089 = 408,744. (That such an assumption would be very favourable may be inferred from the fact that if it is applied to the figures of the 1921 count the population of marriage age would have increased between 1921 and 1926 from 377,183 to 394,891 while it actually increased only to 388,988.)

[4] No attempt was made in the census reports to show the increase by Provinces. This is probably due to the fact that the subdivision into Provinces was changed in 1922 and again in 1925 and 1931. But the data given in ibid. *1931*, Table W, render it possible to recompute the results of 1921 and 1926 for the areas constituting in 1931 the Southern and Northern Province (see Table 3 below).

a statistician. They have to prepare a table showing for each village of their enumeration area the number of (1) boys under five, (2) girls under five, (3) boys from five to marriage age, (4) girls from five to marriage age, (5) single male adults, (6) single female adults, (7) husbands, (8) wives, (9) widowers, (10) widows, (11) Christians, (12) Mahommedans, (13) Pagans, (14) male blind, (15) female blind, (16) male deaf mutes, (17) female deaf mutes, (18) male totally infirm, (19) female totally infirm, (20) males who read English, (21) females who read English, (22) males who write English, (23) females who write English, (24) males who speak English, (25) females who speak English, and finally the distribution of the population by tribes. This is a task which probably very few native enumerators in Nyasaland can perform adequately, and certainly one which not many of the enumerators employed in European cities could carry out properly.[1] The census reports emphasize that the returns of the enumerators 'were carefully scrutinised and checked', but this could at best eliminate some of the most obvious mistakes. The 1926 census report shows in an Appendix covering 165 folio pages for each of the 10,523 villages on Crown Land and for each of the 240 private estates the population by sex and age. The table concerning the villages starts as follows:

Principal Headman	*Village*	*Under 5*		*Between 5 and age of marriage*		*Marriage-able age*		*Total*		*Grand Total*
		M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	
Mlolo	Mlolo . .	45	41	24	10	120	123	189	174	363
	Mpaso .	11	5	6	3	17	20	34	28	62
	Jonasi .	13	16	7	6	28	38	48	60	108
	Penumlungu	11	14	4	6	21	30	36	50	86

Suppose the enumerator had entered all males as females and all females as males or had omitted in his count one-quarter of the females in Mlolo village, how could such mistakes have been discovered? Actually even quite obvious blunders were not detected. It may suffice to mention here that in 1926 in 28 villages in Central Shire District 459 boys under 5 were returned, but not a single male between 5 and marriage age![2]

There is no getting around the fact that at the Nyasaland native counts the basic tables are prepared on the spot by persons who nearly all have no qualifications whatsoever for performing such a task and that after a necessarily quite perfunctory check by administrative officers a clerk in the Census Office does nothing more than to add the totals found in those tables. This method has only one advantage, namely that of reducing expenses to a minimum. The Superintendent of the 1931 census says:[3]

It is difficult to state precisely the exact cost of taking the Census since much of the work has been done by administrative officers and others in conjunction with

[1] It may be mentioned incidentally that the average compensation paid to an enumerator was less than 5*d.* for each village. The 1926 census report rightly says (p. iii) that the native staff 'performed the task of counting the population for small, probably inadequate, gratuities'.

[2] See *Census Report 1926*, Appendix, pp. 11–12. (For 1921 and 1931 the results have not been published by villages.)

[3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 32.

their ordinary duties. They have taken the census in their stride, so to speak. The direct expenditure is comprised of two items, namely £196 paid to the native enumerators[1] and a portion of the salary, say £200, of Mr. Reed, Relief Clerk, to whom was entrusted the compilation from the village statistics of the tables which form the census. This expenditure had already been incurred before the financial situation became so difficult in the latter half of 1931, so that it was not necessary, as has been the case elsewhere e.g. in the Union of South Africa, to abandon the native census on grounds of economy. The final figures were not available until the end of January last, since when the preparation of this Report has occupied my spare moments over the week ends. Taking the direct expenditure at £400 the cost works out at about 5*s*. per 1,000 natives enumerated. For purposes of comparison it may be stated that the 1924 Native Census of Zanzibar with a population of 200,000 cost £1,000 and that of the Gold Coast in 1924[2] cost £4,118 for a population of 2,000,000. The Nyasaland Census at a cost of £400 for almost 1,600,000 natives is but another example of the Protectorate practice of making bricks without straw. This economy has been attained at the cost of some delay, due to the fact that the tabulation of the statistics has all been done by 'hand' without the aid of Hollerith or other machines which are available in other countries, and, as has been stated, much of the work has had to be done out of the office hours. Without this economy, the taking of the census under the existing financial conditions would probably not have been justified.

It lies outside the scope of this survey to discuss whether Nyasaland could not afford the expense necessary for an adequate census. If this was so the next best alternative would have been to take every year a count similar to that of 1931.[3] But to make such a count in 1931 and make no other count for ten years or more was no solution. What Nyasaland made in 1931 without straw were no bricks, and the structure erected could at best serve as a temporary makeshift.

2. *1945*

'The census due in 1936 was postponed on the grounds of economy.'[4] It was postponed till 1941 when it was not taken owing to the war. But before hostilities ceased, the Acting Chief Secretary issued the following Notice:[5]

1. A Census of the whole population of Nyasaland will be taken during the months of March and April, 1945.

2. The Census of Europeans, Asiatics and other Non-Africans will be conducted on a date in April to be advertised later.

3. The Census of the African population will be conducted by African Enumerators working under the District Commissioners.

Enumerators detailed for work on privately owned or leased land will be instructed to report, before starting work, to the owners or occupiers of the land whose co-operation in the matter would be appreciated.

[1] According to *Blue Book 1931*, Section B, p. 6, *1932*, Section B, p. 6, the expense for the census was £248. 4*s*. 3*d*. (£196. 1*s*. 0*d*. in 1931, and £52. 3*s*. 3*d*. in 1932).

[2] Should read '1921'.

[3] The legal basis for making such annual counts has been provided by the 'Statistics Ordinance, 1935' (No. 15 of 1935, 5 Oct., reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1935*, pp. 18–21), which says:

'3. (1) Subject to the provisions of this Ordinance and to the directions of such officer as the Governor may appoint, statistics may be collected annually in relation to all or any of the following matters:—

'(c) Population.'

[4] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 28.

[5] General Notice No. 36 (26 Jan. 1945), *The Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 15 Feb. 1945, p. 23.

Another Notice[1] fixed the date of the African population count.

It is notified for information that the Census of the AFRICAN population will commence on Monday the 19th March, 1945.

Finally, the Governor's Deputy in Council made the following Rules:[2]

1. A census shall be taken of all persons alive in the Protectorate at midnight on the 29th day of April, 1945.

2. All persons within the boundaries of the Protectorate shall supply particulars with respect to themselves, their families and households relating to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

3. Village Headmen shall supply particulars of the native population resident in their villages with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

4. Owners and occupiers of land shall supply particulars of the native population resident thereon with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

5. The Officer Commanding Troops shall supply particulars of the military native population, including followers, and the families and households of such military population and followers, with respect to such matters referred to in the Schedule to the Ordinance as the Superintendent of Census may require.

The Acting Labour Commissioner was appointed Superintendent of Census.[3] He reports with regard to the non-African census:

The census of the non-African population was taken on the night of the 29th April, 1945. . . .

The non-African Census was conducted as on previous occasions. Forms were distributed by District Commissioners, either by post or by hand. In the townships of Limbe and Blantyre most valuable assistance was given by the Indian Chamber of Commerce. Leading members of the Indian community undertook a house to house visit to ensure correct completion of the forms by persons with a limited knowledge of the English language.[4]

The method of counting the Africans was described as follows:

The African census began on the 19th March and was not finally completed until the first week in July. . . .

The count of the African population was undertaken by 167 African enumerators, working under the immediate direction of the District Commissioner in each administrative area. Each enumerator had to visit, on an average, 72 villages and had to count approximately 12,250 persons—a not inconsiderable task.[5] In the weeks immediately preceding the census, every administrative area, except Karonga, was visited by the Superintendent. Experimental counts were conducted in 16 Districts of the Protectorate with the objects of discovering the simplest and best methods of conducting the count and of instructing enumerators in person in order to ensure the maximum of uniformity. As on previous occasions, it was not possible

[1] General Notice No. 49 (19 Feb.), *The Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 28 Feb. 1945, p. 29.

[2] Government Notice No. 33 (21 Mar.), *The Nyasaland Gazette Supplement*, 29 Mar. 1945, p. 20.

[3] See Government Notice No. 32 (17 Mar.), ibid., p. 19. The Superintendent was assisted by the Labour Commissioner's lady clerk. 'The Census staff has had no previous training or experience in Census duties. This report is, therefore, an amateur production and is in no way the work of a statistician.' (*Census Report 1945*, p. 1.) However, the report is much more judicious than the preceding census reports.

[4] Ibid.

[5] See also ibid., p. 18: 'Acknowledgements are . . . due to the Chiefs of the Native Administration who, by sending their own messengers to precede the enumerators, lent the stamp of their prestige and authority and, thereby, materially assisted with the conduct of the census.'

to deal with individual Africans separately. Each village was treated as a separate entity and a return entered for that village. The 1945 census departed from the methods adopted on former occasions in certain important respects. In the first place the count was a *de facto* count of the persons actually living in any given District (in previous censuses the *de jure* method was adopted whereby all persons domiciled in a village were recorded, whether in fact they were actually present, or whether they were abroad) and a record of those absent abroad was taken separately. . . . Secondly there have been two important variations in the method of recording the distribution of the population by age groups. For the first time an attempt has been made to classify children under one year of age, while the age group 5 years to marriage age adopted formerly has been varied to 5 years to the taxable age of 18 years. . . . The form used required the enumerator to break down the village population by sexes and into four age groups, namely, infants under 1 year, children from 1 to 5 years, children from 5 years to 18 years and adults over 18 years. In addition, tribal distribution had to be recorded and a return of literates, divided into those who could read and write a simple letter in English or the vernacular. Finally a record was required of the totally blind by age groups.[1] No attempt was made, as in 1931, to keep a record of deaf-mutism or of the totally infirm;[2] neither was there any attempt made to record the occupations and industries of Africans. In the present census the record of absentees, referred to above, was shown at the bottom of the form. It is as well to remember that this information was obtained by examining every village headman in the country, and a clear distinction should be drawn between the estimate of absentees obtained in this manner, and the figures for the *de facto* population which have been obtained from an actual count.[3]

The counting of the *de facto* population was a great improvement, and the reduction of the number of columns in the form was a step in the right direction.[4]

As regards the accuracy of the returns the Superintendent of Census says:

The non-African population of the Protectorate is so small that the margin of error is negligible.[5] The accuracy of the African census is another matter. In the first place the onus for rendering returns is upon the enumerator and not upon the individual. The skill, energy and conscientiousness of each separate enumerator has, therefore, been the important factor. Every effort was made to recruit men of the best type and the rate of pay was made as attractive as possible with the limited funds available. Yet temporary employment is not popular and it must be admitted that it was not possible to enrol men with a uniformly satisfactory standard of intelligence, with the result that certain areas have been less skilfully handled than others. Furthermore, the staff position in the District Administration was such that field supervision by Europeans was not feasible.[6]

Certain physical difficulties have also had to be overcome: in two Districts, large areas were under flood and the census could not be taken at the proper time. For

[1] Furthermore, the conjugal condition was ascertained.

[2] The question concerning religion was apparently also omitted.

[3] Ibid., pp. 1–2.

[4] The more detailed classification by age at the 1945 count proved to be a failure. 'Whether the information asked for was too elaborate is open to question. Although it may be desirable to obtain certain information, the limiting factor must be the capacity of the worst enumerator and not that of the average or the best.' (Ibid., p. 2.)

[5] See in this connexion p. 524 above. How great the margin of error is in the case of a *small* population may be inferred from the fact that the number of Asiatics was put for 31 Dec. 1941 at 1,370 males and 647 females while the count of 1945 showed 1,776 males and 1,028 females; see p. 594 below.

[6] *Census Report 1945*, p. 2.

these reasons the tables of statistics should only be treated as a useful and, in the aggregate, a fairly accurate estimate of the African population, based on a count.[1]

The cost of the enumeration was again very small.

The actual expenditure incurred in the taking of the census has been just under £1,000. Of this sum £812 was spent in salaries of the 167 enumerators and their transportation and carriers, and £140 was paid to lady clerks, who assisted with the compilation of the records at headquarters. The balance of £46 represents the part cost of waterproof capes loaned to enumerators. This does not take into account the salaries of the District Commissioners, who did so much of the work, or of the Superintendent of Census or of the Labour Commissioner's lady clerk. In terms of actual expenditure the cost works out at ·107 pence per head of the total population. No Hollerith or other mechanical devices were available and tables for all the 12,000 villages of the Protectorate had to be compiled by hand.[2]

II. Total Population

The population ascertained at the various enumerations was as follows:[3]

Year	*Natives*	*Non-Natives*	*Total*
1921	1,199,934	2,049	1,201,983
1926	1,290,885	2,506	1,293,391
1931	1,599,888	3,566	1,603,454
1945	2,178,013	5,207	2,183,220

According to the most recent survey the land area of Nyasaland is 37,374 square miles and the water area 10,575 square miles.[4] The census reports for 1926 and 1931 reckoned with a land area of 37,596 square miles.[5] But the census report for 1945 put the land area at 36,829 square miles.[6] The average density in 1931 was given as 43 inhabitants per square mile, 62 in the Southern and 33 in the Northern Province. The density varied between 11 in Kasungu District and 297 in Chiradzulu District. In 1945 the average density was 56, 83 in the Southern Province, 53 in the Central Province, and 27 in the Northern Province. The density varied between 12 in Kasungu and 310 in Chiradzulu.

Some sections of the country are very sparsely inhabited. According to the 1926 census report the density in the Mwenewenya section with 608 square miles was only 2·8 per square mile.[7] But the density in the Shire Highlands is very high.

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 11. Referring to the marked difference between the sex ratios ascertained in 1945 and at the earlier counts, the Superintendent says (p. 2): 'The figures quoted do not, of course, prove the accuracy of any of the censuses, for there is no evidence to show that any one census has been more accurately compiled than any other.' [2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] See ibid. *1926*, pp. x, xxvi; *1931*, pp. 9, 12, 15; *1945*, pp. 4, 8, 10, 13. Non-natives comprise for 1921–31 only Europeans and Asiatics, but for 1945 also 'Other Non-Africans' (455); see p. 596 below.

[4] See *The Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 455. See also *An Economic Survey of the Colonial Empire* (*1937*), p. 62; *Blue Book 1938*, Section 15, p. 2.

[5] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxix; ibid. *1931*, Table X. In the Introductions to the Reports, however, the land area is given as 'about 37,890 square miles' (see ibid. *1926*, p. iv; *1931*, p. 5). *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 3, estimates the area at 'approximately 38,000 square miles'. [6] See *Census Report 1945*, p. 1.

[7] See ibid. *1926*, p. xxxi. Comprehensive data by smaller sub-divisions than Districts seem not to have been published since 1926, but there is not the least doubt that there are even

TABLE 1. *Population Density, Nyasaland, 1931*[1]

District	*Land area sq. miles*	*Native population*	*Non-native population*	*Total population*	*Density per sq. mile*
Lower Shire	747	81,410	141	81,551	109·2
Chikwawa	1,897	35,892	33	35,925	18·9
Central Shire	951	15,492	11	15,503	16·3
Cholo	624	59,154	277	59,431	95·2
Mlanje	1,531	134,431	240	134,671	88·0
Blantyre	860	73,650	1,332	74,982	87·2
Chiradzulu	270	80,129	121	80,250	297·2
Zomba	903	104,965	461	105,426	116·8
Upper Shire	2,045	60,934	34	60,968	29·8
South Nyasa	2,468	111,484	153	111,637	45·2
Southern Province	12,296	757,541	2,803	760,344	61·8
Ncheu	1,132	78,355	82	78,437	69·3
Dedza	1,818	138,273	125	138,398	76·1
Lilongwe	2,334	121,153	199	121,352	52·0
Fort Manning	1,453	34,105	52	34,157	23·5
Dowa	2,145	138,151	145	138,296	64·5
Kota Kota	1,962	66,108	31	66,139	33·7
Kasungu	3,948	43,226	30	43,256	11·0
Momberas	3,458	106,282	15	106,297	30·7
West Nyasa	2,572	59,384	23	59,407	23·1
North Nyasa	4,478	57,310	61	57,371	12·8
Northern Province	25,300	842,347	763	843,110	33·3
Total	37,596	1,599,888	3,566	1,603,454	42·6

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Tables A, H, X.

In some Districts of the Southern Province, notably in the Shire Highlands, the density rates for a population engaged almost exclusively in agriculture are startling. Chiradzulu with 309·77 [Africans] to the square mile, Cholo with 191·90, Zomba with 152·38, Mlanje with 138·66 and Blantyre with 118·85 all record densities of over 100 to the square mile. All these Districts lie in the Shire Highlands and it is interesting to note that this heavy concentration of population is of comparatively recent date. Observers in the nineties of the last century recall that the Highlands were but sparsely populated and that the Cholo District in particular was covered by virgin forest and heavy bush and, to all intents and purposes, uninhabited. At least one main slave route passed through the Highlands so that settlement of these fertile lands did not take place until after the establishment of ordered Government. There are indications that the density of the population in the Shire Highlands is already leading to a land hunger.[1]

in the Northern Province areas which are very densely settled. Thus the population density of the small Likoma Island is reported to be 420 per square mile (see *Report of the Agricultural Survey of the five most Northerly Districts*, p. 67). See also *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1936*, p. 33: 'At the request of the Bishop of Nyasaland, a visit was paid to Likoma Island in order to suggest, if possible, some means of reviving its long-exhausted fertility. A detailed survey simply served to confirm the opinion long held by others that the high infertility is due solely to intense and prolonged over-population. Nothing short of the enforced removal of at least half the population will effect any lasting improvement.'

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 17. See also *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1942*, p. 15: 'The result (i.e. of uncontrolled immigration) has been an extraordinary congestion of population in certain districts, amounting often to as many as 600 persons per square mile, or more. Since this overcrowding is most marked in the hilly areas, where the land requires the most careful treatment, the results are very alarming.' See, furthermore, *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 111: 'The facts of rapidly increasing population and rapidly declining soil

TABLE 2. *Population Density, Nyasaland, 1945*[1]

District[2]	Land area sq. miles	African population	Non-African population	Total population	Density per sq. mile
*Karonga (North Nyasa)	3,004	82,508	21	82,529	27·5
*Chinteche (West Nyasa)	1,937	52,009	37	52,046	26·9
*Maimba (Momberas)	5,729	156,208	76	156,284	27·3
Northern Province	10,670	290,725	134	290,859	27·3
*Kasungu	3,309	40,197	13	40,210	12·2
*Dowa	1,832	131,195	203	131,398	71·7
*Kota Kota	2,418	75,522	35	75,557	31·2
*Fort Manning	926	42,553	440	273,884	46·0
*Lilongwe	2,650	230,891			87·3
Dedza	1,818	142,324	156	142,480	78·4
Ncheu	1,092	87,690	165	87,855	80·5
Central Province	14,045	750,372	1,012	751,384	53·5
Fort Johnston (South Nyasa)	2,518	111,621	162	111,783	44·4
Liwonde (Upper Shire)	1,843	87,682	802	226,087	47·7
Zomba	903	137,603			153·0
Blantyre	860	102,208	1,977	104,185	121·1
Neno (Central Shire)	941	25,179	11	25,190	26·8
Chikwawa	1,897	59,664	24	59,688	31·5
Chiradzulu	270	83,639	114	83,753	310·2
Cholo	624	119,746	370	120,116	192·5
Mlanje	1,511	209,522	404	209,926	138·9
Port Herald (Lower Shire)	747	66,746	197	66,943	89·6
Southern Province	12,114	1,003,610	4,061	1,007,671	83·2
Total	36,829	2,044,707	5,207	2,049,914	55·7

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, Tables A, L, S, and 8.
[2] Former names of Districts put in parentheses.
* Boundaries changed since census of 1931.

Since 1931 the population at 31 December has been estimated as follows:[1]

	1932	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*
Natives	1,606,431	1,608,023	1,600,713	1,600,076	1,619,530	1,635,804
Non-Natives	3,484	3,291	3,201	3,181	3,396	3,525
Total	1,609,915	1,611,314	1,603,914	1,603,257	1,622,926	1,639,329

	1938	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*
Natives	1,672,787	1,676,600	1,682,456	1,712,892	2,114,654	2,180,104
Non-Natives	3,595	3,609	3,589	3,832	3,890	3,989
Total	1,676,382	1,680,209	1,686,045	1,716,724	2,118,544	2,184,093

fertility have already been sufficiently emphasized to make it clear that the country's capacity for supporting its own people is under an increasing strain. Study of a population map of Nyasaland and adjoining territories shows that the population density is already far greater in this country than in any of its neighbours and the danger of increasing it by immigration, even in districts as yet unsaturated, are obvious and have long been realised.'

[1] See *Blue Book 1932*, Section 15, p. 2, to *1941*, Section 15, p. 2; *Medical Report 1943*, p. 7, *1944*, p. 4.

In his report on the 1926 census the Superintendent stated:[1]

Owing to the hut and poll tax system, to the fact that a village headman must report the settlement of strangers, and to the fact that natives are not allowed, without special permission, to build huts except in an established village, the intercensal distribution of population is probably better known in Nyasaland than it is in England . . . .

It cannot be admitted, however, that this claim was justified even then, since the estimate for 31 December 1925 showed a native population of only 1,205,801,[2] a figure very close to the result of the 1921 count (1,199,934), but considerably lower than the result of the 1926 count (1,290,885). As to the estimates for 31 December 1927 to 1930, the totals were 1,304,123, 1,326,165, 1,356,945, and 1,392,742,[3] while the 1931 count showed a native population of 1,599,888.[4] The Superintendent of Census made the following comment:[5]

[The] uncertainty as to the extent to which immigration is taking place probably explains the greater part of the discrepancy between the statistics of population ascertained by the census and those published in the Blue Book, 1930. The latter gives the total native population as 1,396,246 as against the census figure 1,599,888, a deficit of 203,642.[6] The census figures are the result of exact enumeration, whereas the Blue Book figures are merely estimated; I would suggest that immigration has been under-estimated.

This explanation is satisfactory so far as the Southern Province is concerned. The 1926 count total here was 608,622, the estimate for 31 December 1930 663,402, and the 1931 count result 757,541. Immigration into this Province probably had been very much underestimated. But the situation is quite different in the Northern Province, where immigration was small. The 1926 count total here was 682,263, the estimate for 31 December 1930 729,340, and the 1931 count result 842,347. If the

TABLE 3. *Native Population Nyasaland, 1931–45*[1]

Date	Southern Province			Northern Province[2]			Total		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Count 1931	366,219	391,322	757,541	385,998	456,349	842,347	752,217	847,671	1,599,888
31 Dec. 1935	371,748	399,005	770,753	378,797	450,526	829,323	750,545	849,531	1,600,076
31 Dec. 1939	391,830	433,249	825,079	385,050	466,471	851,521	776,880	899,720	1,676,600
31 Dec. 1941	412,922	447,819	860,741	373,476	478,675	852,151	786,398	926,494	1,712,892
Count 1945(*a*)	528,114	528,948	1,057,062	543,033	577,918	1,120,951	1,071,147	1,106,866	2,178,013
(*b*)	477,902	525,708	1,003,610	469,385	571,712	1,041,097	947,287	1,097,420	2,044,707

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Table O; *Blue Book 1935*, Section 15, p. 2; *1939*, Section 15, p. 2; *1941*, Section 15, p. 2; *Census Report 1945*, Tables 1, 3.
[2] For 1945 Northern and Central Province.
(*a*) *de jure* population. (*b*) *de facto* population.

[1] *Census Report 1926*, p. vi.

[2] See *Medical Report 1925*, p. 16.

[3] See *Blue Book 1927*, Section 15, p. 1; *1928*, Section 15, p. 1; *1929*, Section 15, p. 2; *1930*, Section 15, p. 2. *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1927*, p. 17, give for 1927 only 1,279,000.

[4] The estimate for 31 Dec. 1931 was 1,498,836, and a footnote in the Blue Book (*1931*, Section 15, p. 2) says that this total is 'based on estimates compiled before the 1931 Census figures were available'. But this statement is inaccurate, since the 1931 count returns were available and were actually used in estimating the population for 10 of the 20 districts. These 10 districts showed an apparent increase during 1931 from 575,304 to 666,881 (count total 666,832) while the estimate for the other 10 districts rose only from 817,438 to 831,955 (count total 933,056).

[5] *Census Report 1931*, p. 14.

[6] Actually the Blue Book (*1930*, Section 15, p. 2) gives the total population (including non-natives) as 1,396,246, and the native population as 1,392,742, so that the deficit is 207,146.

1931 count came near the truth, the estimate for 31 December 1930 was wide of the mark.

The intercensal estimates indicate for 1931–5 a slight increase for the Southern Province and a slight decrease for the Northern Province, and for 1936–41 a very large increase for the Southern Province and a slight increase for the Northern Province. If these estimates had been correct, the increase of the female population would have been twice as large in 1931–9 as the increase of the males. In fact, the number of males would not have increased at all in the Northern Province. But these intercensal estimates were far too low. The official figure for the total population was raised from 1,716,724 in 1941 to 2,118,544 in 1942, and to 2,184,093 in 1943. Finally, the enumeration made in the spring of 1945 showed a population of 2,183,220 (including 133,306 native absentees). These returns leave no doubt that the population of the Northern Province had been understated even in 1931.

The 1931 census report says that 'the largest individual village is Mponda's near Fort Johnston with a population of 3,203 as against 2,562 in 1926'. The capital Zomba had 820 inhabitants (including 266 non-natives).[1]

The Superintendent of the 1945 census reports:[2]

> For the first time an attempt was made to record the numbers of Africans residing in the immediate vicinity of the townships of Blantyre and Zomba. The object in view was to collect data upon which to estimate the approximate numbers that might have to be accommodated in the vicinity of the townships. Township boundaries have, therefore, been ignored and the figures show numbers residing in the compounds and villages immediately adjacent to the towns.

	Males	*Females*	*Total*
Zomba .	2,814	1,297	4,111
Blantyre .	2,470	1,124	3,594
Limbe .	4,357	1,822	6,179
	9,641	4,243	13,884

The numbers of non-natives ascertained at the 1945 census in Blantyre Township and in Limbe Township were as follows:[3]

	Europeans		*Asiatics*		*Other Africans*		
Townships	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Blantyre	180	199	271	178	18	16	862
Limbe	145	135	386	263	14	13	956

III. Migration to and from the Protectorate

There has been very much immigration into the Protectorate but little emigration. On the other hand, temporary inward migration has not been considerable, while temporary outward migration has been enormous.

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 31–2. [2] Ibid. *1945*, p. 17. [3] See ibid., Tables A, L, S.

1. *Immigration*

Emigrants from Portuguese East Africa, mostly known as Nguru (Anguru), seem to have come to Nyasaland since the foundation of the Protectorate,[1] but possibly not in very large numbers before 1910.[2] According to the counts of 1921, 1931, and 1945 the Nguru numbered 120,776, 235,616, and 379,638 respectively.[3] The Chikunda, who likewise came from Portuguese East Africa, increased during the same period from 21,893 to 47,438 and 72,866. These figures alone prove that total immigration must have been very large. But it is impossible to tell how large it was because efforts to count the immigrants failed. In accordance with a recommendation made in the 1921 census report,[4] Residents were instructed to keep a record of the natives who settled in Nyasaland from adjacent territories. 'This has been done since 1922 and the records show that about 46,209 men, women and children immigrated into Nyasaland' in 1922–5. But the Superintendent of the 1926 census thinks that 'the immigrants have been undercounted rather than overcounted' and that '60,000 to 65,000 is the lowest at which the total number of immigrants can be reckoned from 1921 to 1926'.[5] Moreover these records were apparently discontinued. The 1931 census report states:

> It is unfortunate that despite the attempts that have been made little success has been achieved in obtaining accurate statistics of immigration and the fact can only be deduced from the census figures without any detailed corroboration by the results attained independently by administrative officers.
>
> The following quotations are culled at random from District Reports, 'Each year there is a large influx into the Blantyre district. During the past few months I have found several hundreds of natives on private estates of which there was no record in our tax census and many of these had settled unknown even to the owners of the estate.' No specific figures are given. From Mlanje, 'These are the only figures that I can find from records in this office. I do not for a moment think that they are in any way the correct figures, but I submit them for what they are worth.' And again 'During recent years there has been a large influx into Mlanje district of natives from Portuguese East Africa.' From Port Herald, 'There has been a considerable amount of immigrants from Portuguese East Africa into the Lower Shire district.' Reports of a like character are received from the Northern Province. Thus, the District Commissioner, Lilongwe, writes, 'These are what have been reported, though I am sure that there are very many more.' The Provincial Commissioner reported 'The District Commissioner, Fort Manning, is officially informed that some 2,000 natives from reserves in Northern Rhodesia wish to settle in Nyasaland in 1929,' and in the following year, '2,200 natives settled in Fort Manning from neighbouring districts,' the neighbouring districts referred to being Portuguese East Africa and Northern Rhodesia.[6]

The report says furthermore:

> The inference that the increase in population is largely due to immigration is supported by the fact that the increase is disproportionately greater in the tribes

[1] See ibid. *1926*, pp. xxxix–xl. See also pp. 630–1 below.
[2] See ibid. *1921*, p. 4.
[3] See ibid. *1931*, p. 15; *1945*, p. 15. In the Mlanje District the number of Nguru increased from 26,473 in 1921 to 92,736 in 1931, and to 150,644 in 1945; see ibid. *1921*, p. 20; *1931*, Table Q; *1945*, Table 4.
[4] See ibid. *1921*, p. 7.
[5] Ibid. *1926*, pp. xxvi–xxvii.
[6] Ibid. *1931*, p. 14.

that do not properly belong to Nyasaland but have their parent stock just across the border. The Nguru, whose real home is Portuguese East Africa have almost doubled their numbers (95 per cent) in ten years, the Chikunda on the Lower Shire River (116·7) and the Wemba, from Northern Rhodesia, who have more than doubled (117·9).[1] The next largest increase is found among the Nkonde (63 per cent) of which people the greater number live in Tanganyika Territory although their Chief has his headquarters on the southern fringe of his people some 20 miles inside the Nyasaland border.[2]

These statements are plausible so far as the Southern Province is concerned.[3] But they utterly fail to explain the enormous population increase in the Northern Province. The number of Nguru, Chikunda, Wemba, and Nkonde increased in 1926–31 in the Southern Province by 65,608 and in the Northern Province by only 9,991. The District Commissioner, Lilongwe, wrote: 'These are what have been reported, though I am sure that there are very many more.' But there were actually very many less since he had estimated the native population of Lilongwe for 31 December 1930 at 134,951,[4] while according to the 1931 count it numbered only 121,153. It may well be that in 1929 2,200 natives from Portuguese East Africa and Northern Rhodesia settled in the Fort Manning District, but this fact can explain only a negligible fraction of the fantastic population increase of 160,000 in the Northern Province indicated by the counts of 1926 and 1931. As matters stand it seems safer to distrust the count results for the Northern Province and to assume that while immigration into the Southern Province was large, it was small into the Northern Province.

Immigration seems to have caused no concern until about 1925. The Commission which in 1920 made a very thorough study of the future needs of land on the part of the natives based its population forecast entirely on natural increase.

> . . . absence of statistics in regard to emigration and immigration obliges us to leave those factors out of account. So far as we can form an opinion we believe that their present effect on the total number of the population over the whole Protectorate is not great.[5]

The 1921 count which was made the day before this report was signed revealed the great effect of immigration on the total number of the population of the Protectorate. But the Superintendent of Census saw nowhere any danger of overcrowding.

> It may safely be said that no amount of education, religious or secular, and no wisdom of administration will ever raise a people from the savage to the civilised state, until the population begins to press on the means of subsistence. Not until then will the struggle for existence force a people to utilise its labour in the production of commodities to exchange for the necessities of life, which its own land no longer produces in sufficient abundance to supply the increasing population. In a country like Nyasaland there is no possibility of nature failing to supply food for an almost

[1] For immigration from Northern Rhodesia in 1934–8 see pp. 429–31 above.

[2] *Census Report 1931*, pp. 14–15.

[3] The Nguru, who no doubt all the time provided the bulk of the immigrants, numbered in 1931 in the Southern Province 235,363, in the Northern Province 253.

[4] See *Blue Book 1930*, Section 15, p. 2.

[5] Land Commission, *Report*, p. 3.

illimitable population; and it is rather in the artificial stimulation of economic needs, for luxuries tend to become necessities, that any prospect lies of bringing the native to develop that habit of unremitting industry to supply his wants that is the rule in Europe, where climatic conditions have brought pressure to bear from the very beginning. . . .

These remarks have been made preparatory to the statement that the population of Nyasaland is only 30 to the square mile; varying from 90 in Blantyre to 17 in Mombera, and 10 in North Nyasa. It is obvious that economic pressure is not present in Nyasaland as a civilising force . . . .[1]

The East Africa Commission which visited the Protectorate in September 1924 spoke of 'the numerous immigrants from Portuguese East Africa, mostly Anguru',[2] but did not mention the effects of immigration in its extensive analysis of the native land problem.

The Colonial Report published in 1925 seems to have been the first public document to call attention to the dangers of immigration.

As regards immigrants, there is a stream of permanent settlers from Portuguese East Africa, which appears to be slightly on the increase, the number so settling being returned at over 10,000 in 1924. These immigrants serve a useful purpose as labourers, but steps are being taken to regulate their introduction as settlers.[3]

In many parts of the Southern Province the chief source of labour is Portuguese East Africa, whence many thousands of natives immigrate yearly to work on the various plantations in Nyasaland, and many of these natives remain permanently either as settlers on private land or, with the permission of the authorities, on Crown land. This process of permanent and semi-permanent infiltration of alien natives has a beneficial effect on the labour supply. Indeed, without this source of supply in some districts, the labour problem would become extremely acute. But, on the other hand, the settlement of thousands of natives in the very areas where Crown land is least plentiful is creating a serious state of congestion in many places, and a position has arisen which is receiving the closest attention of the Government.[4]

The 1926 census report described the situation as follows:[5]

Government itself appears to have discriminated against the Nguru, as it was formerly the practice to allow non-Nguru immigrants to settle on Crown Land, a privilege which was denied, in theory, to the Nguru, who were only allowed to settle on private estates whose owners or occupiers were willing to receive them. In actual fact, however, no steps appear to have been taken in recent years to check the immigration of Nguru, and the Shire Highlands was threatened with a great congestion of natives on the comparatively small areas of Crown Land that remain. At present, therefore, no Nguru is allowed to settle on Crown Land in the Protectorate unless he has close family ties with some native already established there. As a matter of fact, it is said that the tide of immigration already showed signs of slackening and that along some parts of the boundary line there were wide strips on the Portuguese side entirely devoid of inhabitants.

But if there were actually any signs of slackening in the tide of immigration they were deceptive, and after the great influx in 1926–31 the census report stated:

To such an extent has this inundation depleted the area available for the needs of the indigenous population that further settlement is now prohibited. Large numbers, however, still come annually to work on European estates and return home on the completion of their contract.[6]

[1] *Census Report 1921*, p. 6.
[2] East Africa Commission, *Report*, p. 111.
[3] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1924*, p. 6.
[4] Ibid., p. 9.
[5] *Census Report 1926*, p. xl.
[6] Ibid. *1931*, p. 16.

It will be noticed that the Nguru were welcome as labourers but not as settlers. The 1932 Report on Native Affairs, referring to the increase of the Nguru since 1921, stated:

Their continued increase has for long been a matter of some concern to Government; they are welcomed by the planting community for they are industrious as temporarily resident workers on an estate; and they are preferred in this capacity to the indigenous native, who is liable to allow himself to be too much distracted by his home and family ties to exhibit that concentration of effort which is a desirable attribute even in the unskilled labourer. Unfortunately, the Nguru does not content himself with entering the Protectorate for the purpose of seeking temporary employment; in increasing numbers he is settling both on Crown and on privately owned land, and as soon as he finds himself comfortably established with a place in the village community he also begins to find his distractions to be an obstacle to the continuance of his former industry. This peaceful penetration is viewed with concern not because the Nguru is necessarily undesirable in himself, but mainly because he is so rapidly occupying all the available land in the Southern Province that the time has come when effective steps must be taken to control his entry, or there will be left no room for the normal expansion of the indigenous population.[1]

The types of immigrants into Nyasaland fall into three main categories, as follows:

(1) Families moving *en masse* in order to find more congenial surroundings. It is this kind of movement which causes the setting up of new villages in hitherto uninhabited areas. Between 1910 and 1928 there was a steady but gradual movement of Anguru encouraged by estate owners in the Southern Province.

(2) Single males and young boys who come in search of work and after earning sufficient money take a wife or concubine, with whose influence they are usually able to acquire a piece of land to hoe. This is the type of immigrant which is least desirable and whose intrusion is most resented by those elders who have come to understand the serious aspect of the problem. Many of them are Anguru from Portuguese territory east of Mlanje. Most of them have never paid tax in their own homes and intend to evade taxation in the Protectorate as long as they can; they have little respect for headmen or their elders; they take as much out of the land as they can and, if conditions are not entirely to their liking, they move on, deserting their women and children. Having no relations in this country, they suffer no restraining influences nor checks upon their movements.

(3) Those men who have family ties in their own countries and who come for three or four months in the planting season in order to earn money for their annual requirements in cloth or for tax. Some of those who came from Portuguese territory are in possession of passes, and there is little doubt that most of this type do pay tax in their own homes.

During the year the Government gave its careful consideration to the whole question of regulating alien immigration without unduly interfering with the labour supply of the planting community. District Commissioners were instructed to make fuller use than they had been doing of their powers under the District Administration (Native) Ordinance, 1924, to control settlement and in particular to take disciplinary action against village headmen who permitted unauthorized settlement and failed to report new-comers.[2]

On 15 May 1933 the Governor in his Address to the Legislative Council stated:

The vexed question of uncontrolled immigration resulting in serious congestion of population in certain areas has, I hope, been satisfactorily settled. The steps that have been taken should enable us to prevent further settlement in congested areas

[1] *Report on Native Affairs 1932*, p. 5. See also ibid., p. 25. [2] Ibid., pp. 6–7.

without at the same time interfering with the fluid supply of labour which is so essential to the planting community.[1]

The Colonial Report for 1932, in discussing this subject, said:

It is also hoped that with facilities for stricter control it will be possible to have more accurate statistics of the number and grades of immigrants than it has been possible to compile in the past.[2]

But this hope was not fulfilled, and it is very difficult, therefore, to judge the extent of immigration since 1931. The 1934 report of the Commissioner of the Southern Province says that in that year 'it was possible to initiate tentatively a more definite policy regarding population distribution', one of the objects being 'Discouragement of alien settlement from adjoining territories'.

The . . . object has been pursued by propaganda amongst the Native Authorities and village Headmen and by legislation which makes immigrant labour more readily traceable e.g., the Native Hut and Poll Tax (Immigrant Natives) Rules 1934 . . . . There were early indications that the influx of alien settlers on to Crown Land had been definitely checked . . . .[3]

The report for 1936 by the Acting Commissioner was less optimistic.

. . . Mlanje, Cholo, Chikwawa and the Lower Shire Districts continue to find it necessary to employ numbers of Anguru immigrants to supplement the local labour force. Despite the action taken against unauthorized settlement by these people, as opposed to temporary residence for the duration of the season, the infiltration is very hard to check. A number of headmen have been punished for shielding immigrants, mostly their own relatives from Portuguese Territory. . . .[4]

It is estimated that in 1936 the Anguru [in the Mlanje District] number about 100,000 or 75% of the total population.[5]

The discouragement of further immigration is a major point of policy in the border Districts but although a number of unauthorized immigrants are brought in to the bomas all that can be done is to escort them to the border whereupon they just walk along it till they are out of sight of the police and enter the district again. The position is thus a farcical one and must remain so until the scheme of native identification is implemented and in running order.[6]

At the same time the Native Welfare Committee urged 'That Government should refuse to admit any further Anguru natives except as labourers on estates and on conditions embodying repatriation within a limited period'.[7]

In any case immigration of Ngurus continued to be serious in certain areas.

. . . Native Authority Katuli was much exercised over Anguru immigration into his area from Portuguese East Africa. He himself and many of his people hailed from Portuguese Territory in the not very distant past and the restriction of immigration of persons who must frequently be related to those already settled is a matter

[1] *Summary of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council*, 15 May 1933, p. 6. See also the Acting Governor's Address, ibid., 28 Sept. 1932, p. 4.
[2] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1932*, p. 7.
[3] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1934*, p. 9.
[4] Ibid. *1936*, p. 12.
[5] According to the 1931 count they numbered 92,736.
[6] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 13.
[7] *Report of the Native Welfare Committee 1936*, p. 16.

of some difficulty. The Native Authority himself complains that there is no room for additional settlers.[1]

There remains the vexed question of Anguru immigration. There are indications that the rate of settlement decreased but without compulsory registration it will be impossible to check it entirely.[2]

Three persons were convicted and fined in Mlanje district for selling their tax receipts to natives of Portuguese East Africa anxious to acquire a Nyasaland domicile.[3]

On 13 September 1938 the Governor, in his Address to the Legislative Council, said:

The question of the control of alien labour coming into the Protectorate is still unsolved. Government formulated proposals for control and submitted them to the Convention of Associations for scrutiny. Each of the affiliated bodies of the Convention condemned the proposals but in no case was one single constructive alternative proposal put forward. I will take this opportunity of saying that while Government welcomes suggestions from outside, if it can get no constructive help from outside, it must inevitably fall back on its own resources.

He announced at the same time that he had entrusted to the Native Welfare Committee 'the preparation of a memorandum setting out a clear and unequivocal statement of the Government native policy which may remove doubt and misconception as to the aims of the Government'.[4] Thereupon the Committee, in its Memorandum dated January 1939, stated:[5]

In dealing with immigration, Government's policy recognises that it is becoming increasingly imperative to insist that in future immigrant labourers, on completion of their contract, shall return whence they came and no longer be allowed to settle in the Protectorate, and that the present position should be reviewed with a view to the possibility of repatriating many who have already settled.

I did not find any evidence of such repatriations and the 1939 report of the Commissioner of the Southern Province merely states:[6]

There are indications that Anguru immigration has been checked if not entirely stopped.

The Director of Agriculture, in a recent report, described the situation as follows:

Although some control on immigrants is exercised by the Native Authority, the latter has not always the proper appreciation of the future of his land to guide him, or the executive ability to carry out such desire as he may have to prevent or to limit the evil. There are various means of circumventing the regulations, and it appears that, as in so many urgent matters of this nature affecting the land, if the problem is to be dealt with quickly and effectively it needs closer intervention on the part of the District Administration—a measure at present impracticable.[7]

Though there are no statistics on the number of immigrants, it is probably safe to say that immigration since 1931 has been on a smaller scale than in the preceding decade.[8]

[1] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 22. [2] Ibid. *1938*, p. 17. [3] Ibid., p. 29.
[4] *Summary of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council*, 13 and 14 Sept. 1938, pp. 7–8.
[5] Native Welfare Committee, *Memorandum on Native Policy*, p. 18.
[6] *Report of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 12.
[7] *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 111. See also footnote 1 to p. 533 above.
[8] I found no evidence that the difference was great. It appears, for example, that according

2. *Emigration*

Information about emigration is exceedingly scanty. The Superintendent of the 1921 census recommended 'That Residents be instructed to keep an accurate record . . . of any Nyasaland natives who emigrate permanently to other territories, and to submit an annual return thereof to the Superintendent of Census',[1] but no action appears ever to have been taken. It seems, however, that emigration on the whole was caused only by such inconspicuous intertribal movements as are to be expected in a native territory with purely artificial boundaries.[2] But there have been in recent years two notable exceptions. The one concerns emigration from the Mzimba District, which apparently started in 1935.

1935. . . . a few cases have been reported in which the aridity of the Mzimba District has impelled cattle owners to take their herds across the border and to settle in Northern Rhodesia . . . .[3]

1939. . . . emigration is confined almost entirely to the unfertile Mzimba District, whence 86 people moved to Kasungu as compared with 667 in 1938,[4] and 541 settled in Northern Rhodesia as compared with 3,369 in 1938 and 967 in 1937.[5]

The other notable emigration is that of women going into territories where migrant labourers from the Northern Province are working.

1936. A matter of serious consequence in its sphere which is engaging the attention of the Atonga Tribal Council in the West Nyasa District and also of the District and Provincial Officers is the growing tendency among the Atonga women to make their own way to Southern Rhodesia and there to enter into illicit unions or to live a life of harlotry. The problem affects other Districts and has been deliberated, for example, by the Native Authority of Mwase in Kasungu. Suggestions have been put forward inviting the co-operation of the Government of Southern Rhodesia on the line that admission into that territory shall be denied to women from Nyasaland who are not provided with the proper papers, including a marriage certificate, and are not accompanying or joining their husbands.[6]

3. *Migration of Labourers into Nyasaland*

Temporary migration into Nyasaland is so closely connected with permanent immigration that it was unavoidable frequently to mention the former when dealing with the latter. But information about temporary migration, at least for 1929–41, is much more detailed, and I shall discuss it here more fully by itself.

to the counts the number of Nguru increased between 1921 and 1931 by 114,840. Assuming a yearly natural increase of 1 per cent., net immigration amounted to about 9,700 per year. From 1931 to 1945 the total increase was 144,022. Allowing again for a similar natural increase, net immigration amounted to about 7,200. But the 1945 figure (379,638 Nguru) excludes absentees.

[1] *Census Report 1921*, p. 7.

[2] See *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 7; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 48. As regards such emigration to Northern Rhodesia see pp. 424, 426–31 above.

[3] Ibid. *1935*, p. 43.

[4] Kasungu is a District of the Northern Province.

[5] Ibid. *1939*, p. 38. The total population of the Mzimba District was estimated in 1939 at 150,000 (see ibid., p. 52).

[6] Ibid. *1936*, p. 48. See also ibid. *1939*, p. 44: '. . . the Atonga of West Nyasa show the utmost zeal in preventing the emigration of their women for immoral purposes . . . .' See, finally, *Report of the Labour Department of the Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 7: 'The Tonga Tribal Council refuse to allow any but married women to emigrate, and then only when they proceed to join their husbands abroad.'

On 27 March 1929 there was taken a Native Labour Census 'with the object of obtaining statistics of reasonable accuracy to assist the administration in dealing with labour and economic problems generally'. The figures, furnished by European and Asiatic employers, lacked uniformity. 'There is evidence that at the census of March, 1929, certain employers returned the number of labourers actually employed, while others returned the number of natives on their labour rolls.'[1] The total number of male labourers thus returned was 83,331, of whom 10,553 or 13 per cent. were 'temporary alien field labourers'. A second labour census taken on 15 January 1930 revealed that 72,565 male natives were on the labour rolls of European and Asiatic employers on that date, including 6,768 or 9 per cent. 'temporary alien field labourers', and that the number of male natives actually at work was 58,120.[2] The report on the second census states that 'for comparative purposes it will probably be more accurate ... to take the mean of the totals shown' at this census, i.e. the mean of 72,565 and 58,120.

This mean shows that there were approximately 20,000 (or 23 per cent.) less natives employed in January, 1930, than in March, 1929, and it is common knowledge that even at the latter date the number of natives employed was considerably below the average. The period of acute depression through which the Protectorate is now passing is betrayed by these figures in no uncertain fashion, particularly when it is remembered that the general demand for labour is greater in January than in March.[3]

Thus the decrease in the number of alien field labourers employed was even larger than indicated by the returns (10,553 and 6,768), and it may well be that the number of alien field labourers on the labour rolls of European and Asiatic employers had been in January 1929 twice as high as in January 1930. A third census taken in August 1930 showed that 73,148 male natives were on such labour rolls, of whom 4,521 were 'temporary alien field labourers', and that the number of male natives actually at work numbered 56,665. The census 'was taken in August in order to reflect labour statistics taken in the non-planting season as against those taken at a time when agricultural labour is in greatest demand'.[4] It appeared that while the total number of natives at work was practically

[1] *Report on Native Labour Census Jan. 1930*, p. 1. 'The Native Labour Census Rules, 1928', issued on 20 Dec. (Government Notice No. 327 of 1928, *The Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 31 Dec. 1928), were in fact somewhat ambiguous, as they merely asked for the number of native labourers employed on census date. 'The Native Labour Census Rules, 1929', issued on 10 Oct. (Government Notice No. 40, reprinted in *Orders in Council, Proclamations, &c. 1929*, p. 71), were more precise; they asked for the number of native labourers on the labour roll on census date and also for the number of native labourers actually at work on census date.

[2] See *Report on Native Labour Census Jan. 1930*, pp. 4, 6. See also *Medical Report 1933*, p. 19: 'Of the number of males employed in January, 1930, 6,768 were alien labourers from Portuguese territory and employed on, in the main, plantations in the Cholo-Mlanje area ....'

It may be mentioned incidentally that the Report on the Census by mistake overstated the decline in alien labour when it said (p. 1): 'The reduction since the last labour census in alien natives employed represents 64 per cent., as against the general reduction of 23 per cent.' The number of alien natives was not reduced *by* 64 per cent., but *to* 64 per cent. The reduction in alien natives actually represents 36 per cent. as against the general reduction of 23 per cent.

[3] *Report on Native Labour Census Jan. 1930*, p. 1.

[4] Ibid. *Aug. 1930*, p. 1.

the same in August as in January 1930, the number of aliens had declined by one-third (2,247). But this decrease 'can be directly attributed to the decrease at this time of the year of alien Anguru temporary labour on the Mlanje tea estates'.[1] Unfortunately, these labour censuses were discontinued, and we must resort for subsequent years to the scanty and little-reliable data given incidentally in the various official reports.

1931. Northern Railway Extension. . . . The labour employed by contractors was voluntarily obtained and averaged about 16,000 men a month over the period May to November. It is estimated that of this number one tenth were from Portuguese territory . . . .[2]

Some 900 Nyasaland natives were employed as at the 31st December on work connected with the construction of the new bridge over the Zambezi and that number may be taken as slightly above the average for the earlier months of the year. The average number of Portuguese natives employed was about 3,000 a month. The higher average of Portuguese natives is accounted for by the fact that the bridge site and both approaches are in Portuguese territory.[3]

1932. The number of Nyasaland natives employed on work in connection with the construction of the new bridge over the Zambezi numbered 1,259 on the 31st of December, as compared with approximately 900 at the end of 1931, and during the same period the number of Portuguese natives employed decreased by about 500.[4]

1933. It is interesting to read in the report of the District Commissioner, Dowa:

> 'It cannot be said that the local native has availed himself of the opportunities for work provided by the railway construction in this district. This opportunity was lost in 1932 when the earthworks were being thrown up. Wages were high (10*s*. per month and food) and the native was called upon to do a proportionate task, and this the local was either unwilling or unable to do. In consequence the contractors gradually eliminated the locals, and confined themselves to imported labour. There was only one European contractor on construction work in this district during the year under review. The wages paid were only 6*s*. per month and food, but the tasks were not decreased. The contractor, having had previous experience of the unreliability of the local native, imported practically the whole of his labour force of some 800 men. A few local natives both from this district and from Fort Manning were employed, but appeared to be unequal to the by no means inconsiderable tasks set, and were in consequence paid off.
>
> 'While this is no doubt regrettable, it is not surprising. The Nyasaland native when working near his village is surrounded by the distractions of home; it is not to be wondered at that "days off" are taken with irritating frequency. Imported labour, the majority of whom are "Anguru" from Portuguese Territory away from ties, have only one object in view, to complete their contract as quickly as possible, and return home with the money so earned.'

Statistics shew that the employment of alien labour is essential to the successful working of agricultural estates in the Protectorate. Local labour readily takes on the congenial, but rejects the heavier and less pleasant tasks. It has been demonstrated in the case of the tea estates, for instance, that about 80 per cent. of the labour on heavy manual work is done by aliens, whilst in the case of more congenial specialist work it is 80 per cent. which is in the hands of the local.[5]

1934. Large numbers of natives from Portuguese Territory immigrated into the Lower Shire District and worked for the local inhabitants during the cotton season and by no means all returned to their homes as the prospects of re-employment in

[1] Ibid. The number of alien field labourers in the Mlanje District decreased from 2,549 in January to 478 in August 1930 (see ibid., p. 7), labour for plucking not being required on the tea estates in August.

[2] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 58.

[3] Ibid., p. 59.

[4] Ibid. *1932*, p. 25.

[5] Ibid. *1933*, pp. 12–13.

1935 were good. As field workers they were welcomed, but they were not allowed to hoe gardens on their own account and attempts to do so were speedily reported.[1]

Estate owners usually prefer to use the immigrant Anguru labour for temporary field work and the supply from this source did not appear to have been diminished to any extent by the application of the provisions of the Native Hut and Poll Tax (Amendment No. 2) Ordinance 1934 and the Subsidiary Rules for Immigrant Natives which were designed to regulate the movements of immigrant labour and imposed upon them the obligation to contribute to the general revenue of the Protectorate at the rate of 6*d*. per month for every month worked in the territory.[2]

The control of the disease [smallpox] in this district [Mlanje] is especially difficult as a large quantity of alien labour crosses the border from Portuguese territory where the disease is endemic, looking for work on the tea plantations of Mlanje; as some indication of the numbers dealt with, from November 1st to the end of the year, 2,410 alien natives were vaccinated as they entered this territory.[3]

The Committee appointed in 1935 by the Governor to inquire into emigrant labour discusses first the question 'Why the Local Labourer is Emigrating while Foreign Labour Immigrates'.

In the 'boom' days after the war planters in the Southern Province recruited labour regularly from the Northern Province. Gradually increasing difficulty was found in obtaining this labour and immigrant Nguru labour from Portuguese East Africa took its place. This immigration reached alarming proportions and action was taken to limit it. But still there are thousands of Nguru labourers on estates in the Southern Province and many planters find that the Nguru works better than the local native.

Explanations of these developments are not hard to find. Firstly, with improved communications, it is almost as easy (if not easier in some districts), for the labourer from the Northern Province to go to Southern Rhodesia for work as it is for him to go to say, Cholo, and the wages in Southern Rhodesia are normally higher. Secondly it seems to be the universal experience that the African labourer, regarded purely as a machine to get work done in the shortest time, works far better away from his own home and country than in it.

Family obligations, the necessity for attending every village function, visiting funerals, weddings or the like, have still a strong hold on the worker who is working in the vicinity of his home. He will continually be taking 'off days': he is too much interested in his family and village life. When he goes afield to work—he goes *to work*. He wants to earn as much as he can as soon as he can. There are no family hindrances. Further, at the period of the year when the planters require most labour, local Natives are busy in their own gardens.[4]

The Committee states furthermore:

The Nguru have not only replaced local labour but they have created a serious land shortage: this in turn has led to the cultivation of hill and slopes and consequent deforestation and soil erosion. Steps have been taken to reduce this immigration but its effect has been serious.

The immigration has led not only to this land shortage and spoliation of land: the appearance of foreigners prepared to work harder, to be the 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' has induced a superiority complex among the local Natives. Where Nguru labour is available Native public opinion appears to frown on manual labour for wages. The more enterprising Native actually employs Nguru labour: the less enterprising would apparently prefer to default in tax payment—or, if necessary, migrate, rather than work.[5]

[1] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1934*, p. 9.
[2] Ibid., p. 15.
[3] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 18.
[4] *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 20.
[5] Ibid., p. 23.

The Committee submitted to the District Commissioners in July 1935 a Questionnaire which yielded the following answers to questions regarding temporary immigration:[1]

District	*Question 18 (b)* *Is it necessary to import alien labour into your District because of these natives?*[1]	*Question 27 (a)* *If there is no surplus of male labour to what extent, if any, is the local supply supplemented by immigration from outside the Protectorate?*	*Question 27 (b)* *If there is a surplus of male labour to what extent, if any, is it augmented by immigration from outside the Protectorate?*
Lower Shire	No.	Large numbers of Anguru enter each year in search of temporary employment: very few allowed to remain.	See reply to 27 (*a*).
Chikwawa	No.	Some Anguru work for natives planting cotton for short periods.	No surplus.
Central Shire	One estate at one time imported 20 Anguru.	A few P. E. A. men enter to work in cotton fields.	See reply to 27 (*a*).
Cholo	Yes, to some extent during the rains.	Some 5,000 Anguru came over annually to the Tea estates, especially in rains when locals engaged in gardens.	"
Mlanje	Alien labour used by estate owners, who prefer it.	Surplus due to use of immigrant labour.	"
Blantyre	Alien labour imported but more because of wages, etc.	Does not apply.	To a considerable extent by Nguru immigrants, specially on private estates.
Chiradzulu	Not because of (*a*) but immigrant Anguru work better.	—	Nearly all plantation labour consists of immigrant Anguru.
Zomba	Not at present time.	—	Not augmented to any extent: during rains some Anguru from P. E. A. signed on: they are said to accept low wages.
Upper Shire	One planter tries to import Anguru.	—	—
South Nyasa	No.	No immigrant labour in this district.	No immigrant labour in this district.
Ncheu	Not known.	—	There are a few natives from P. E. A.
Dedza	No, but soon may be.	No immigrant labour.	Lake plain people are occupied in cotton growing.
Fort Manning	No.	—	Negligible—a few from Fort Jameson.
Lilongwe	No.	Not applicable.	Not augmented.
Dowa	No, not because of 18(*a*), but see Ch. VI of Report on Native Affairs 1933.[2]	—	Negligible.
Kota-Kota	No.	—	Not at all.
Kasungu	No.	—	—
Mzimba	No.	But little immigration and none to work.	See reply to 27(*a*).
West Nyasa	Question does not arise—small amount of employment.	—	No appreciable immigration.
North Nyasa	No.	—	None.

[1] Refers to Question 18(*a*) 'Do you consider there is, or have you any evidence of, an increasing tendency for natives to rely on their wives for their maintenance and not undertake a proper proportion of the work devolving upon them?'

[2] See p. 545 above.

[1] See ibid., pp. 102, 112–13.

Subsequent official reports contain the following comments:

1935. In the Mlanje District there was no shortage of labour and it was estimated that 6,000 immigrants were employed on the tea estates and in working for other natives, increasing numbers of whom are becoming peasant producers assisted by their labourers and their families.[1]

The results of the tax on immigrant labour instituted in 1934 proved to be disappointing and it is estimated that only about one quarter of the total amount which should have been derived from this source was received. The failure is attributed to the difficulty of discriminating between immigrant and Nyasaland natives owing to the absence of any reliable system of identification and to the lack of co-operation on the part of certain employers. The checking of huts and census records continued unceasingly despite the handicap of lack of European staff from which many Districts suffered.[2]

1936.[3] The re-opening of some of the old sisal estates in the Lower Shire District has provided fresh opportunity for work but the labour is hard and the local people do not find it attractive so that immigrant Portuguese natives have been chiefly employed.[4]

A survey made in 1937 showed that in addition to 49,000 male wage-earners in Nyasaland there were 'over 7,000 immigrant Anguru labourers chiefly on tea estates'.[5]

Reports of the Provincial Administration for 1938 and 1939 stated:

1938. . . . Cholo . . . much of the labour comes from Portuguese East Africa but this year it did not come so freely. . . .[6]

As a result of this emigration [to the Lupa Goldfields], a shortage of labour has been experienced for the first time in the [Northern] Province . . . . In the Ncheu District the eleven estates employing paid labour recruit the majority of their men from Portuguese territory.[7]

1939. In Cholo an enquiry in November revealed that 60 per cent. of the labour was from outside the district and the total supply was still 28 per cent. below the optimum demand. The supply of cheap Anguru 'hoeing' labour from Portuguese East Africa was short . . . .[8]

Hitherto those engaged in agriculture have relied for their normal labour supply on a population whose institutions have been those appropriate to a subsistence

[1] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1935*, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 12. See also the statement of the Governor in the Legislative Council, 19 Oct. 1936: 'With regard to the report of the [Finance] Committee I am inclined to agree with regard to the tax on alien labourers that nothing really satisfactory can be achieved until we know from whom the tax ought to be collected and it seems to me that we shall not know this until we have a more efficient system of registration' (*Summary of the Proceedings*, 19 and 20 Oct. 1936, p. 16; see also ibid., p. 14).

See, finally, Eric Smith, *Report on the Direct Taxation of Natives in the Nyasaland Protectorate* (dated 19 Aug. 1937), pp. 27–8:

'The imposition of this tax was unpopular with both employers and employees, and exceptional difficulties have been associated with the collection. As there is no internal registration, and as all Natives seeking work leave their Hut Tax receipts at home with their wives, evasion of the tax became widespread, particularly as many employers contend that the imposition of the tax caused a marked falling off in the number of Nguru labourers applying for work.

'Of the important industries in this country, tea is the sole surviving European one, and the free flow of this casual Nguru labour is vital to its interests. . . . I submit that Government should foster the interests of the tea industry, and put nothing in its way in the form of a tax upon casual labour, the outcome of which may deter a number from coming over in search of work.

'I recommend that the Hut and Poll Tax (Amendment No. 2) Ordinance, 1934, be repealed.'

[3] See also 'Immigration', p. 541 above.

[4] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 13.

[5] Bell Commission, *Report*, p. 13.

[6] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1938*, p. 17.

[7] Ibid., p. 52.

[8] Ibid. *1939*, p. 12.

economy and in some cases have met extra seasonal requirements by employing casual immigrants from Portuguese territory. But the marked falling-off of these immigrants has caused anxiety to many employers as to the future . . . .[1]

The Report of the Labour Department for 1941 said:

It is estimated that some 55,000 adult males, excluding casual labour from Portuguese East Africa and youths of under taxpaying age were in paid employment in the Protectorate during the year 1941. Of this number approximately 20,000 have been employed on the tea estates and some 3,000 on the tobacco estates in the Southern Highlands. About 47 per cent. of those employed on the tea estates are local villagers (including 3 per cent. estate tenants), 27 per cent. are from other districts of the Protectorate, and 25 per cent. seasonal workers from Portuguese East Africa.[2] On the tobacco estates about 50 per cent. of the labour is drawn from estate tenants, 14 per cent. from contiguous villages, 26 per cent. from other districts of the Protectorate, and 10 per cent. are seasonal workers from Portuguese East Africa.

. . . The seasonal immigrant from Portuguese East Africa comes over for a few months only and demands no more than temporary shelter.[3]

Finally, the Memorandum on Native Policy of the Native Welfare Committee of January 1939 contains the following interesting statement:

At present many of the wealthier natives occupy more land than the average individual holding, and cultivate cash crops by means of paid and frequently immigrant Anguru labour.[4]

All that can be said is that the total number of alien labourers in European and Asiatic employment may have been as high as 15,000 at the beginning of 1929, that it fluctuated a great deal—within the year and also from year to year—and that in addition an unknown number of alien labourers was employed by native peasants.

4. *Migration of Labourers from Nyasaland*

Migration of labourers to other countries has affected on the whole the composition of the population of Nyasaland in a similar manner as migration of labourers from Northern Rhodesia has affected the composition of the population of that Territory. But a comparison of the history of migration shows some marked differences. Before the First World War migration was apparently smaller from Nyasaland than from Northern Rhodesia, though already then the population of the former Territory was probably larger. In the course of the war Nyasaland seems to have taken the lead, and, partly owing to the development of the copper mines in Northern Rhodesia since 1925, which provided employment for Northern Rhodesians and attracted also some Nyasalanders, migration from Nyasaland has constantly exceeded migration from Northern Rhodesia. As to the available information concerning migration, it was until 1935 for

[1] *Report of the Labour Department 1939*, p. 7. See also ibid. *1941*, p. 2.

[2] See also Margaret Read, 'Migrant Labour in Africa' (1942), p. 613: '. . . the European tea estates have to rely largely on immigrant labour from Portuguese East Africa, because the standard of living in Nyasaland villages is such that the wages offered do not attract local labour'.

[3] *Report of the Labour Department 1941*, pp. 3–4.

[4] Native Welfare Committee, *Memorandum on Native Policy*, p. 19.

Nyasaland at least as inadequate as for Northern Rhodesia, but since then it has improved considerably in Nyasaland.

Migration up to 1935. As far back as fifty-five years ago the attention of the British South Africa Company had been called to the possibility of using Nyasaland labour for the industrial development of Southern Rhodesia. In a report presented to the Directors the Masailand explorer Joseph Thomson summarized his opinion as follows:

> Thus on the score of labour it may be safely said that the whole of Nyasaland is most admirably endowed and most thoroughly prepared to meet any future development due to European enterprise. In this respect I know no other place in Africa so thoroughly well supplied with eager industrious men as yet unspoiled by gin and a too-paternal government.[1]

Margaret Read, writing in 1942, said:

> The chief export of Nyasaland in the past fifty years has been men. Male labour began to emigrate in the 'nineties to the port of Beira, to the Rhodesian Railway, to the Belgian copper mines and the Rand Gold Mines, to farms and plantations from Tanganyika to the Cape, and even, as soldiers in the King's African Rifles, to Mauritius, Ashanti, and Somaliland. Early Government and mission reports show that, already in 1902, 3,000 to 4,000 Nyasaland Africans were going annually to Southern Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa to work in the ports and on the railways, and by 1904 the number was said to be over 10,000. In 1903 recruitment began for the Rand Mines, and in that year just under 1,000 went, and in the two following years over 1,700.[2]

Some provisions for safeguarding the interests of emigrant labourers were made shortly after the foundation of the Protectorate through the 'Queen's Regulations dealing with the Engagement of Native Labour in the British Central Africa Protectorate'[3] of 15 January 1894,[4] but the earliest evidence that such migration occurred on a large scale is to be found in the enactment of 'The British Central Africa Native Labour Ordinance, 1904'[5] which showed great concern about the effects of migra-

[1] British South Africa Company, *Report 1889–92*, p. 37.

[2] Read, p. 606.

[3] *British Central Africa Gazette*, 1 Feb. 1894, reprinted in *Report on Emigrant Labour*, pp. 75–7.

[4] Some years later emigration seems to have been forbidden temporarily by Sir Alfred Sharpe. See Lionel Decle, 'The Development of our British African Empire', p. 324: 'When the scarcity of labour in the South caused recruiting agents to enlist natives from the interior he saw the disastrous results which befell those natives who left their country to go and work in the gold mines; he saw them return after two years' work, during which they had earned what ought to have made them rich men for life; and yet all they brought back with them was a miscellaneous collection of useless articles. They had learnt to throw money away senselessly, and not one of them had saved any of his earnings. Most of them in addition were broken in health, because the Central African native cannot stand work underground—all considerations which, by the way, make Chinese labour the only solution to the difficulty—what is more the natives who had worked in the mines returned with absurd ideas about wages, demanding to be paid in Nyasaland the same salaries as they had received in the South, not realising that their earnings in the mines were in proportion with the cost of necessaries there. In consequence, Sir Alfred Sharpe wisely prohibited the natives of British Central Africa to leave their country, since to do so was only harmful to them and equally harmful to their native land.' The problem of labour migration from Nyasaland and neighbouring territories to South Africa was discussed in detail by Sir Harry Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate* (1902), vol. i, pp. 282–6.

[5] No. 4 of 1904 (30 Nov.), *British Central Africa Gazette*, 30 Nov. 1904, reprinted in *Report on Emigrant Labour*, pp. 80–4.

tion upon the well-being of the relatives left behind and upon public revenue.[1]

This Ordinance was repealed and replaced by the Employment of Natives Ordinance, 1909,[2] which prohibited the recruiting of natives in Nyasaland for service outside the Protectorate.[3] But this embargo was not in the original Bill. In introducing it in the Legislative Council[4] in November 1909 the Governor declared:[5]

> With regard to natives leaving the Protectorate, the policy of this Government remains the same as it has been in the past, namely that the large stream of native labourers who make their way out of Nyasaland to Southern Rhodesia and other territories South of Zambesi should be regulated by Government, in order that the number may be controlled and that arrangements may be made for those who desire to go whereby their journey can be carried out in comfort, they may go under definite conditions, they may return to the country at the end of their service and may bring back with them a proportion of the money earned in the shape of deferred pay.

In the subsequent debate the Deputy Governor stated that 1,300 natives had recently left for the Mines of the Transvaal.

> 3,000 was the limit fixed by the Secretary of State, and he was informed that the full number had volunteered.
>
> One thousand came from South Nyasa District. The remainder were Natives from Mlanje, Chikala, Liwonde, Ncheu, Nyasa, Dedza, Blantyre and Zomba.[6]

He stated furthermore, 'That the number known to have left the Protectorate in the last six months (May to October inclusive) for Southern Rhodesia under Government supervision was 3,000. A further 800 were now leaving.'[7]

As to the future great fear was expressed by the Senior Unofficial Member of the Council that the clause which authorized the Governor to allow recruiting upon licence would enable the South African Colonies to draw an excessive number of natives from Nyasaland.

[1] See in particular clause 14:

'A Native of the Protectorate desiring to leave the Protectorate in search of employment, or under a contract of service, or for any purpose, may do so upon obtaining from the Magistrate of the District in which he resides a Pass in the form prescribed in the Schedule A to this Ordinance, or in any form which the Commissioner may duly substitute therefor. Before issuing such Pass the Magistrate shall satisfy himself

(*a*) That the native has made, or intends to make satisfactory provision during his absence for the maintenance of his wife or wives, children and other persons whom he is legally bound to support.

(*b*) That he has made, or intends to make provision for the payment of any hut tax legally due by him.

(*c*) That he is not leaving the Protectorate to evade satisfaction of his just debts or other legal obligations, or in contravention of the provisions of this Ordinance.'

[2] No. 6 of 1909 (5 Nov.), *Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 30 Nov. 1909, reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate in Force 1913*, pp. 491–501. The Ordinance came into force on 1 Mar. 1910.

[3] 'Recruiting for the Rand was stopped in 1907 owing to the large number of deaths' (Read, p. 606).

[4] The Ordinance of 1904 had been enacted by the Commissioner for the British Central Africa Protectorate. The Legislative Council was established in 1907.

[5] 'Extracts from the Summary of the Proceedings of the Fourth Session of the Legislative Council held at Zomba on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th of November, 1909', *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 85.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ibid., p. 86.

In the report of the British South Africa Company two years ago it was openly declared that the natives in Nyasaland afforded an enormous labour supply, the whole of which was available for Southern Rhodesia.

It seems to him that this was what had to be fought against, and so long as this clause remained as it stood he saw in it a means by which the Governments of the South would find measures to drain more and more of the labour of the Protectorate to the South. While this policy remained unaltered the attitude of the Protectorate would become more and more to get labour to hire out to the South African Colonies, which would grow to such an extent that practically the native himself would cease to take interest in the Protectorate.

He called attention to the state of affairs in the Atonga country where hardly an able-bodied man would be found—only old men, women and children, all the men having left for South Africa.[1]

He did not think one had any right to put any obstacles in their [the natives'] way if they wished to go, but of what he was in terror was that this kind of emigration would be looked upon by the Colonies of South Africa in the light that a very large source of labour could be drawn from the Protectorate, and if this were the case the Colonies would use every possible means by which to secure that labour. His Excellency had said the labour emigration from this country was growing. If it grew and the three South African Colonies saw that they had a stock of labour from which they could draw still further, they would use every possible means both by this Government and the Government at home for more of this Protectorate's labourers to be drawn to the South. His feeling in regard to this question was that the Government should, by proper regulating, restrain and not encourage it. Let it be clearly understood that this country was not to be recognised as a country from which labour could be provided for the Colonies in South Africa. His objection to Clause 23 was that there was nothing in it by which it was made expressly clear that permits would not be given.[2]

The Governor apparently realized that at least for Southern Rhodesia, whereto 'there was already an existing stream of independent labour'[3] the prohibition of recruiting licences would not make much difference, but since the Senior Unofficial Member 'obviously voiced the unofficial opinion',[4] he yielded, and the Ordinance, as enacted, provided that 'no licence shall be issued to recruit natives for service outside the Protectorate'. The Committee appointed in 1935 to inquire into Emigrant Labour summarized the situation as follows:

Prior to 1909 recruiting of Nyasaland Natives for employment abroad was permitted: legislation ensured that adequate safeguards existed for recruited labour.

The Ordinance of 1909 prohibited recruiting: between the date of its enactment and the end of 1934 no Nyasaland labour was recruited or engaged inside the Protectorate for work abroad. (The one exception was in connection with the construction of the railway).[5]

The Committee may have been right in stating that since 1909 no Nyasaland labour was recruited or engaged *inside the Protectorate* for work abroad, but if it had consulted the reports of the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau it would have realized that the question *where* Nyasaland

[1] *Report on Emigrant Labour*, pp. 87–8.
[2] Ibid., p. 89. [3] Ibid., p. 88. [4] Ibid., p. 11.
[5] Ibid., p. 61. The exception was made in the case of the Trans-Zambesia Railway Company, the Ordinance of 1909 having stated explicitly that employment of natives by this Company was not to be deemed employment outside the Protectorate

labour was recruited was quite irrelevant.[1] This Bureau, to be sure, related that 'Organised Recruiting in Nyasaland ceased in 1910', but it gave at the same time the following figures of Natives recruited by it from Nyasaland:[2]

1908	*1909*	*1910*	*1911*	*1912*	*1913*	*1914*	*1915*	*1916*
775	2,848	4,327	443	2,403	7,062	4,045	2,163	964

1917	*1918*	*1919*	*1920*	*1921*	*1922*	*1923*	*1924*	*1925*
393	129	890	1,635	547	88	468	147	123

Nothing about the total amount of labour migration to Southern Rhodesia can be inferred from either these figures or those given to the Legislative Council. But the 1911 census of Southern Rhodesia revealed that about 5,000 Nyasaland natives were then employed on mines while there were 7,629 (7,281 male, 348 female) Nyasaland 'Natives enumerated on Householders' Forms, travelling by Rail or Coach, and living in Urban Localities'. The total of 12,600 is stated to represent the number of Nyasaland natives 'living in Southern Rhodesia at 7th May, 1911'.[3] Since probably the bulk of Nyasaland native labourers staying abroad lived in Southern Rhodesia,[4] the total number of native labourers abroad possibly did not exceed 20,000. Very little was known about the number of migrants during the following decade. The numbers of Nyasaland natives recruited by the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau were high in some years, particularly in 1913,[5] but dropped to almost nil in 1918. The amount of recruiting, however, affected very little the number of Nyasaland natives employed on the Southern Rhodesia mines. While only 2,654 were recruited in 1918–20, of whom, of course, many had returned by the end of 1920, the number of Nyasaland natives on those mines, which on 30 June 1919 was only 7,411, jumped to 14,708 on 31 December 1920. As to migration of Nyasaland natives in general the Colonial Reports for 1920–2 stated:

> 1920. . . . 3,533 natives returned while 6,099 left. . . . Natives leave the Protectorate in large numbers for South Africa, where more highly paid work than they

[1] The Committee mentioned (p. 28) that 'from time to time since 1909 recruiting agencies have been established just over the Nyasaland border in Portuguese East Africa and Northern Rhodesia which have recruited Nyasaland labour for work chiefly on the mines'. But this reference certainly did not cover the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau, which was a semi-public organization operating uninterruptedly for decades.

[2] See Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, *Report 1917*, p. 44; *1925*, p. 40.

[3] See Southern Rhodesia, *Census Report 1911*, pp. 24, 38. But see also p. 445 above.

[4] To judge from the Proceedings of the Legislative Council the only numerically important migration was that to Southern Rhodesia and the Transvaal; there was no migration to Northern Rhodesia, but some migration to German East Africa concerning which the Governor said: 'A form of emigration which distinctly needed legislation . . . was the emigration of natives to German Territory in search of railway work. There were many dangers connected with this form of emigration as the natives went into sleeping sickness country' (*Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 88).

[5] In this year not fewer than 7,062 or 54 per cent. of the 13,563 labourers distributed by the Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau were natives of Nyasaland.

are able to find locally attracts them.[1] They are there employed principally in mining, agricultural, and domestic work.[2]

During 1920, an average number of 14,000 Nyasaland natives was employed on the Rhodesian mines. A number were engaged also for the construction of the Trans-Zambesi railway. It is estimated that at least 20,000 adult males are employed annually outside the Protectorate.[3]

1921. Of natives of Nyasaland the numbers recorded at stations of entry and exit were 6,419 inwards and 7,194 outwards, but it must be remembered that considerable numbers annually leave the Protectorate by various routes for employment in the Union of South Africa, Rhodesia, Portuguese East Africa and the mines at Katangas in the Belgian Congo. It is impossible to state numbers with any degree of accuracy, but the employment does not generally extend over a period of twelve months and it is estimated that the numbers outwards are about balanced by the numbers who return in any given period. The reports of the Rhodesia Mining Bureau shew that an average of about 12,500 described as Nyasaland natives were so employed during 1921.[4]

1922. As regards natives, it is only possible to say that 4,758 left and 5,607 entered through stations of entry, but many others crossed the borders without being recorded. There is a constant stream of natives to Southern Rhodesia, where they seek employment on farms and in mines and, for the most part, return home after an absence of a year or so.[5]

The Administration evidently had no idea of the large number of natives employed outside the Protectorate. According to the Southern Rhodesia census of 3 May 1921 the number of Nyasaland male 'natives actually at work, or present in the towns, on Census day' was 44,702, the number of females being 3,172.[6] Since in addition considerable numbers had gone to the Union of South Africa, Portuguese East Africa, and the Belgian Congo the total number of adult males employed outside the Protectorate cannot have been less than 60,000 and may have been much larger.

The situation apparently changed little in the intercensal period 1921–26. The number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia was shown by the 1926 census to be 43,169 (43,020 males and 149 females).[7] The apparent slight decrease for men and the enormous decline for women since 1921 was due to the fact that the scope of inquiry had been wider in 1921. Nor is there any indication that the number of Nyasaland natives working in other countries differed essentially from what it had been five years earlier.

[1] See also *Report of a Commission Appointed to Enquire into Public Revenue and Expenditure* (1924), p. 10: '. . . a very considerable proportion of the native tax is paid with money sent or brought into the country by natives who have left it to work for higher wages elsewhere. The Provincial Commissioner of the Central Province estimates that as much as 40% of the taxes in his province are paid with money earned outside. We are without figures as to the Northern Province but the proportion may be taken to be high there also where opportunities for local work are so very few. In the Southern Province the proportion is probably negligible.' (At that time the Central Province comprised six and the Northern Province four of the ten Districts which from 1931 on constituted the Northern Province.) See furthermore *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 103: 'In order to obtain money to pay the tax and to buy necessaries, it is alleged that approximately 30,000 Nyasaland natives leave the Protectorate every year to seek work in other territories.'

[2] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1920*, p. 7.

[3] Ibid., pp. 8–9. [4] Ibid. *1921*, p. 6. [5] Ibid. *1922*, p. 6.

[6] See Southern Rhodesia, *Final Report regarding the Census 3rd May 1921*, pp. 6, 19.

[7] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report regarding the Census 4th May 1926*, Part III, p. 47.

But the Administration of Nyasaland was still of the opinion that the number of migrant labourers was not great. In connexion with the 1926 count an attempt had been made 'to keep an account of natives absent in Rhodesia, and most of the Districts rendered returns'.

Lower Shire	*Chikwawa*	*Central Shire*	*Cholo*	*Mlanje*	*Blantyre*	*Chiradzulu*	*Zomba*	*Upper Shire*	*South Nyasa*	*Total S. Prov.*
—	—	4	—	—	221	30	87	360	1,172	1,874

Nchau	*Dedza*	*Lilongwe*	*Fort Manning*	*Dowa*	*Kota Kota*	*Kasungu*	*Mombera*	*West Nyasa*	*North Nyasa*	*Total N. Prov.*
1,563	2,219	4,467	246	4,308	—	—	3,363	2,300	—	18,466

It appears that in 6 of the 10 Districts of the Southern Province 1,874 were absent in Rhodesia and in 7 of the 10 Districts of the Northern Province 18,466. The Superintendent of the Census estimated the number of absentees from the three Northern Districts which had made no returns at 5,101, 'thus bringing the grand total for the Protectorate to 25,441'.

In addition to these, numbers of natives from the north proceed to the Belgian Congo in search of work, and from all parts of the Protectorate to Portuguese East Africa, Tanganyika and Kenya. Probably the number of trained natives of all descriptions who seek their fortune abroad is not generally realised. The Census returns for Southern Rhodesia indicate about 60,000 as the number of Nyasaland natives living there, but that figure need not be taken too seriously. It undoubtedly includes a great number of natives from Northern Rhodesia and a far greater number of natives from Portuguese Nyasaland who prefer to give their tribe as Blantyre or Nyasa rather than endeavour to enter into lengthy explanations of less well-known domiciles in their own countries. The 60,000 also includes a considerable number of natives who never intend to return to Nyasaland and have lost all connection with it, but who nevertheless have not formally adopted a Rhodesian domicile. It is probably safe to put the number of absentees at about 30,000.[1]

As a matter of fact the Census returns for Southern Rhodesia did not 'indicate about 60,000 as the number of Nyasaland natives living there'. They merely showed that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia was 43,169. This figure includes, of course, natives who have been absent for so long a time from Nyasaland that they are no more counted as absentees in the Protectorate, and it includes also non-taxable juveniles who probably were likewise not included in the Nyasaland records. But the difference between 43,000 and 25,000 is too great to be explainable by these two factors alone. There are in fact reasons to think that the estimate of 25,441 (taxable) absentees in Rhodesia was an understatement. The Superintendent of Census accepts 702 as the total number of absentees from 9 of the 10 Districts in the Southern Province. Migration from the Southern Districts into Rhodesia was certainly much smaller than from the Northern Districts, but it was by no means negligible.[2] How large this migration actually was it is impossible to tell, and it is also impossible to tell whether the Superintendent's estimate for the

[1] *Census Report 1926*, p. xxviii.

[2] See *Report on Emigrant Labour*, pp. 90, 99.

three Northern Districts which made no return was accurate. But the fact that the total number of Nyasaland 'absentees' in Rhodesia recorded in the seven other Northern Districts and in South Nyasa was 19,638 is, it seems to me, quite reconcilable with the result of the Southern Rhodesia census that the total number of natives originating from the twenty Districts of Nyasaland and employed in Southern Rhodesia was 43,169. As to the absentees working in other countries than Rhodesia, the Superintendent of Census seems to have estimated them at about 4,000 or 5,000. I should say that a guess of 12,000 or 15,000 would have been nearer the truth.

TABLE 4. *Nyasaland Natives entering Southern Rhodesia in Search of Work, 1925–43*[1]

Year	Adults		Juveniles	Total
	Original Registrations	*Re-entrants*		
1925	..	..	..	16,974
1926	..	..	..	16,738
1927	13,078	4,209	2,597	19,884
1928	14,769	5,004	2,257	22,030
1929	16,267	4,553	2,683	23,503
1930	18,167	4,320	2,736	25,223
1931	12,470	2,549	1,849	16,868
1932	8,682	1,417	1,327	11,426
1933	19,907	3,150	3,004	26,061
1934	34,986	4,854	4,127	43,967
1935	30,637	2,744	4,121	37,502
1936	23,964	1,672	3,906	29,542
1937	35,319	2,128	5,161	42,608
1938	30,366	1,260	1,951	33,577
1939	24,863	2,794	872	28,529
1940	16,692	1,350	728	18,770
1943	18,881	2,427	351	21,659

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner 1925*, p. 4; *1926*, p. 8; *1927*, p. 5; *1928*, p. 6; *1929*, p. 8; *1930*, p. 8; *1931*, p. 8; *1932*, p. 11; *1933*, p. 8; *1934*, p. 6; *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 7; *1937*, p. 8; *1938*, p. 8; *1939*, p. 6; *1940*, p. 8; Southern Rhodesia, *Report of Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration 1943*, p. 2. The totals given in the 1943 Report (ibid.) for 'Native Immigrants entering Southern Rhodesia' from Nyasaland in 1930–43 differ for most years from those given above. They read 25,223, 16,741, 11,582, 27,031, 43,976, 36,596, 29,868, 42,598, 33,580, 28,496, 18,771, 27,054, 17,734, and 21,659.

In the second half of the 1920s migration of labourers seems to have increased conspicuously.[1] The number of Nyasaland natives recorded as entering Southern Rhodesia in search of work rose from 16,738 in 1926 to 25,223 in 1930. The average number of Nyasaland natives employed on the Southern Rhodesia mines rose from 13,422 in 1926 to 15,632 in 1930,

[1] This development had not been expected; see *Census Report 1926*, p. xi: 'As the production of economic crops by natives extends over the Protectorate on an ever increasing scale, and as the pay and conditions of labour in Nyasaland gradually improve, it may be anticipated that the stream of emigration will gradually diminish in intensity.' (As to the gradual improvement of pay there seems to have been a limit. In 1934 by far the largest employer of labour in the Northern Province, the Public Works Department, reduced the labourer's rate of pay from 4*d*. to 3*d*. a day; see p. 560 below.)

and the total number of male Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia rose from 43,020 on census date 1926 to 49,487 on census date 1931.[1] The number of Nyasaland natives employed on Northern Rhodesia mines, which had been practically nil in 1926,[2] rose to 3,944 on 31 December 1930.[3] The Administration apparently once suspected that the number of natives working abroad might be larger than it had thought it was in earlier years, since the Colonial Report for 1929 said that 'any number between 30,000 and 60,000 are working outside the Protectorate, chiefly in the Rhodesias and the Union of South Africa'.[4] But the Report upon Native Affairs for 1931 reverted to the former estimates:

> It is not possible to state with any accuracy the numbers of Nyasaland natives who are away from their homes and at work in places outside the Protectorate. It is probable however that from 30,000 to 40,000 are away at one time. They go away and work for a year, or perhaps even two or three years, after which they return to their homes and after a period of rest, emigrate again. Emigration is greatest from the Northern Province and its flow is principally to the mines in Southern and Northern Rhodesia and to a lesser extent to Congo Belge and Tanganyika.[5]
>
> Natives employed outside the Protectorate probably number not less than 30,000.[6]

Since on census date 1931 not fewer than 54,000 Nyasaland natives were employed in the Rhodesias alone and since more or less considerable numbers were employed in the Union of South Africa, in the Belgian Congo, in Tanganyika, and in Portuguese East Africa, the total number of natives employed outside the Protectorate then undoubtedly exceeded 75,000.

By the time the census was taken the economic crisis had already slightly reduced the number of Nyasaland natives employed abroad and the number decreased considerably for about one year more, but it then began to rise again and in the course of 1933 probably reached a higher level than it had ever attained before. Nor did the increase stop in 1933; it continued at great speed in 1934 and 1935, and, less rapidly, in 1936 and 1937. The number of Nyasaland natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines, which never before July 1933 had exceeded 16,000, was at the end of 1933–37 18,145, 23,189, 27,406, 29,751, and 31,136. According to the 1936 census the total number of male natives from Nyasaland employed

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report on the Census of Population, 1936*, p. 106.

[2] No figures are available for 1926; the average for 1927 was 544.

[3] See also p. 434 above.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1929*, p. 23.

[5] *Report upon Native Affairs 1931*, p. 8.

[6] Ibid., p. 56. The figure 30,000 seems to have been used all the time indiscriminately by Nyasaland officials dealing with emigrant labour. The East Africa Commission, which visited Nyasaland in September 1924, reported (p. 38): 'In Nyasaland we were informed that no less than 30,000 Nyasa boys engage in work outside Nyasaland every year . . . .' The Superintendent of the 1926 census put the number of natives temporarily absent on census date at about 30,000. The Superintendent of the 1931 census said likewise (p. 27) that 'not less than 30,000 are temporarily working outside the Protectorate'. The above quotation from the 1931 Report upon Native Affairs apparently implies that the *total* number of natives employed outside the Protectorate was estimated at probably not less than 30,000.

TABLE 5. *Nyasaland Natives employed on Southern Rhodesia Mines, January 1919 to December 1944*[1]

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Average
1919	7,216	7,261	7,296	7,305	7,244	7,411	7,736	8,422	8,625	9,177	9,303	10,370	8,114
1920	10,574	11,205	11,586	11,572	11,374	12,137	12,514	13,378	13,553	13,901	13,966	14,708	12,539
1921	14,457	14,360	14,081	14,305	13,486	13,891	13,478	13,586	13,281	12,678	13,571	14,151	13,777
1922	13,989	13,699	13,629	12,461	13,186	12,948	12,803	13,006	12,917	13,441	13,359	13,110	13,208
1923	13,133	13,003	12,853	12,751	12,629	12,563	12,741	13,017	12,817	12,981	13,084	13,144	12,893
1924	13,674	13,699	14,158	14,257	13,897	14,098	14,108	14,209	14,059	13,194	14,283	14,602	14,020
1925	13,996	13,717	13,679	13,648	13,363	12,773	12,555	12,303	12,515	12,777	13,237	13,244	13,151
1926	13,724	13,274	13,494	13,584	13,313	13,365	13,619	13,357	13,324	13,552	13,096	13,364	13,422
1927	13,128	12,878	13,237	12,982	12,979	12,082	12,253	12,906	12,658	13,069	12,719	13,101	12,833
1928	12,992	13,443	13,181	12,844	12,799	13,052	13,279	13,137	13,953	14,266	14,194	14,787	13,494
1929	14,812	15,133	14,855	14,992	14,171	14,399	15,094	15,248	15,432	16,072	15,912	15,751	15,156
1930	16,608	16,390	15,317	15,881	15,619	15,588	15,310	15,752	14,637	15,890	15,744	14,849	15,632
1931	15,269	15,001	14,693	14,747	14,241	13,545	13,139	12,568	12,633	12,106	12,106	12,614	13,555
1932	12,797	13,219	13,157	13,140	12,971	13,276	13,451	13,380	13,415	13,766	13,995	14,280	13,404
1933	14,473	14,911	15,033	15,051	15,311	15,771	16,056	16,910	17,307	17,787	17,744	18,145	16,208
1934	18,197	18,570	18,399	18,244	18,354	18,722	19,845	20,828	21,248	21,727	22,764	23,189	20,007
1935	23,642	24,126	24,090	24,275	24,619	25,114	25,381	26,267	26,761	27,508	27,795	27,406	25,582
1936	27,698	27,524	27,091	27,186	27,053	27,238	27,779	28,342	28,641	28,879	29,182	29,751	28,030
1937	29,961	29,659	29,379	28,616	28,411	28,323	28,559	29,651	30,120	30,315	30,786	31,136	29,576
1938	31,001	30,919	30,129	30,001	29,387	28,928	28,721	28,897	28,411	28,241	28,691	28,866	29,349
1939	28,310	27,911	27,826	27,467	27,398	27,656	28,023	28,240	29,084	28,836	28,739	29,292	28,232
1940	29,456	29,215	28,972	28,507	28,178	28,190	28,317	27,711	27,612	27,682	27,235	26,939	28,168
1941	27,136	26,661	26,598	26,299	25,781	25,559	25,580	25,841	26,307	26,373	26,519	26,783	26,286
1942	26,857	26,650	26,593	25,851	25,648	25,276	25,156	25,187	25,266	25,099	25,082	24,760	25,618
1943	24,583	24,312	23,922	23,465	22,937	23,116	22,857	22,758	22,597	22,866	22,814	23,386	23,301
1944	23,177	23,286	23,125	22,886	22,457	22,193	22,056	21,773	22,142	22,075	21,965	21,716	22,404

[1] See Rhodesia Chamber of Mines, *Report 1919*, p. 19; *1920*, p. 17, to *1930*, p. 17; *1931*, p. 9, to *1936*, p. 9; *1937*, p. 27; *1938*, p. 32; *1939*, p. 37; *1940*, p. 27; *1941*, p. 24; *1942*, p. 31; *1943*, p. 29; *1944*, p. 32. The yearly averages differ for some years from those given in Chapter 'Northern Rhodesia', Table 18 (col. 3).

TABLE 6. *Nyasaland Natives employed on Northern Rhodesia Mines, January 1930 to December 1938*[1]

Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
1930	1,680	1,976	2,034	1,873	2,323	2,504	2,438	2,756	3,080	3,181	3,329	3,944
1931	3,576	3,392	3,344	3,113	3,263	2,977	3,265	3,270	3,401	3,137	2,855	2,623
1932	2,273	2,015	1,897	1,583	1,476	1,391	1,301	1,238	1,140	1,122	1,132	1,126
1933	1,148	1,158	1,172	1,249	1,316	1,281	1,265	1,299	1,297	1,317	1,341	1,354
1934	1,407	1,428	1,461	1,479	1,471	1,447	1,474	1,470	1,464	1,496	1,496	1,457
1935	1,439	1,422	1,407	1,398	1,380	1,347	1,380	1,370	1,339	1,337	1,302	1,310
1936	1,281	1,269	1,273	1,254	1,235	1,237	1,228	1,221	1,206	1,183	1,168	1,208
1937	1,160	1,221	1,086	1,128	1,117	1,121	1,131	1,140	1,146	1,142	1,167	1,239
1938	1,168	1,179	1,141	1,099	1,103	1,150	1,190	1,182	1,226	1,246	1,258	1,274

[1] See Northern Rhodesia, *Mines Department Report 1930*, Schedule No. 4; *1931*, Schedule No. 4; *1932*, Schedule No. 4; *1933*, p. 20; *1934*, p. 19; *1935*, p. 20; *1936*, p. 18; *1937*, p. 28; *1938*, p. 28.

in Southern Rhodesia was 70,362,[1] or 20,875 more than on census date 1931.

Nothing indicates that the Administration before the end of 1935 had the slightest notion of the enormous amount of emigrant labour. But what is perhaps still more surprising is that, even if it grossly underestimated the numbers, it had not realized the grave dangers of such migration for the native community which stayed behind. The main reasons why the situation was not considered very serious probably were that this emigration brought considerable money into the Protectorate and that in spite of this emigration there was plenty of labour supply both for the Government and the planters. The first point was particularly stressed in the 1926 census report:[2]

> From the general point of view it is immaterial whether a local native works for a planter here or in Rhodesia. Some people might prefer to see him cultivating foodstuffs abroad rather than tobacco at home, and few would rather that he stayed in his village in economic idleness. In so far as the native goes abroad he is selling a commodity, labour, in the highest market, and putting the average earnings abroad at £1 a month it is easily seen that labour is about the most valuable export from Nyasaland. It is reckoned that each native who works in Rhodesia brings or remits money home to the extent of about £5 a year, after providing for his living expenses and purchasing the clothes and other articles with which such natives usually return from the South. Putting the total as low as £100,000 a year, that sum may be regarded as the net profit from the export of labour industry. It is open to doubt whether the 30,000 temporary emigrants could at present be employed at home, either in producing crops for export or in paid employment, in such a way as to provide an addition to the country's net earnings, after meeting all expenses and their own maintenance and purchases on the Rhodesian scale, equivalent to the £100,000 actually distributed at present. In other words, if the 30,000 natives

[1] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report on the Census of Population, 1936*, p. 106. It is very much to be regretted that no data are available concerning the number of Nyasaland women living in Southern Rhodesia. See in this connexion Burden, *Nyasaland Native Labour in Southern Rhodesia* (1938), p. 14: 'As communications with the north improve, and they have improved greatly in the past three years, the tendency of the northern agricultural labourer is either to proceed home at regular intervals or to have his wife and younger children with him. The compounds of the best employers are readily recognisable by the number of married women and children which are to be seen about.'

[2] *Census Report 1926*, pp. xxviii–xxix.

stayed at home and worked on European estates, would the export of tobacco increase to such an extent that an additional net profit of £100,000 would accrue to Nyasaland after the natives had satisfied their needs on the Rhodesian scale, and if so, would that additional £100,000 be distributed so beneficially to the community as a whole as the surplus of the earnings of the emigrant labour are at present?

From the general point of view, again, those natives who go abroad and remit money home, or return with their savings, are spending more on imported goods and thus causing more trade and employment than if they had stayed at home, even if they had worked. The export of labour is thus an important item in considering the balance of trade. . . .

How little the exodus affected the domestic labour market may be inferred from the following fact. In 1934 not fewer than 43,967 Nyasaland natives entered Southern Rhodesia alone in search of work. The bulk came from the Northern Province, and it is safe to say that in that single year about one-fifth of the able-bodied males[1] migrated from this Province to Southern Rhodesia. Yet the Provincial Commissioner stated in his annual report:[2]

Labour was plentiful during the year, and the number of those who were unable to find employment must have been considerable. . . .

By far the largest employer of labour in the Province was the Public Works Department, which probably employed more natives than all the estate owners together. The Department reduced the labourer's rate of pay from four pence to threepence a day; and even at the lower wage hundreds of applicants for work had to be refused.[3]

It was in fact, if one may say so, merely by accident that the amount and the implications of these migrations were discovered. In September 1934 a new Governor came to the Protectorate. When he arrived he 'found that the declared policy of the Government was to prohibit recruitment of labour for work outside the Protectorate'; he 'was informed that there were anything up to 50,000 natives of the Protectorate working

[1] According to the 1931 census the total number of males over 15 (including infirms) was 205,805.

[2] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1934*, p. 31.

[3] But from 1936 on the situation became more difficult. 'In the case of the new road, Likwenu–Kawinga–Namwera, the only alternative to employing forced labour was to offer wages much above the current rate plus a meat ration, or cash in lieu' (*Report of the Public Works Department 1936*, p. 7). 'The same measures were adopted for the recruitment of labour' in connexion with some other work (see ibid., p. 8). The total expense for 32,880 man months in 1936 £12,982. 11*s*. 1*d*. 'Average cost unskilled labour per man/month—7*s*. 11*d*.' (ibid., p. 19). In 1937 and 1938 the Department found it necessary to employ women and children.

1937. 'In the North, particularly between Chendo-Fort Hill and Mwenzo, all able-bodied men are accustomed to leave their villages and trek to the Lupa gold fields, so the only labourers to be obtained are decrepit old men and youths. Towards the end of the year, however, owing to the prevalence of famine, many women and children sought work as casual labourers and with their assistance it was possible to carry out a fairly large road construction programme' (ibid. *1937*, p. 8).

1938. 'In the Central Division the requisite labour was, in general, forthcoming, but an increasing dearth of able-bodied men was observed, as a result, no doubt, of expanding activity in the recruitment of labour for Rhodesia and the Union. Consequently the labour strength tended to comprise mainly boys up to 16 years of age and elderly men. It is to be expected that this tendency will increase.

'In the northern area no difficulty was experienced in obtaining the labour required but the supply of able-bodied men was augmented by the recruitment of women and children to whom work on the roads appears to be congenial' (ibid. *1938*, pp. 7–8).

abroad'; and he ascertained that the administration 'had absolutely no means of tracing these men'.[1] In order to ensure a stricter control of this emigration he decided to reintroduce recruiting within the Protectorate and announced in his Address to the Legislative Council on 14 June 1935 that he had granted a private company exclusive rights for a period of three years to engage labour in the Northern Province for employment in Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa. He also expressed the hope 'to induce some other local firm of repute to undertake a similar agency in the Southern Province'.[2] The unofficial members of the Legislative Council were not opposed to this policy—'the Secretary of State should be told that the free flow of labour was wrong'[3]—but they resented that the Governor had inaugurated this policy without first consulting them, and the debate became quite lively:

> The Hon. T. M. Partridge . . . emphasised that Government had innocently underrated the importance of the matter.
>
> His Excellency did not agree and said that on his arrival in the Protectorate he had been surprised at the little interest shown. There seemed to be no objection to boys drifting about without supervision.[4]

The question was raised whether it would not be preferable that the Government itself established recruiting bureaux, a proposal which was rejected by the Governor. Finally the unofficial members demanded the appointment of a committee 'to look into the whole matter'. The Governor had no objection.

> His Excellency said that the advantage of an investigation would be that Government would then be able to put up a much stronger argument to the Secretary of State for the definite control of labour and could say that the idea of the free exodus of labour was an anachronism.[5]

Findings of the Committee on Emigrant Labour. The Committee appointed on 30 June 1935 consisted of five members (three unofficials and two officials).[6] It began its work in July, sat in Committee on 33 days between 24 July and 12 December, examined some 500 witnesses, and studied memoranda and reports submitted by many others.[7]

The Committee in the Introduction to its Report stated:[8]

> As individuals we approached our task with feelings of grave responsibility: our knowledge of the existing conditions varied considerably, but we were all aware that Natives had been and still were going abroad in large numbers to seek employment and that this exodus must affect the social and economic life of the Natives.
>
> Our investigations have deepened profoundly our individual and collective sense of responsibility. We must confess that, six months ago, there was not one of us who realised the seriousness of the situation: as our investigations proceeded we became more and more aware that this uncontrolled and growing emigration brought misery and poverty to hundreds and thousands of families and that the waste of life, happiness, health and wealth was colossal.

[1] See *Summary of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council*, 14 June 1935, p. 4.
[2] Ibid., p. 5. [3] Ibid., p. 16. [4] Ibid., p. 17.
[5] Ibid.; see also ibid., p. 18: 'Such a committee would strengthen his hand if he wished to persuade the Secretary of State that unorganised labour was a bad thing.'
[6] See *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1935*, pp. 11, 43.
[7] See *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 5. [8] Ibid., p. 7.

The report itself, which (with Appendices) comprises 150 folio pages, is a remarkable document covering the whole field of emigrant labour from Nyasaland. I must confine myself here to summarizing the Committee's findings concerning the amount of emigrant labour. The Committee starts its chapter 'The Extent of the Exodus' by saying:[1]

> We wish to make it quite clear, in dealing with the extent of the exodus, that we cannot state with any exactitude the number of emigrants who depart annually, the number who return and the number who do not return: our enquiries inside the Protectorate have met with guarded estimates or statements of inability to give definite information.

The Committee states furthermore:[2]

> There is not the slightest doubt that the existing pass system has been a complete failure. The evidence of District Commissioners, Native Authorities and others has indicated beyond all shadow of doubt that the number of passes issued has no cognisable proportion to the number of emigrants. . . .
>
> If some of us had hopes that the tax census would prove of greater value, we were disillusioned early on in our investigation. The tax census is designed to be a record of tax payers and tax defaulters. In keeping the tax census book different methods are adopted in different districts but, generally speaking, provided the tax is paid no entry is made as to whether the hut owner is present in the village or abroad. In most districts if a man whose whereabouts is unknown has been in default for three or four years, or if his wife has obtained a divorce on grounds of desertion, or if the village headman states that all trace of the man is lost, the name of the defaulter is struck off. It will be realised therefore that the tax census is of little use as an indication of the extent of the exodus. . . .
>
> (1) *Evidence of District Commissioners.* The lack of reliable official information concerning the number of emigrants has been demonstrated by the replies of District Commissioners to a circular letter sent to them by the Chief Secretary in June, 1935, and to a Questionnaire which we submitted to them in the following month. The Chief Secretary's letter asked for a return of the number of tax payers absent from the Protectorate: a summary of the replies will be found in Table 1 of Appendix 5. Our Questionnaire asked for the number of adult male Natives absent from the Protectorate in 1934. A summary of the replies are contained in Table 2 of the same Appendix. The totals of the two returns are 46,821 and 58,328[3] respectively. But neither indicate, of course, those who have been absent for so long that their names have been struck off the tax census. . . .
>
> (2) *Evidence from Southern Rhodesia.* For many years, under its registration system, Southern Rhodesia has kept a record of immigrants from Nyasaland[4] which can be regarded as substantially accurate. No immigrant Native looking for work can stay long in Southern Rhodesia without being registered. . . .
>
> Information is not available as to the number of those who went on to the Union after being registered in Southern Rhodesia. Most labourers—though not all—who go to the Union pass through Southern Rhodesia.
>
> Nor is there any information available as to the number of those who return.
>
> It is known that in 1934 12,822 passes were issued in Southern Rhodesia for Natives to proceed to Nyasaland. Probably a number returned without passes but on these figures the net exodus to and through Southern Rhodesia in 1934 amounted to 31,145.
>
> (3) *Number employed on Southern Rhodesian Mines.* There are no records available to indicate the total number of Nyasaland Natives resident in Southern Rhodesia

[1] *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 13. [2] Ibid., pp. 13–15.

[3] 'This total does not include migrants from the Upper Shire, Lilongwe and Dowa districts, as the District Commissioners concerned were unable to give an estimate of the numbers.'

[4] See Table 4 above.

in any one year. Available records are limited to the number employed on the mines. Since 1924 the number of Nyasaland Natives employed on the mines has never been less than 12,000. The average in 1934 was 20,007. In June, 1935, the number was 24,300: it has always represented one third of the total mine labour.

The Nyasaland Native does not as a rule like mine work. It would appear that for every one employed on the mines four are employed in other work. It appears further from our evidence that the average duration of absence of the Native who goes to Rhodesia, and returns, is from three to five years.

(4) *Estimate of Numbers now working in Southern Rhodesia.* Basing our estimate on the figures of immigration into Southern Rhodesia, on the nature of employment and average duration of absence, and on evidence from reliable sources in Southern Rhodesia, we make a conservative estimate that, as we report,[1] there are 75,000 Nyasaland Natives in Southern Rhodesia.

(5) *Numbers of Emigrants to South Africa.* The number at present in the Union is more difficult to estimate. We have received however from a reliable source the information that in 1932 there were approximately 10,000 'prohibited immigrants', of whom nearly all were Nyasaland Natives, on the Witwatersrand, in Durban and Pretoria. We know of other centres[2] in the Union in which for many years numbers of Nyasaland Natives have been employed. We believe that 20,000 would be a fair estimate of the number resident in the Union in 1934.

(6) *Numbers of Emigrants increasing rapidly.* If cash remittances from labour abroad are an indication of the numbers of the labourers that number is increasing very rapidly. The Postmaster-General has supplied us with details regarding remittances for the first six months of 1934 and of 1935. . . . A study of these tables shows a percentage increase for the Protectorate as a whole of 66·83%.

(7) *Other Countries to which Emigration occurs.* While Southern Rhodesia and the Union have received most of our emigrant labour in the past, there are other countries which have employed and still employ large numbers.

Portuguese East Africa has for many years employed Nyasaland Natives on the Sugar Estates and in domestic and office work. There are probably from 2,000 to 3,000 employed in that country at present.

The Union Miniere in the Belgian Congo used to employ a considerable number of Nyasaland Natives. Of recent years it has replaced most of the foreign unskilled labour by local labour. There are still however a number of Nyasaland Natives, mostly Tonga, in employment there.

The Northern Rhodesian Government estimates that there are approximately 2,000 Nyasaland Natives employed in Northern Rhodesia at present.

Since the war Tanganyika has employed large numbers of Nyasaland Natives in Government service as teachers, clerks, hospital dressers, etc. We have seen a list of two hundred names of men from Nyasaland employed in Dar-es-Salaam who are connected with one mission alone in Nyasaland. Of recent years this skilled migration, considerable as it was, has been overshadowed by migration of unskilled labour to the Lupa Gold Fields. In Appendix 6 will be found the report of one of our members who visited the Lupa area. It is estimated that there are now some 15,000 on the gold fields and that in addition some 2,000 to 5,000 Nyasaland Natives are employed elsewhere in Tanganyika.

(8) *Estimate of Total Exodus.* We have no hesitation in stating that the total number of Nyasaland Natives at present abroad is in the neighbourhood of 120,000.

(9) *Evidence of Census Report.* Confirmatory evidence as to the extent of the exodus can be found in the Census Report of the year 1931. (This is the last occasion on which a census was taken.)

The census shows that adult females outnumber adult males by some 105,000 although the number of child males exceeds that of child females. The Census is conducted as far as the Native population is concerned on the *de jure* system, i.e., it includes 'all natives permanently domiciled whether in fact that native was

[1] Dec. 1935. [2] 'e.g. Messina, Barberton, Modderfontein, De Hoek.'

actually present or whether he was away abroad or even in another part of the Protectorate'.

(10) *Proportion of Absentees to total male Population.* If our estimate of 120,000 is approximately correct, it appears that more than a quarter of the adult male population is absent from the Protectorate.

(1) The Evidence of District Commissioners was summarized by the Committee as follows:[1]

APPENDIX 5.—TABLE 1

Estimate of the Number of Tax Payers who are at Work or seeking Work outside the Protectorate, 1935

(*Extracted from District Commissioners' replies to a Secretariat letter*)

District[1]	*Estimated number*	*District*	*Estimated number*	*District*	*Estimated number*
Port Herald	2,200[2]	Liwonde	2,250[3]	Kota-Kota	3,000[4]
Chikwawa	300	Fort Johnston	905[5]	Kasungu	1,354[6]
Blantyre and Central Shire	1,000	Ncheu	3,500	Mzimba	8,000[7]
Cholo	1,046	Dedza	6,500	Chinteche	4,000
Mlanje	1,000	Fort Manning	700	Karonga	2,300
Chiradzulu	766	Lilongwe	3,000[8]		
Zomba	2,500	Dowa	2,500[9]		46,821

[1] For names of Districts see Table 2, p. 534.

[2] 'Of this number not more than 550 continue to pay tax in Nyasaland.'

[3] 'Figure given is—between 2,000 and 2,500.'

[4] 'At least this number.'

[5] 'This figure is based on the number of Protectorate passes issued since January, 1934.'

[6] 'Estimated that between 300–400 absentees have been struck off the list and are not included in this figure.'

[7] 'Approximately.'

[8] 'This figure does not include 200 absentees who have been struck off the census.'

[9] 'Figure given—between 2,000 and 3,000.'

APPENDIX 5.—TABLE 2

Estimate of Number of male Adults outside the Protectorate in 1934

(*Extracted from District Commissioners' replies to Questionnaire*)

District	*Estimated number*	*District*	*Estimated number*
Lower Shire	2,200	Dowa	Unable to Estimate.
Chikwawa	500	Kota-Kota	5,000
Central Shire	Approx. 100	Kasungu	3,000
Cholo	1,042	Mzimba	Impossible to say: Estimate 60%–70% of population is absent.
Mlanje	2,000		
Blantyre	470		
Chiradzulu	1,000		
Zomba	2,500	West Nyasa	6,000
Upper Shire	Unknown	North Nyasa	In Rhodesia and S. Africa, 500
South Nyasa	695		
Ncheu	3,500	Total—(Excluding Upper Shire, Lilongwe and Dowa, and placing Mzimba at 22,750)	58,328
Dedza	6,500		
Fort Manning	571		
Lilongwe	Unknown		

[1] See *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 116, Appendix 5, Tables 1 and 2.

It appears that in a number of cases the District Commissioners entered the same figure in their replies to the Secretariat letter and in the Committee's Questionnaire; in a few cases the former figure was higher, in many cases it was lower. That the total of the entries in the Questionnaire (58,328) was so much higher in spite of the fact that estimates were lacking for three Districts was evidently due to a misunderstanding. The District Commissioner of Mzimba had stated in his reply to the Secretariat letter that approximately 8,000 taxpayers of the District were at work or seeking work outside the Protectorate in 1935. But when asked by the Committee 'What number of the total male adult labour population of your district were employed outside the Protectorate during 1934?' he answered: 'Impossible to say: estimate 60%–70% of population is absent'.[1] What he evidently meant was that it was impossible to say how many were employed outside the Protectorate but that 60–70 per cent. of the total male adult labour population of 35,000 were absent from the District. Yet the Committee entered 65 per cent. of 35,000 or 22,750 as the number outside the Protectorate. Another mistake of the Committee, which, however, worked in the opposite direction, occurred in the case of North Nyasa (total male adult labour population 10,000). The District Commissioner had entered in the Questionnaire: 'In Rhodesia and S. Africa 500. In Tanganyika, probably 50% of total labour population.' The Committee entered only 'In Rhodesia and S. Africa, 500' and overlooked the 5,000 in Tanganyika.[2] But even a more careful use of this very defective evidence would not have permitted the drawing of any definite conclusions.

(2) The Committee apparently underestimated the number of Nyasaland natives who returned without passes from Southern Rhodesia. It is safe to say that in 1934 when 12,822 returned with passes at least an equal number returned without passes. It is inconceivable that the net exodus should have exceeded 18,000.

(3) The Committee errs in assuming that 'there are no records available to indicate the total number of Nyasaland Natives resident in Southern Rhodesia in any one year', and that 'available records are limited to the number employed on the mines'. It was apparently not aware of the fact that the censuses recorded the total number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia. These censuses show that for every 1 employed on the mines in 1921 and 1926 2, in 1931 2·5, in 1936 1·6, and in 1941 1·8 were employed in other work; they disprove the Committee's belief that for every one employed on the mines four are employed in other work.[3]

[1] Ibid., p. 90.

[2] At another place (p. 36) the Committee took account only of the 5,000 natives in Tanganyika and overlooked the 500 in Rhodesia and South Africa.

[3] See also Burden, p. 4: 'At present only approximate estimates can be given of the distribution of Nyasaland natives as exact figures are recorded only in respect of the mining industry which in 1937 employed an average of 30,777 natives from Nyasaland. I estimate the number employed in agriculture at 25,000 and those working in the towns at 20,000. Of the latter figure at least half are to be found within the boundaries of the Salisbury Municipality.'

(4) In view of the Committee's assumptions it would not have been surprising if it had come to the conclusion that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in December 1935 in Southern Rhodesia far exceeded 100,000. It shows the great caution of the Committee that it arrived at an estimate of 75,000. This was probably not, as the Committee thought, a conservative estimate, but since according to the census taken a few months later 70,362 male Nyasaland natives were employed in Southern Rhodesia, the Committee's estimate came remarkably near the truth.[1]

(5) If more recent estimates are exact, the estimate that 20,000 Nyasaland natives were employed in 1934 in the Union was probably no overstatement.[2]

(6) A large increase in cash remittances from labour abroad from one year to the next does not necessarily imply an essential increase in the number of labourers abroad. But the Committee, actually, does not take account of this increase in cash remittances in estimating the total number of Nyasaland natives employed abroad in December 1935.

(7) The Committee reckoned with 2,000 or 3,000 Nyasaland natives employed in Portuguese East Africa, apparently a similar number in the Belgian Congo, 2,000 in Northern Rhodesia, and 17,000 or 20,000 in Tanganyika. The estimate for Portuguese East Africa is certainly not too high,[3]

[1] Unfortunately the terminology used by the Committee is quite loose. It speaks indiscriminately of Nyasaland natives 'employed', 'now working', 'resident', 'living', and 'at present' abroad. The statement that 'there are 75,000 Nyasaland Natives in Southern Rhodesia' was certainly an understatement if it was to comprise all Nyasaland natives in Southern Rhodesia (including women and including men absorbed in life in the reserves). But the context, it seems to me, shows that the Committee all through wants to estimate the number of male natives 'employed' abroad (probably including those seeking employment).

It is very difficult to state precisely the groups of alien natives living in Southern Rhodesia who are not included in the census figures relating to the number of alien natives in employment. They certainly do not include:

(1) Unemployed men and women.

(2) Men absorbed in life in the reserves. 'Marriage with women resident in the countries to which our labourers migrate is doubtless responsible for keeping many permanently abroad. There must be thousands of Nyasaland-born men who have become absorbed in life in the reserves in Southern Rhodesia.' (*Report on Emigrant Labour 1935*, p. 29.)

(3) The few craftsmen working on their own account (see Burden, p. 8).

They probably exclude wholly or in part:

(4) Natives employed by other natives.

(5) Natives who have succeeded in changing their 'foreigner's' pass for a local inhabitant's pass in Southern Rhodesia (see *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 29).

[2] See also in this connexion *Report on Nyasaland Natives in the Union of South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia* by the Senior Provincial Commissioner, John C. Abraham (dated 22 Feb. 1937), pp. 2–3: 'Enquiries at the Immigration Department failed to elicit any definite information about the numbers and distribution of Nyasaland natives. I had hoped that, in view of the fact that each male immigrant is charged a fee of 5*s*. for his permit on which his tribe is recorded, that statistics might be available from which a reasonably accurate figure might be obtained in substitution for the successive estimates, largely guesswork, of the total of Nyasaland natives entering the Union. . . . To sum up, all my local enquiries in the Union failed to elicit any definite total of the number of Nyasaland natives employed there; such information as I did obtain tends to confirm the latest suggestion that 20,000 would be a fair estimate of the total number resident in the Union.'

[3] The Commissioner of Lower Shire reported that 1,537 labourers from his District were employed in Portuguese East Africa, and natives from other Districts, both northern and southern, were likewise reported to have gone there; see *Report on Emigrant Labour*, p. 99.

and the estimate for Northern Rhodesia is no doubt too low.[1] But the estimate for Tanganyika is much too high.[2]

(8) Since the number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia exceeded 70,000, and since the number employed in other countries can hardly have been less than 35,000 and may have exceeded 40,000, the Committee's estimate that the total number of Nyasaland natives employed abroad was in the neighbourhood of 120,000 can be accepted as fairly accurate.

(9) The fact that according to the 1931 census report adult females outnumber adult males (including 'absentees') by some 105,000, although the number of child males exceeds that of child females, indicates that many Nyasaland natives staying abroad were omitted at the count; but it affords no confirmatory evidence as to the extent of the exodus. That the number of males under marriage age exceeded the number of females under marriage age was evidently due to the fact that girls between 14 and 16 were usually considered as of marriage age while boys of that age were not so considered. The genuine excess of female over male adults was probably less than 90,000, and a considerable part of this excess may have been due to causes other than migration. It should be realized, moreover, that in 1931 the number of Nyasaland natives employed abroad was so much smaller than in 1935 that it is futile to seek in the 1931 returns a corroboration of figures relating to 1935.

(10) Even if the Nyasaland natives employed abroad in December 1935 numbered only 110,000 and not 120,000, they probably would still have constituted about one-quarter of the total male adult population.

Migration 1936–44. Other attempts to ascertain the number of Nyasaland natives employed outside the Territory were made in accordance with the Agreement concluded on 21 August 1936 between the Governments of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland.[3] A survey carried out from February to October 1937[4] yielded the following results:[5]

[1] Over 1,300 natives from Nyasaland were employed on the Northern Rhodesia mines alone. See also p. 434 above.

[2] The Committee refers the reader to the report of one of its members who visited the Lupa area. But this report (ibid., pp. 120–3) merely states that 'Nyasaland natives obtaining Lupa Controlled Area passes at Mbeya District Office' averaged 15 per day from Jan. to Oct. 1935. Since, on the one hand, these natives comprised only a fraction of those who went to Tanganyika while, on the other hand, 'most go for a short period 2–3 months', it is impossible to draw from the visiting member's report any conclusion as to the number of Nyasaland natives employed on a given date in Tanganyika. The Commissioner of North Nyasa, as has been mentioned, indicated that 5,000 natives from his District were employed in Tanganyika, but all other District Commissioners entered either very small figures or vague replies in the Committee's Questionnaire.

[3] See p. 463 above.

[4] See *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 15: 'In February four Cadet Officers of the Administration were seconded for special duty under a Senior District Officer for the purpose of taking a Population Survey showing the distribution of the male adult population. This was necessary under the Salisbury Agreement of 1936, whereby the three territories of Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland undertook to supply to each other by October 1937 particulars showing the labour supplies available in each territory. The survey was completed by October . . . .' See also Eric Smith, *Report on the Direct Taxation of Natives in the Nyasaland Protectorate* (dated 19 Aug. 1937), p. 11: 'All males are being recorded with their address abroad if known; or if not known, where they were last heard of and when they left the Protectorate'.

[5] See Bell Commission, *Report Nyasaland*, p. 337.

	Southern Province	*Northern Province*	*Total*
Total adult male population	231,009	259,990	490,999
Number of adult males unfit to proceed to work for wages	23,260	24,218	47,478
Number of adult males fit to proceed to work for wages	207,749	235,772	443,521
Number of fit adult males employed for wages in countries other than their own	22,350	67,747	90,097
Number of fit adult Nyasaland emigrants not heard of since 1930 [included in preceding figure]	2,986	19,252	22,238
Percentage of fit adult male population employed for wages in countries other than their own	10·8	28·7	18·3[1]
Number of fit adult males employed for wages in their own country	38,453	10,346	48,799
Number of fit adult males making livelihood at home in the production of economic crops, i.e., excluding subsistence producers	81,702	88,944	170,646
Number making livelihood at home in other wholetime economic production and distribution	2,025	815	2,840
Total number of fit adult males not earning wages, and not engaged in production of economic crops or earning livelihood in other economic production and distribution, i.e., subsistence producers	63,219	67,920	131,139
Estimate of total internal labour requirements for ensuing year	46,248	13,270	59,518

[1] Should read 20·3. The Commission by mistake related the number of absentees to the total adult male population and not to the fit adult male population. Its statement that '18·3 per cent. of the fit adult population is employed for wages in countries other than their own' (ibid., p. 96) is, therefore, wrong.

I have summarized in Table 7 the results for the various districts, distinguishing the countries where those employed outside the Territory were living.

The figures concerning adult male natives employed outside the Territory were certainly much more complete than those provided by the District Officers in 1935. But, showing a total of 90,097, they were still quite defective.[1] Even so the proportion of natives from the 'Dead North' (Kota Kota, Kasungu, Mzimba, West Nyasa, North Nyasa) who were returned as employed outside the Territory was not less than 42·5 per cent. of the total number of adult males fit to proceed to work for wages. The number of natives who had not been heard of since 1930 appeared to be 22,238, of whom 10,582 came from the 'Dead North'.[2] This, however, did not imply that the supply of labour in Nyasaland lagged behind the demand.

[1] See also Report of the Acting Commissioner of the Northern Province (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 50): 'During the year the labour and population census of the Protectorate was undertaken by Administrative Cadets under the supervision of the Special Commissioner and later by District Officers. Results for the Province were never finally completed: in North Nyasa orders were received to cease work at a time when there yet remained one hundred and twenty six villages unsurveyed, and in the West Nyasa District the continued opposition of the Atonga made progress so impossible that the attempt to carry out the special census had to be abandoned.'

[2] The figures of 'the lost ones' (machona) are probably understated for many districts. It seems most unlikely, for example, that West Nyasa, which showed by far the largest proportion

TABLE 7. *Adult Male Natives employed for Wages, Nyasaland, 1937*[1]

District	*Total adult males*	*Adult males fit to work for wages*	*Fit adult males employed for wages*									
			Nyasaland[2]	*Southern Rhodesia*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*South Africa*	*Tanganyika Terr.*	*Belgian Congo*	*Other Countries*	*Outside Nyasaland*		
										Total	*Per cent. of fit adult males*	*Not heard of since 1930*
Lower Shire .	18,294	16,543	893	448	—	11	—	—	381	840	5·1	24
Chikwawa .	11,626	10,881	318	600	3	3	2	—	9	617	5·7	—
Cholo . .	18,187	16,477	5,353	554	—	66	15	—	7	642	3·9	35
Mlanje . .	46,547	43,586	12,386	738	27	63	54	—	149	1,031	2·4	35
Blantyre .	28,428	25,330	6,721	3,294	111	282	137	6	124	3,954	15·6	986
Chiradzulu .	20,922	19,350	2,632	1,129	44	133	134	—	25	1,465	7·6	225
Zomba . .	28,954	26,679	6,121	1,936	84	380	765	26	109	3,300	12·4	553
Upper Shire .	31,261	24,673	1,518	3,072	31	200	532	3	86	3,924	15·9	255
South Nyasa .	26,790	24,230	2,511	5,401	102	672	269	6	127	6,577	27·1	873
Southern Prov.	231,009	207,749	38,453	17,172	402	1,810	1,908	41	1,017	22,350	10·8	2,986
Ncheu . .	21,268	19,112	2,606	1,800	83	2,367	96	—	28	4,374	22·9	1,146
Dedza . .	33,324	30,514	1,226	4,443	70	1,281	87	—	108	5,989	19·6	1,090
Lilongwe .	48,093	45,850	2,183	4,717	72	785	7	—	41	5,622	12·3	2,503
Fort Manning	13,101	12,054	428	3,849	334	225	111	—	—	4,519	37·5	914
Dowa . .	33,627	31,232	632	5,535	33	374	22	7	3	5,974	19·1	3,017
Kota Kota .	23,475	20,964	566	7,800	474	510	176	30	40	9,030	43·1	3,975
Kasungu .	10,644	9,783	460	3,504	294	453	26	4	3	4,284	43·8	1,332
Mzimba. .	46,316	41,399	1,111	12,396	1,343	3,517	1,251	225	45	18,777	45·4	4,634
West Nyasa .	16,717	12,812	656	2,856	753	2,540	1,059	289	294	7,791	60·8	541
North Nyasa .	13,425	12,052	478	6	250	76	1,049	3	3	1,387	11·5	100
Northern Prov.	259,990	235,772	10,346	46,906	3,706	12,128	3,884	558	565	67,747	28·7	19,252
Total . .	490,999	443,521	48,799	64,078	4,108	13,938	5,792	599	1,582	90,097	20·3	22,238

[1] See Bell Commission, *Report Nyasaland*, p. 337.

[2] 'Exclusive of over 7,000 immigrant Anguru labourers chiefly on tea estates' (ibid., p. 13).

The male adult native population survey revealed that the supply of labour greatly exceeded the demands of the industries of the Protectorate, even after full consideration had been taken of the number of male adult labourers employed for wages both within and outside of the Protectorate, and those engaged in the production of economic cash crops and in other whole-time occupations.[1]

In accordance with the Salisbury Tripartite Agreement identification certificates were issued free to all able-bodied male applicants wishing to migrate to neighbouring territories after 1 January 1938, and entry into either Southern or Northern Rhodesia was to be refused after 1 March 1938 to any Nyasaland native not in possession of an Identification Certificate.[2] The number of certificates issued with endorsements was as follows:[3]

		Endorsements made to							
Year	*Province*	*Southern Rhodesia*	*South Africa*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*Tanganyika Territory*	*Belgian Congo*	*Port. East Africa*	*Other countries*	*Total*
1938	Southern	13,574	1,129	154	157	2	679	9	15,704
	Northern	24,195	4,034	821	254	18	90	9	29,557
1939	Southern	11,450	1,879	155	56	—	648	28	14,216
	Northern	18,611	5,638	1,140	85	10	50	37	25,571

Another estimate made for the end of 1938 put the number of Nyasaland natives employed outside the Territory at 113,500.[4] The Labour Branch of the Provincial Administration described the situation as follows:[5]

South Africa. No strictly accurate figures can be given, but it is estimated that at the present time at least 27,000 Nyasaland natives are employed as wage-earners in the Union of South Africa. Of this number it is estimated that 8,000 are engaged on mines (gold, platinum, copper etc.) 3,000 in other industries such as railways, cement works, garages etc., 2,000 in hotels and as domestic servants and the remainder on farms. The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association were granted permission to engage up to 8,500 natives in the Northern Province on the 22nd June, 1938, for work on the Witwatersrand gold mines. At the close of the year the Association had accepted some 4,000 recruits.

. . . The average mine-worker stays at work for 12 months and then returns home to rest. Agricultural workers and others stay for longer periods of work but there is a steady ebb and flow movement going on all the time the turn-over leaving a slight preponderance each year in favour of the Union of South Africa.

Tanganyika Territory. It is estimated that some 7,000 Nyasaland natives seek employment in Tanganyika Territory annually in Government service, on the sisal estates and at the Lupa goldfields. None of this labour is contracted. The work on the Lupa gold fields is extremely popular in the Northern Districts of the Pro-

of natives employed outside the Territory, should have 'lost' only 3 per cent. of its adult male population. It should be realized, on the other hand, that not all the 22,238 'fit adult Nyasaland emigrants not heard of since 1930' were still in 1937 employed for wages in other countries. Some had died and some survivors were no longer wage-earners.

[1] *Report of Labour Branch of Provincial Administration 1938*, p. 11.

[2] See *Report of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 15. But see also ibid. *1938*, p. 51: '. . . the Government of that Colony [Southern Rhodesia] undertakes to turn back any persons found without certificates or endeavouring to make their way into the Union of South Africa, but it is known that many people are successful in defeating the authorities in both cases.'

[3] See *Report of Labour Branch of Provincial Administration 1938*, p. 21; *1939*, p. 16.

[4] See *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1938*, p. 36.

[5] *Report of Labour Branch of Provincial Administration 1938*, pp. 15–16.

tectorate. Nyasaland natives work for spells of three or four months, unless they are Foremen or skilled workmen, and then return home. A count of Nyasaland natives on the gold fields during September, 1938, disclosed 2,163 then working....

Northern Rhodesia. It is estimated that some 4,000 Nyasaland natives are employed in Northern Rhodesia. A considerable number of these are employed on the Copper Belt, while others are engaged in Government service, on farms and with industrial undertakings. Natives who go to Northern Rhodesia for work usually obtain seasonal employment and there is a constant to and fro movement.

Southern Rhodesia. . . . At the close of the year 1936, according to Southern Rhodesia statistics, there were 70,363 Nyasaland natives employed[1] and at the end of the year 1938 it is estimated that between 72,000 and 75,000 were employed.

Twenty eight thousand of this number are employed on the mines, the remainder in agriculture and other industries.

It will be noted by reference to Appendix II that 37,769 identification certificates were endorsed for Southern Rhodesia during the nine months ended the 31st of December, 1938.

Unfortunately, no strictly accurate figures exist of the numbers of Nyasaland natives who have returned home from work in Southern Rhodesia during the year, or, for that matter, from any other place outside the Protectorate. From information available, however, of ferry crossings, rail passages, etc. etc. it is estimated that some 31,000 of our natives returned home in comparison with an influx of 33,577 [into Southern Rhodesia].

Although the present ebb and flow movement of labour gives no cause for concern, a more accurate appreciation of the numbers returning home seems desirable, more especially in those districts where the exodus has been unduly heavy. These figures must necessarily come from within the Protectorate and a scheme for collecting such statistics is being considered for partial, if not general, application in the Protectorate.

It can be accepted that two labourers go from the Northern Province to every one from the Southern Province, for work in Southern Rhodesia.

On the basis of the 1938 estimate (slightly revised) the following estimate was made for the end of 1939:[2]

	Southern Rhodesia	*South Africa*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*Tanganyika Territory*	*Belgian Congo*	*Portuguese East Africa*	*Total*
Absent at 1 Jan. 1939 . .	75,000	27,000	4,300	5,890	600	1,976	114,766
Emigrated[1] 1939: Contracted .	736	6,882[3]	—	950	—	—	8,568
Uncontracted	27,760	2,179	1,408	162	9	530	32,048
Returned 1939: Contracted .	1,015	3,847	—	—	—	—	4,862
Uncontracted .	25,364	8,000	2,318	1,035	11	1,027	37,755
Migrated from S. Rhodesia to S. Africa	−9,000	+9,000	—	—	—	—	—
Absent at 31 Dec. 1939 . .	68,117	33,214	3,390	5,967[3]	598	1,479	112,765

[1] With Identification Certificates, except the 950 labourers contracted for Tanganyika.

[2] 'The quota of natives allowed the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association, Limited, for work on the Rand, is 8,500 at any one time. This number had not been attained at the end of the year owing to the general embargo that was put on recruiting in the Protectorate between the 4th September and the 10th October. The Association also stopped recruiting during the months of May, June, and a portion of July' (*Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 10).

[3] 'Owing to the alluvial workings at the Lupa becoming exhausted and some small workers having closed down on account of the war, there is not now such a great demand for labour as in previous years . . .' (ibid., p. 11).

[1] This was the figure ascertained for 5 May 1936. It probably was higher at the close of the year since the number of Nyasaland natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines increased from 27,186 on 30 Apr. to 29,751 on 31 Dec.

[2] See *Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 19. 'The numbers of natives who returned . . . are in the case of Southern Rhodesia based on figures supplied by the

As regards the total man-power of the Protectorate the Labour Department of the Provincial Administration stated:[1]

> It is estimated that the number of adult males in the Protectorate fit to leave their villages for work for wages can reasonably be put at 329,000. Of this number at the close of the year it is estimated that (*a*) 87,292 were making their livelihood at home in the production of agricultural crops for sale; (*b*) 3,421 were engaged at home in other economic production and distribution; (*c*) 62,513 were employed for wages by non-natives of the Protectorate; and (*d*) 112,765 were away at work in other territories. The balance of some 60,000 able-bodied natives remain in their villages either as subsistence producers or resting before going out for work again. Labour is employed chiefly in agriculture; in tea, cotton, tobacco, soap, sisal, and rubber factories; by commercial firms, railways and Government departments; and in domestic service.

It seems impossible to reconcile this statement with the figures ascertained at the 1937 survey, which showed a total adult male population of 490,999 and put the number of adult males fit to proceed to work for wages at 443,521. The figure of 490,999 adult males may at first sight seem excessive, since the 1931 count had shown only 408,799 adult males, and since according to the population estimate for 1936 and 1937 the total male population of the Protectorate had increased since the count by only a few thousand.[2] But neither the count nor the population estimates included 'the lost ones'[3] and they were probably also quite incomplete concerning those temporarily absent.[4] Even so the 1937 survey figures may have been too high.[5] But the 1939 figure of 329,000 adult males fit to leave their villages for work for wages (including 112,765 who were at work in other territories) seems far too low.[6]

Southern Rhodesia Government; in the case of South Africa as regards uncontracted labourers the figures are supplied by the Labour Officer, Johannesburg; in the case of Northern Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa the figures have been afforded by the Principal Immigration Officer and in respect of Tanganyika and the Belgian Congo they are proportionately calculated on the average between the Southern Rhodesian and Northern Rhodesian total of returnees.'

[1] *Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 8.

[2] See *Blue Books 1936* and *1937*, Section 15, p. 2. See also Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 183.

[3] It may be mentioned incidentally that it seems wrong to include 'the lost ones' in the number of adults fit to proceed to work for wages. Since they have not been heard of for seven years they must be treated like other (permanent) emigrants, who, of course, are not included.

[4] See also in this connexion Eric Smith, *Report on the Direct Taxation of Natives in the Nyasaland Protectorate* (1937), p. 11: 'Considerable difficulty has been experienced throughout my enquiries in obtaining reliable information concerning the number of absentees working outside the Protectorate, as for various reasons the District Census Records do not show the great majority of these absentees.'

[5] For 1938 the number of 'adult males who were fit to work for wages' was estimated at 424,000 (see *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1938*, p. 35) or nearly 20,000 less than in 1937. This, however, was not due to a belief that the total number of adult males had been overstated in 1937 but rather to a change of opinion as to the number of those not fit to work for wages. 'The total number of adult male taxpayers in the country is estimated to be 495,200 of which number 71,000 are exempted from taxes for various reasons, but mostly because they are unfitted to earn a livelihood' (*Medical Report 1938*, p. 11). But a correct appraisal of the various figures is again difficult owing to loose terminology. The adult males include juvenile workers who are under tax-paying age.

[6] The number of fit adult males making livelihood at home in the production of economic crops, which in the 1937 survey had been put at 170,646, was estimated in 1939 at 87,292; the figure of subsistence producers was reduced from 131,139 to 'some 60,000'.

As regards the migration of Nyasaland natives from Southern Rhodesia to the Union and the number of Nyasaland natives employed in these two countries, the 1939 report of the Labour Department of the Provincial Administration contains three different statements:

(1) Considerable difficulty was experienced in obtaining reliable statistics of the number of northern natives, both those entering the Union and those already employed in the various industries, and these could only be compiled by visiting all ports of entry and the industrial centres where such natives were known to be found in appreciable numbers. During the first half of the year over 7,000 temporary permits were issued to Nyasaland native immigrants at the four northern Transvaal stations of Messina, Louis Trichardt, Pietersburg and Potgietersrust, and after adding an allowance for those issued in the second half of the year and deducting a proportion for renewals for those previously employed in those areas, it is estimated —and this is probably an under-estimate—that in 1939, 9,000 Nyasaland natives entered the Union clandestinely from Southern Rhodesia. Similarly no official or reliable figures could be obtained which showed the numbers of these 'prohibited immigrants' who were leaving to return to their homes, but an approximate calculation, based on the numbers known to be employed in the various industries, indicates that approximately 8,000 uncontracted Nyasaland natives must have left to return to the Protectorate or to Southern Rhodesia.[1]

The figures [balance remaining in Southern Rhodesia and the Union] must be taken only as a rough estimate until the Southern Rhodesian Government publishes official statistics for the year 1939. It is believed that many more Nyasaland natives may have migrated from Southern Rhodesia to the Union. The number of our natives in Southern Rhodesia on the 1st of January, 1939, was probably nearer 78,000 than the 75,000 quoted and at the close of the year the Government of Southern Rhodesia maintained that there were not more than 68,000 of our natives in the Colony.[2]

(2) The flow of Nyasaland natives from Southern Rhodesia to the Union of South Africa still continues at an alarming pace and the total entering the Union from the Colony in 1939 is thought to have been anything between 9,000 and 14,000, as compared with an estimate of 11,000 for 1938. The total number of Nyasaland natives in Southern Rhodesia at the 31st December, 1939, is estimated to be about 68,000, but this figure is to be accepted with reserve until March next when fuller information on the subject will be available from the Government of Southern Rhodesia. If this figure is anything like correct, it is now thought that the total in the Colony at the end of 1938 must have been considerably in excess of the 72/75,000 then estimated. The lower number of Nyasaland natives in the Colony is, of course, accounted for by the losses to the Union and there may well be nearer 40,000 than the 33,000 Nyasaland natives estimated as being employed in the Union.[3]

(3) The number accredited to the Union of South Africa may prove to be very much lower than is actually the case, for it is now believed that there were considerably more than 75,000 Nyasaland natives in Southern Rhodesia on the 1st January, 1939, and that the exodus from Southern Rhodesia to the Union may have been nearer 14,000 than the 9,000 estimated.[4]

The Colonial Report for 1939 tends also to consider the figures entered for Southern Rhodesia and the Union as minimum figures:

Of the 112,800 Nyasaland natives believed to be employed in other territories between 68,000 and 72,000 are working in Southern Rhodesia, between 33,000 and 35,000 in the Union of South Africa, 4,000 in Northern Rhodesia, and 6,000 in the Tanganyika Territory.[5]

[1] *Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 10.
[2] Ibid., p. 9. [3] Ibid., p. 12. [4] Ibid., p. 19.
[5] *Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Nyasaland 1939*, p. 29.

Finally, the Medical Report for 1939 states:[1]

> The Nyasaland Labour Commissioner estimates that at the close of 1939 there were 115,765 Nyasaland male natives working in adjacent territories as compared with 114,776 in 1938. The following data are from figures kindly provided by him.
>
> Working in S. Rhodesia 71,117 . . . .[2]

The last quotation indicates that the Labour Commissioner had finally decided to raise by 3,000 the figure of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia at the end of 1939.[3]

The whole discussion on migration from Southern Rhodesia to the Union seems quite confused. The Labour Commissioner says that 'the total entering the Union from the Colony in 1939 is thought to have been anything between 9,000 and 14,000 as compared with an estimate of 11,000 in 1938'. This seems to indicate that the number of migrants was about the same in both years. How is it then to be explained that this migration should have reduced the number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia very considerably in 1939 but had not at all this effect in 1938? The explanation, I suppose, is that the Labour Commissioner, in making his computation for 1939, overlooked that the number of migrants from Southern Rhodesia to the Union was largely offset by migrants who returned from the Union to Southern Rhodesia.[4] In any case there seems no reason to suppose that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia had changed essentially in the course of 1939. The numbers of Nyasaland natives employed on Southern Rhodesia mines at the end of 1938 and 1939 were 28,866 and 29,292 respectively.[5]

Although the available data are not very satisfactory, it is safe to say that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in the Union at the end of 1939 was higher than when the Committee on Emigrant Labour made its estimate, that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in Southern Rhodesia had not changed essentially, and that the number of Nyasaland natives employed in all other countries combined had decreased (owing to the reduction in the number of those working in Tanganyika). The total number of Nyasaland natives employed outside the Territory had certainly not declined.

The war, of course, affected the labour situation.

> The principal objectives in planning the war effort have been:—
>
> (*a*) the enlistment of as many fit men as possible—European and African—in the military units of the East African Forces;

[1] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 9.

[2] All other figures are the same as those reproduced on p. 571.

[3] It is difficult to see how he could have obtained this result which substituted an increase of 1,000 for a decrease of 2,000 in the total number of absent natives.

[4] See also in this connexion the quotation from his Report, p. 10.

[5] The number decreased up to May 1939 and increased thereafter (see Table 5). See also in this connexion Southern Rhodesia, *Report on Mines 1939*, p. 7: 'The flow of labour from Nyasaland was interrupted during the year owing to the suspension by the Nyasaland authorities of the issue of passports, but the supply has been resumed and was satisfactory during the last few months.'

(*b*) the production of essential foodstuffs for local requirements, civil and military;

(*c*) The production of economic crops in carefully selected and already tested areas;

(*d*) the supply of labour for certain important local industries, and the encouragement of labour surplus to essential local needs to proceed to Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa to assist in the war effort there.

At the end of the year Nyasaland had approximately 220 Europeans and 10,000 Africans serving with the military units of the East African Forces.[1]

The available data on emigrant labour are somewhat scanty for the war years. I shall first summarize the most important figures for 1940–4.

The numbers of civilian Nyasaland Natives absent from the Protectorate were estimated as follows:

31 Dec.	*Southern Rhodesia*	*Union of S. Africa*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*Tanganyika Territory*	*Other Territories*	*Total*
1940[1]	67,000	31,000	3,000	800	..	(101,800)
1941[2]	73,000	29,855	4,500	1,500	1,245	110,100
1942[3]	69,000	26,000	..	..	..	..
1943[3]	71,677	24,733	..	..	..	..
1944[4]	78,658	33,028	4,500	800	..	116,986

[1] See *Report of Labour Department 1940*, p. 1; *Medical Report 1940*, p. 6.

[2] See *Report of Labour Department 1941*, p. 7. Apart from 110,100 'able-bodied males employed outside Protectorate in civil occupations', there were 11,000 'able-bodied males with army'; see ibid., p. 15.

[3] See ibid. *1944*, pp. 5–6.

[4] See ibid., p. 2. The number of Natives absent from the Protectorate and serving in the Military Forces was approximately 25,000 at the end of 1944; see ibid.

The numbers of Identification Certificates issued to emigrant labourers were 26,000 in 1940 and 32,000 in 1941.[2] In 1942–4 they were as follows:[3]

Year	*Endorsements made to*				
	Southern Rhodesia	*Union of S. Africa*	*Northern Rhodesia*	*Other Territories*	*Total*
1942	19,443	2,642	1,402	373	23,860
1943	26,119	5,264	1,354	258	32,995
1944	30,620	5,901	1,309	369	38,199

[1] *Report of Labour Department 1941*, pp. 1–2. See furthermore, ibid., p. 13: 'At the end of December ninety three Nyasaland natives had enlisted in the South African Non-European Army.'

[2] See ibid. *1940*, p. 2; *1941*, p. 9.

[3] See ibid. *1944*, p. 1. 'The increase of 14,339 in 1944 over the 1942 figure does not necessarily represent the increase in emigration over the period. There seems reason to believe that there is a growing appreciation of the value of the Identification Certificate as a Passport and that numbers of Africans, who formerly would have gone without one, now apply for a certificate before leaving' (ibid.). 'The figures of Certificates endorsed for travel to Southern Rhodesia do not, in fact, represent the number who have gone to work in that Colony. Numbers of Africans, particularly from the northern districts, use the Identification Certificate to assist them to pass through Southern Rhodesia. They seem to have little difficulty in entering the Union where there is a ready market for their labour' (ibid., p. 2). '83 per cent. of the 5,901 endorsements for South Africa in 1944 is in respect of men recruited by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association; the balance is in respect of men who have returned on leave from South Africa with permits to re-enter issued by the South African Immigration Authorities' (ibid., p. 1).

The numbers of Nyasaland Natives who left the Protectorate and who returned were estimated by the Nyasaland Government as follows:[1]

	Southern Rhodesia		*Union of S. Africa*		*Northern Rhodesia*		*Tanganyika Territory*		*Other Territories*	
	1940	*1941*	*1940*	*1941*	*1940*	*1941*	*1940*	*1941*	*1940*	*1941*
Left (*a*)	19,000	26,339	14,000	11,737	1,600	1,561	500	500	..	788
Left (*b*)	291	706	3,533	8,055	—	—	—	—	—	—
Returned (*a*)	..	23,637	..	14,401	..	1,350	..	450	..	705
Returned (*b*)	..	405	..	6,591	—	—	—	—	—	—

(*a*) Independently. (*b*) Under contract.

The Southern Rhodesia Government put the total numbers of Nyasaland Natives entering the Colony in 1940–3 at 18,771, 27,054, 17,734, and 21,659 respectively.[2]

At the census taken in 1941, 71,505 male Nyasaland natives in employment (67,168 Unrecruited and 4,337 Recruited) were enumerated in Southern Rhodesia.[3] The numbers employed on mines are shown in Table 5.

I shall now give for individual years some passages from official reports.

1940. In Nyasaland, beyond the usual rainy season scarcity, there has been no noticeable shortage of labour despite the active recruiting campaign for the armed forces during the second half of the year. . . . In May, in order that the military recruiting campaign should not be prejudiced, the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association closed their recruiting activities . . . .

The effect of the military recruiting campaign was to retard appreciably the flow of emigrants to the South. The numbers registered as entering Southern Rhodesia during the year was 18,771, a fall of over 9,000.[4] This reduction is by no means due, however, solely to recruiting for the army. Other factors were the natural uncertainty about the war, the improvement in the price of local agricultural products and the encouragement to produce more food so as to be prepared for all possible calls upon supplies.[5]

[1] See *Report of Labour Department 1940*, p. 1; *1941*, p. 8. It will be noticed that the number of Nyasaland Natives who went under contract to Southern Rhodesia was very small. See also in this connexion Burden, pp. 2–3: '. . . the majority of Nyasaland natives who live in districts from which emigration has been prevalent for some years are well aware of the activities of recruiters and are usually strongly averse to becoming "cibalo"—a term of opprobrium originally denoting "forced labour" and now indiscriminately applied to all recruited or attested labour. The result of this aversion is that of the immigrants attested by recruiters, the majority are either from tribes unaccustomed to emigration such as Anguru or Amanganja from the Lower Shire districts or consist of those who lack the initiative or physical strength to proceed any further on their own. In consequence the employer only too often finds that he has paid a considerable fee for a useless labourer and as the private recruiting agency is generally called in to supply the requirements of those employers who cannot obtain voluntary labour the resulting conjunction of inefficient labourers and bad employers causes difficulties . . . .'

[2] See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration 1943*, p. 2.

[3] See *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia*, 21 Mar. 1942, p. 2; ibid., 7 Apr. 1942, p. 3.

[4] The number had decreased from 42,598 in 1937 to 33,580 in 1938 and to 28,496 in 1939. See Southern Rhodesia, *Report of Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration 1943*, p. 2.

[5] See also Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of Labour Department 1940*, p. 2: 'Registered tobacco growers on Native Trust Land for the 1940/41 season have increased by 16,400 to 56,737. Those on private estates increased by 3,100 to 19,687. These large increases are, of course, responsible to a considerable extent for the reduction in emigration.' The total number increased to 82,788 in 1941/2 and to 108,147 in 1942/3; see ibid. *1944*, p. 4.

Recruitment for agricultural and mine labour has been in abeyance since the commencement of the military recruiting campaign.[1]

It is estimated that the numbers returning from these countries [Union of South Africa, Southern and Northern Rhodesia, Tanganyika Territory] are approximately the same as those entering them. It is impossible to say how many of those who entered Southern Rhodesia did so with the intention of working in that territory. Many continued southwards to seek work in the Union of South Africa . . . . In Tanganyika the number of our natives employed has considerably decreased owing to reduced activity on the alluvial gold deposits of the Lupa. In Northern Rhodesia a somewhat smaller number was employed than in 1939.[1]

Excluding indentured labour employed by the Chamber of Mines on the Reef it is estimated that 23,000 of our natives are in the Union, of whom 21,400 are in the Transvaal.

Many Nyasaland natives contract connubial ties with women in the Union. As husbands they are favoured because they are, as a rule, more generous than is the male Union native. This amiable trait is, however, only too often the beginning of their detribalization in that they never have sufficient money to return home.

Clandestine immigration into the Union shows no signs of falling off. 5,000 natives registered at Messina during the year but 14,000 are estimated to have found their way into the country....

Constant difficulty is experienced in making contact with relations of deceased natives owing to so many having assumed false names on entering the Union and posing as Union or Portuguese natives in order to obtain urban employment. Nyasaland natives recruited in their own country are employed on 20 Reef Gold Mines. At the end of the year, including those recruited in the Union, 6,282 natives were so employed. 43 new arrivals from Nyasaland were repatriated before they commenced work and 164 were repatriated as unfit or disabled during their period of employment.[2]

1941. In common with other colonies a very appreciable percentage of the country's productive man-power is with the armed forces or is employed as labourers on productive war work in the Union of South Africa and the Rhodesias.[3]

The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association were permitted to re-open recruiting for the Rand mines (to a maximum of 8,500 natives) with effect from the 1st May . . . .[4]

While the popularity of the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association has become firmly established because of the excellent conditions and treatment the natives receive under this organisation there still remains a strong reluctance to sign a contract on the part of most natives. This is accounted for partly by the fact that

[1] Ibid. *1940*, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 4. See also *Medical Report 1940*, p. 6: 'Of the number offering for recruitment to the W.N.L.A. 30% had been rejected on medical grounds. 207 of the 3,533 passed as fit locally, were returned from the Rand as unfit for service for various reasons.'

[3] *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1914*, p. 10.

[4] *Report of Labour Department 1941*, p. 2. See also ibid., p. 12: 'The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association had all but reached their quota of 8,500 Nyasaland natives by the end of the year. The number of recruits repatriated before commencing work expressed as a percentage of the new arrivals was ·54.' See, furthermore, *Medical Report 1941*, p. 9: 'The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association recruits labourers from Nyasaland for work at the Rand Mines in South Africa. They maintain their own doctor who examines and passes labourers seeking employment. The standard of fitness required is high and special attention is given to the condition of the lungs. Local Africans of poor physique have begun to learn that to apply for recruitment by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association is of little use. The Medical Officer maintained by W.N.L.A. advises that of 10,661 natives examined he passed 9,548 as fit for work on the Rand.'

many thousands of Nyasaland natives accustomed to work abroad have established their own connections, and partly to the known tenacity of the African in retaining his freedom even at the cost of some inconvenience to himself. He refuses to bind himself to an unknown employer.[1]

It is estimated that some 12,000 Nyasaland natives entered the Union clandestinely during the year . . . .[2]

There has been a big demand in Southern Rhodesia for Nyasaland labour during the year on account of the increased acreages on the tobacco estates and to expansion in the farming and mining industries.[3]

It is impossible to say how many of those who entered Southern Rhodesia did so with the intention of working there; it can be stated, however, that at least 10,500 Nyasaland natives entered the Union of South Africa clandestinely, and that a great many of them assumed temporary Portuguese East Africa domicile for the purpose.[4]

The total number of Nyasaland natives registered as having entered the Colony during 1941 was 27,045 an increase of 8,283 over the previous year. The number reporting their departure for Nyasaland was 13,296. It is estimated that a further 10,000 odd natives left without reporting their departure.[5]

The number of Nyasaland workers in the Tanganyika Territory remains fairly constant. In Northern Rhodesia a somewhat larger number was employed than in 1940. Those employed in other territories—notably Portuguese East Africa—return to their homes in Nyasaland at regular intervals.

The total number of Nyasaland natives estimated to be working outside the Protectorate at the end of 1941 is slightly under the average number for the past four years.[6]

1944. In November, 1942, under the pressure of military requirements, it became necessary to prohibit the recruiting of natives, other than for military duties, for service outside the Protectorate. Subsequently, when the ban was removed in September, 1943, recruiting was resumed on a reduced scale.[7] The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association's quota was fixed at 5,000[8] as against 8,500 in 1942, and circumstances have not yet permitted a resumption of the higher rate.[9]

In consequence of the better wages and generally improved working conditions in all industries and farms there has been a considerable increase in the number of Northern natives entering the Union, whilst fewer have left, when compared with the figures for 1943.

The estimated figures of immigrants for 1943 and 1944 are 7,000 and 12,500 respectively, exclusive of labour recruited by the W.N.L.A.

At the end of the year some 5,278 of the total Nyasaland natives in the Union were men enrolled by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association for the gold

[1] *Report of Labour Department 1941*, p. 9.
[2] Ibid., p. 12.
[3] Ibid., p. 10.
[4] Ibid., p. 8.
[5] Ibid., p. 11.
[6] Ibid., p. 8.

[7] See also in this connexion Southern Rhodesia, *Report of Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration 1943*, p. 4: 'Passports for Southern Rhodesia were again issued to migrants of the Northern Province from about September 1st, which resulted in a big influx from Nyasaland for the last three months of the year. These Natives informed me that they intended getting into Southern Rhodesia while the going was good as they never knew when the issue of passports would be stopped again.'

[8] See also Nyasaland, *Medical Report 1943*, p. 8: 'Recruiting by the Witwatersrand Native Labour Association was continued on a reduced scale during the year. The standard of fitness required is high and the medical practitioner employed by the Association in Nyasaland reports that of 5,144 natives examined, 828 were rejected. The main causes of rejection were poor physique and defective lungs.'

[9] *Report of Labour Department 1944*, p. 3. See also *Medical Report 1944*, p. 5: 'The Witwatersrand Native Labour Association was granted a permit to engage, during the period September, 1944 to September, 1945, 5,000 natives for service on the gold mines of the Witwatersrand.'

mines. The estimated figures for Nyasaland natives leaving the Union (exclusive of compulsorily repatriated W.N.L.A. recruits) are:—

1942	*1943*	*1944*
10,000	7,800	5,340[1]

The Rhodesian Chamber of Mines recruited 207 natives in 1942 on a permit for 2,000. The permit was renewed in 1943 but was not operated. The average number of Nyasaland natives employed in the Southern Rhodesian mining industry (not necessarily by members of the Chamber of Mines) at any one time is about 22,000 and it is reasonable to suppose that the reluctance of natives to enter into a contract for work in Southern Rhodesia is due to the uncertainty of the conditions to be met with on mines in that country.[2]

No natives were legally recruited in Nyasaland for Southern Rhodesia in 1944 and of the 27,884 who entered that Colony during the year only 2,830 were recruited and attested before a Native Commissioner.

Labour conditions are reported to vary considerably and to be far from satisfactory on some mines and farms.[3]

The count of 1945. New light on the number of absentees was thrown by the count of the African population made in the spring of 1945. The Superintendent of Census reported:

Although, for administrative purposes, a knowledge of the numbers of absentees is of the first importance, this is the first occasion on which returns have been rendered. . . . The returns show 133,306 persons absent abroad of whom 9,446 are women. Of this total 24·11% are reported as having left Nyasaland before the beginning of the European War, 56·95% since the 3rd of September, 1939, and 18·94% were serving with the armed forces. In spite of the difficulties faced by enumerators,[4] these figures do correspond approximately with the estimates submitted by the Nyasaland Government Representatives in neighbouring territories. In all probability they are on the low side since persons who do not keep in touch with their villages and who do not return at regular intervals are apt to be forgotten. The returns of men serving with the armed forces corresponded closely with the known figure. From time to time extravagant estimates have been made of the adult male emigrant population that has become lost to the Protectorate. If this were the case, it might be expected that a census would show a disproportionate excess of females to males. The 1945 census records 49·2 males and 50·8 females to every 100 of the population—a remarkably even balance between the sexes. It is fair to assume, therefore, that the estimates of absentees submitted by the Government Representatives are reasonably accurate and that 'the lost ones' do not number more than a few thousand.[5]

According to the estimates submitted by the Nyasaland Labour Representatives in neighbouring territories there were at the end of 1944 117,000 (civilian) 'Africans absent from the Protectorate' in the Rhodesias, the Union of South Africa, and Tanganyika Territory. There were in addition approximately 25,000 Africans absent from the Protectorate and 'serving in the Military Forces'.[6] As compared with this total of 142,000, the 1945 count showed 133,306 Africans absent abroad, including 25,236 'serving with the armed forces'. But neither of the totals is all-inclusive.

[1] *Report of Labour Department 1944*, p. 6.

[2] Ibid., p. 3.

[3] Ibid., p. 5.

[4] See also *Census Report 1945*, p. 2 : '. . . the information regarding absentees demanded a high degree of patience and determination'.

[5] Ibid., p. 15.

[6] See p. 575 above.

TABLE 8. *De facto African Population and Absentees, Nyasaland, 1945*[1]

District	*De facto population*			*Absent from the Protectorate*							
				Civilians				*Serving in Forces*	*Total*		
				Left before Sept. 1939		*Left after Sept. 1939*					
	M.	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Karonga	37,646	44,862	82,508	790	105	3,283	453	599	4,672	558	5,230
Chinteche	21,149	30,860	52,009	4,533	474	5,788	910	429	10,750	1,384	12,134
Mzimba	66,643	89,565	156,208	1,928	250	11,319	607	1,434	14,681	857	15,538
Northern Province	125,438	165,287	290,725	7,251	829	20,390	1,970	2,462	30,103	2,799	32,902
Kasungu	17,601	22,596	40,197	2,124	313	1,881	153	516	4,521	466	4,987
Dowa	59,813	71,382	131,195	923	58	4,050	123	658	5,631	181	5,812
Kota Kota	33,975	41,547	75,522	1,087	170	2,900	249	624	4,611	419	5,030
Fort Manning	19,750	22,803	42,553	1,944	648	1,680	620	894	4,518	1,268	5,786
Lilongwe	109,188	121,703	230,891	2,332	118	4,449	111	1,139	7,920	229	8,149
Dedza	65,230	77,094	142,324	2,050	118	5,498	198	1,367	8,915	316	9,231
Ncheu	38,390	49,300	87,690	1,451	85	4,925	443	1,053	7,429	528	7,957
Central Province	343,947	406,425	750,372	11,911	1,510	25,383	1,897	6,251	43,545	3,407	46,952
Fort Johnston	49,142	62,479	111,621	2,375	295	5,149	866	1,382	8,906	1,161	10,067
Liwonde	41,894	45,788	87,682	812	72	1,668	168	2,236	4,716	240	4,956
Zomba	65,390	72,213	137,603	1,203	161	1,565	208	5,843	8,611	369	8,980
Blantyre	50,477	51,731	102,208	911	140	2,161	301	1,409	4,481	441	4,922
Neno	11,406	13,773	25,179	398	31	926	79	262	1,586	110	1,696
Chickwawa	28,540	31,124	59,664	490	8	1,348	50	253	2,091	58	2,149
Chiradzulu	38,300	45,339	83,639	800	137	2,449	262	1,504	4,753	399	5,152
Cholo	59,397	60,349	119,746	524	75	1,853	191	701	3,078	266	3,344
Mlanje	103,621	105,901	209,522	740	2	4,066	113	2,380	7,186	115	7,301
Port Herald	29,735	37,011	66,746	1,457	12	2,794	69	553	4,804	81	4,885
Southern Province	477,902	525,708	1,003,610	9,710	933	23,979	2,307	16,523	50,212	3,240	53,452
Total	947,287	1,097,420	2,044,707	28,872	3,272	69,752	6,174	25,236	123,860	9,446	133,306

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, Tables 1, 3.

As regards the count, 'the returns of absentees purport to show only those who have kept in touch with their villages and there are known to be many persons who are "lost"'.[1] The census report, moreover, considers all the 133,306 persons absent abroad to be over 18 years old.[2] This would suggest that children and juveniles were omitted. The estimate of 142,000, on the other hand, excludes those absent in areas other than the Rhodesias, the Union of South Africa, and Tanganyika Territory; it may have been incomplete also as regards visitors and as regards Nyasaland labourers who claimed to come from Portuguese East Africa.

It appears that of the total male adult population 24·2 per cent. were absent from the Protectorate. The percentages were 39·3 for the Northern Province, 24·1 for the Central Province, and 19·7 for the Southern Province. More than 40 per cent. of the male adults were thus absent from Chinteche (60·2) and Kasungu (43·7).[3]

The results of the 1945 count are summarized in Table 8.

IV. Composition of the Native Population

1. *1921–41*

In order rightly to appraise the composition of the native population as shown by the counts and estimates made prior to 1945 it is necessary to realize that they refer to the *de jure* population which differs essentially from the *de facto* population as very many natives 'permanently domiciled' in the Protectorate are working abroad[4] while comparatively few natives from other territories are temporarily present in Nyasaland.[5]

Sex. According to the counts of 1921, 1926, and 1931 the ratio of females to 100 males was 115·0, 114·8, and 112·7 respectively.[6] The figures for the Southern Province were 109·8, 109·7, and 106·9; for the Northern Province 119·5, 119·6, and 118·2. The enormous excess of females in the Northern Province (in spite of the inclusion of absentees) must be due in a large

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 13. [2] See ibid.

[3] It should be realized, of course, that in addition to those absent abroad there are people absent in other Districts. According to the 1945 count, the total number 'Absent, working or visiting in other districts in the Protectorate' was 46,225 (32,559 males, 13,666 females). The adult males present in the Kasungu District numbered 5,833, while 1,482 were counted in another District and 4,521 were absent abroad.

[4] As shown in Section III, the number of males employed outside the Protectorate was 60,000 or more in 1921 and 1926, 75,000 or more in 1931, and over 100,000 from 1935 on. Many of them had been away for years, but the great majority was considered 'temporarily' absent. The number of absentee women (married or unmarried) was comparatively small.

[5] The rule to exclude those temporarily present was apparently not observed everywhere. In discussing the 1931 census results, the District Commissioner, Chikwawa, stated: 'During the last four years the population of this district has increased by about 10 per cent owing to the cotton industry attracting many new permanent settlers. In addition to this, there has come about a large floating population which comes into the district from other districts to plant or assist in planting cotton and leave after the harvest. It is possible that quite a number of these have been counted in this year's census taken in April last and may give an exaggerated idea of the population of the district.' (*Census Report 1931*, p. 14.)

[6] The estimates for 1911 and 31 Dec. 1920 showed 126·1 and 117·8 females per 100 males. See ibid. *1911*, p. 14; *1921*, p. 5; *Blue Book 1920*, Section 15, p. 1.

measure to emigration.[1] Since the excess was already very large in 1921, there must have been a very large emigration before that year. That, on the other hand, the excess decreased very little in 1921–31 indicates that emigration continued during this period. According to the estimates for 31 December 1939 the ratio of females to 100 males rose to 110·6 in the Southern Province, 121·1 in the Northern Province, and 115·8 in the Protectorate.[2]

Age. According to the three counts the percentage of children under 5 among the total population was 29·05, 27·63, and 27·66 respectively, the percentage of persons between 5 and marriage age 13·13, 13·91, and 14·67 respectively, and the percentage of people of marriage age 57·82, 58·46, and 57·67 respectively. The 1931 census report says that 'the enormous drop in numbers' from the first to the second group 'must be due to deaths in the first period, and these deaths must occur chiefly in the first year of life, because the later they are postponed the less effect will they have in lessening the numbers of the population in the second period. The fall in 1921 amounted to 57 per cent, in 1926 to 30 per cent, and in 1931 to 40 per cent.'[3]

It is interesting to note that neither the 1921 nor the 1931 census report challenged the accuracy of the distribution by age. The 1921 report said explicitly:[4]

> As regards the division of 5 years and under, although native parents have no means of telling the exact ages of their children, they can probably be relied on to remember that period of time with some degree of accuracy; and as there is no reason to believe that overestimation of that age was more common than underestimation, or vice-versa, the figures obtained may probably be regarded as substantially accurate. The division by age of marriage can have presented no difficulty to the native mind.

Actually many natives (including enumerators) had not the slightest idea of what was to be understood by age of marriage. In South Nyasa all single persons, including the oldest bachelors and spinsters, were returned in 1921 as under marriage age, while in West Nyasa no fewer than 20·3 per cent. of the people of marriage age were entered as single. In 1931 this percentage was 12·8 for South Nyasa and 17·3 for West Nyasa. But the official who was Superintendent of Census both in 1921 and 1926 had apparently himself no clear idea what might be the marriage age. In 1921 he considered 20 years as the lower limit,[5] while he said in 1926: 'Marriageable age would probably be in the neighbourhood of 14 for females and 16 for males, at which age natives would be more developed than Europeans at corresponding ages.'[6] He changed likewise in 1926 his opinion as to the

[1] The term 'emigration', as used in this section, includes migrants staying abroad and not counted as absentees.

[2] The ratios for 31 Dec. 1941 were 108·5, 128·2, and 117·8 respectively.

[3] *Census Report 1931*, p. 25. This statement is evidently taken from 'Notes on the Nyasaland Census' by the Senior Health Officer (*Medical Report 1931*, Appendix III). The actual drop, however, was 55 per cent. in 1921, 50 per cent. in 1926, and 47 per cent. in 1931.

[4] *Census Report 1921*, p. 3.

[5] See ibid., p. 4.

[6] Ibid. *1926*, p. xxxiii.

capability of the natives to distinguish children under 5 from older children, and now thought that both in 1921 and 1926 there was reason to believe that overestimation of that age was quite common.

> The age groups relate rather to social and physical states than to definite time periods. It is most likely that enumerators have on both occasions counted children as being 5 when they cease to sleep in their parents' huts, and it is probable that the actual age would be nearer 7.[1]

But his successor, in analysing the 1931 figures, again thought that the youngest group included only children under 5 and that the next group comprised for each sex children over 5 and under 15.

Since at the 1921 count the first group was more than twice as large as the second group it is of course absolutely impossible that the first group comprised only 5 years and the second group 15 years. But the assumption made at the 1931 count was also wrong. Since the first group was nearly twice as large as the second group, the first group cannot have comprised only 5 years and the second group 10 years. The suggestion made in the 1926 census report that the first group comprises the first 7 years of life and the second group for the girls the next 7 years and for boys the next 9 years certainly comes much nearer the truth, but this too cannot be accepted as correct.

That many parents put the marriage age lower for girls than for boys is in itself not surprising and is a plausible explanation of the fact that in the Southern Province the ratio of females to 100 males between 5 and marriage age was at the three counts 80·8, 86·2, and 84·1. But the ideas about the respective lower limits of marriage age for boys and girls evidently differed very much from district to district and varied also considerably in the course of time. In the Northern Province as a whole the ratios of females to 100 males between 5 and marriage age were 88·8, 88·0, and 96·9 respectively, and while in the Mlanje District (Southern Province) the figure for 1931 was 67·8 it was 124·6 in the Dedza District (Northern Province). There was certainly a strong tendency to put the beginning of marriage age lower for girls than for boys, but the extent to which this was done varied enormously and there were notable exceptions to this rule.

The assumption that the first age group comprised about 7 years and the second group about 8 years may possibly be correct in all cases where the number of children in the first group did not exceed the number of children in the second group by more than, say, 75 per cent. But the difference was greater in 1921 in 13 of the 18 districts, in 1926 in 14 of the 20 districts, and in 1931 in 13 of the 20 districts. In South Nyasa 1921, the first group was 5 times as large as the second group; in Upper Shire 1931, the first group was 3·3 times as large as the second group. The anomalies are, of course, more striking still in some smaller administrative subdivisions. A few examples taken from the 1926 census report may serve as an illustration:[2]

[1] Ibid.

[2] See ibid., Appendix, pp. 11–12, 29, 42, 45, 47–8, 106–8, 151–5.

District	*Chief or Headman*	*Villages*	*'Under 5'*	*'Between 5 and age of marriage'*
Central Shire	George.	11	467	40
	Masache	21	676	53
Mlanje	Nyangu	2	120	3
Chiradzulu	Malika	70	3,220	254
	Chiniko	49	2,033	142
	Chingoli	7	330	14
	Chiwewe	20	769	55
Fort Manning	Zulu	62	3,206	538
	Mlongeni	63	1,745	1,935
	Mkanda	61	2,575	602
West Nyasa	Mlowe	24	1,079	1,096
	Mbwana	25	1,382	1,806
	Mkumbira	47	1,620	1,102
	Mankambila	53	1,278	2,459
	Kabunduli	55	1,515	923
	Gulu	31	939	803
	Marenga	49	1,514	2,876
	Kanyenda	36	2,585	1,136

The above table shows first seven areas in which the children 'under 5' were more than 10 times as numerous as those 'between 5 and marriage age'. It shows secondly the age distribution in the three sections of the Manning District. Each section consists of 61 or 63 villages, and each section has 3,000 or 4,000 inhabitants under marriage age. But in Zulu there were about 6 times and in Mkanda about 4 times as many children under 5 as over 5, while in Mlongeni the children under 5 are less numerous than those over 5. Finally, the table shows the age distribution in the eight sections of West Nyasa. The differences here are also striking. In Mlowe and Gulu there are about as many children under 5 as over 5; in Kanyenda there are more than twice as many children under 5 as over 5; in Mankambila and Marenga there are nearly twice as many children over 5 as under 5.

It evidently does not help much to substitute 7 years for 5 years as the upper limit of the first age-group. It is obvious that where the number of children in the second group is nearly twice as high as in the first group, the second group must have comprised a large proportion of the children under 7. It is obvious, on the other hand, that where the number of children in the first group was more than, say, 2·5 times as high as in the second group, the first group must have comprised a large proportion of the children over 7. It is evident, finally, that where the first group was more than, say, 5 times as numerous as the second group the results have no meaning whatsoever. The attempts to distinguish between the younger and the older children have failed completely, and the elaborate efforts of the Superintendent of Census and the Senior Health Officer to draw conclusions from these figures served no useful purpose.[1]

[1] To give just one example. The Superintendent of Census points out (*Census Report 1931*, p. 25) that in 1926–31 the percentage increase was larger for the children over 5 than for the children under 5. All that can be safely inferred from this, it seems to me, is that the wrong allocations to the lower age-group were slightly fewer in 1931 than in 1926. But the Superintendent

In view of the varying interpretations of the term 'marriage age' it is doubtful, furthermore, whether any final conclusions can be drawn from the proportion of persons under marriage age. The percentages for the whole Protectorate at the three counts were 42·2, 41·5, and 42·3 respectively. The figures for the Southern Province were 42·0, 39·9, and 41·4; for the Northern Province 42·4, 43·0, and 42·9. The variations are small. If the lower limit of marriage age was actually about 15 years, the proportion of people under marriage age would appear to be high. But this is what one would expect in a country with a large excess of women. In 1931 the ratio of persons under marriage age to 100 females of marriage age was 131·8; 132·8 in the Southern Province, and 131·0 in the Northern Province. These ratios are not particularly high.

The large excess of women deserves particular attention. There were in the Southern Province in 1921 123·5 females to 100 males of marriage age. By 1926 the figure had dropped to 120·6 and by 1931 to 117·4. Part of this excess was due to the fact that girls between 14 and 16 years were usually included while boys of that age were excluded. Assuming that there had been at the time of each count 102 females to 100 males under marriage age,[1] the ratio of females to 100 males of marriage age would appear to be 116·3, 115·5, and 110·8 respectively. The excess of women, especially at the earlier counts, seems large. But as there was some, though not much, emigration of men, this large excess of women in the Southern Province may be accepted as genuine.[2] In the Northern Province the ratio of females to 100 males of marriage age was 138·6, 143·8, and 133·9 respectively. The factor of the difference in the age limit for boys and for girls is small but is apparently responsible for the great fluctuations in the ratios. Assuming that there had been all the time 102 females to 100 males under marriage age,[3] the ratio of females to 100 males of marriage age would appear to be 135·0, 136·3, and 132·4 respectively. The preponderance of women in the Northern Province is enormous, but emigration from this Province was also enormous.[4] Assuming that three-quarters of the excess

of Census gives the following explanation (ibid., p. 26): 'It is . . . extremely probable that between 1928 and 1931 a considerable immigration set in and continued throughout the period. These immigrants would bring with them families constituted in much the same way as the indigenous families, and would thus introduce a large number of individuals in the 5–15 group who so far as Nyasaland is concerned had never been in the 0–5 group . . . .'

[1] The counts show ratios of 93·4, 95·2, and 93·8 respectively.

[2] The 1933 *Medical Report* suggests (p. 14) that one reason for the large excess of women is 'the immigration of polygamous families'. But this argument is not convincing. Polygamy in the Southern Province is rare, and in the Mlanje District which had the largest proportion of immigrants the number of wives is practically the same as the number of husbands (in 1931, 29,963 and 29,440 respectively).

[3] The counts show ratios of 97·9, 94·1, and 100·3 respectively.

[4] Strange to say, it did not occur to the Superintendent of Census, when discussing the excess of women, that emigration of men may play a part. After having pointed out that in 1926 in Lower Shire, Lilongwe, Dowa, Momberas, West Nyasa, and Kasungu (all of which except Lower Shire are in the Northern Province) the ratio of females to 100 males at all ages was 121·9, as against 114·8 for the country as a whole, he said: 'It is difficult to account for this discrepancy. In each of the six districts except Momberas there is actually an excess of males over females in the lowest age group, and also in the adolescent group except in Dowa. The excess of females as compared with the rest of the community would appear to be attributable entirely to the

TABLE 9. *Native Population by Sex and Age, Nyasaland, 1921, 1926, and 1931*[1]

Year	Province	Under 5 years			Between 5 and marriage age			Marriage age			Total		
		Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1921	Southern	83,019	82,033	165,052	35,393	28,585	63,978	141,660	174,931	316,591	260,072	285,549	545,621
	Northern	90,456	93,108	183,564	49,559	44,007	93,566	158,051	219,132	377,183	298,066	356,247	654,313
	Total	173,475	175,141	348,616	84,952	72,592	157,544	299,711	394,063	693,774	558,138	641,796	1,199,934
1926	Southern	81,299	81,329	162,628	43,157	37,196	80,353	165,743	199,898	365,641	290,199	318,423	608,622
	Northern	98,260	95,681	193,941	52,851	46,483	99,334	159,537	229,451	388,988	310,648	371,615	682,263
	Total	179,559	177,110[2]	356,669[2]	96,008	83,579[2]	179,587[2]	325,280	429,349	754,629	600,847	690,038	1,290,885
1931	Southern	105,367	104,449	209,816	57,858	48,638	106,496	202,994	238,235	441,229	366,219	391,322	757,541
	Northern	115,056	117,663	232,719	65,137	63,094	128,231	205,805	275,592	481,397	385,998	456,349	842,347
	Total	220,423	222,112	442,535	122,995	111,732	234,727	408,799	513,827	922,626	752,217	847,671	1,599,888

[1] Computed from *Census Report 1921*, p. 22; *1926*, Table M; *1931*, Tables O, W.

[2] Totals do not agree with sum of items.

was due to emigration the deficit of men attributable to this factor would have amounted to 41,536, 43,459, and 50,060 respectively.[1]

Conjugal condition. The figures of marital condition among the natives must not be taken too literally.

> The definition of marriage cannot . . . be laid down with the precision obtaining in European countries owing both to the growing laxity in this respect among some tribes and to the lack of formality that prevails very extensively as regards the contracting and dissolving of the marriage tie. The position is also complicated by the fact that co-habitation without formal marriage is not viewed with any effective reprobation.[2]
>
> It is probable . . . that divorced or separated natives are classed indifferently as single or widowed . . . .[3]

TABLE 10. *Native Population of Marriage Age by Sex and Conjugal Condition, Nyasaland, 1931*[1]

	Males				*Females*			
Province	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Total*
Southern	20,976	175,182	6,836	202,994	22,583	188,378	27,274	238,235
Northern	23,185	176,965	5,655	205,805	25,927	221,143	28,522	275,592
Total	44,161	352,147	12,491	408,799	48,510	409,521	55,796	513,827

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Table P.

According to the 1931 count the percentage of bachelors among the males of marriage age was only 10·8 (10·3 in the Southern Province and 11·3 in the Northern Province); the percentage of husbands was 86·1 (86·3 and 86·0), and the percentage of widowers 3·1 (3·4 and 2·7). Among the females of marriage age the percentage of spinsters was 9·4 (9·5 and 9·4), the percentage of wives 79·7 (79·1 and 80·3), and the percentage of widows 10·9 (11·4 and 10·3).

In view of the widely held belief that polygamy is quite common in Nyasaland,[4] the excess of wives over husbands deserves particular atten-

adults and could be explained in various ways; lower expectation of life in polygamous males, healthiness of the married state for native women, introduction of brides from outside the district when the local supply proves insufficient.' (*Census Report 1926*, p. xxxvi.)

[1] These figures are submitted here only in order to show that the excess of women in the Northern Province, great as it is, is not greater than might be expected in view of the large number of natives who in the course of the last decades have left the Protectorate for good. They bear no relation to the estimates of Nyasaland natives employed abroad as (1) they do not include the 'absentees', who are supposed to be covered by the counts, (2) they represent rather the excess of emigrant men over emigrant women, (3) they are not affected by the mortality of those who die abroad. It should be noted, moreover, that not much attention ought to be paid to the apparent increase in 1926–31 as the population was probably understated in 1921 and 1926.

[2] Ibid., p. xxxiii. [3] Ibid., p. xxxvi.

[4] The Land Commission appointed in 1920 reported (p. 2) that 'a considerable proportion of the native population is polygamous'. The *Census Report 1926* stated (p. xxxv): 'A native may... be married under the Marriage Ordinance, 1902, in which case the marriage is subject to the rights and obligations of an ordinary English marriage. Few natives, however, adopt this method which is obviously unsuited to a backward community predominantly pagan and polygamous.' The *Report on the Nyasaland Railways 1927* said in discussing labour (pp. 30–1): 'If he [the native] is tempted to spend he will be induced to work and the influence of his wives in this respect is far from negligible.' The *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935* said (p. 29) that 'the majority of our labourers are pagans and polygamous'.

tion. For the Protectorate as a whole the ratio of the number of wives to 100 husbands was 123·0 in 1921, 122·8 in 1926, and 116·3 in 1931. But here again it is advisable to distinguish between the two Provinces. The figures for the Southern Province were 116·4, 112·1, and 107·5 respectively. They seem to indicate that the proportion of wives of polygamous husbands was very much smaller in 1931 than in 1921. But it appears that the decline was mainly due to the returns from one district, the Mlanje District where the ratio of wives to 100 husbands at the three counts was 154·6, 107·8, and 101·8 respectively. It is obvious that the ratio in Mlanje had been overstated in 1921,[1] and it is likely that in that year the excess of wives over husbands in the Southern Province was smaller than indicated by the count. In any case there can be no doubt that according to the 1931 count polygamy was very rare in the Southern Province. In the Northern Province the ratio of wives to 100 husbands at the three counts was 129·0, 133·9, and 125·0 respectively. While the number of husbands in 1931 was practically the same in the Northern as in the Southern Province, the number of wives in the Northern Province exceeded that in the Southern Province by over 30,000. The 1926 census report stated:[2]

Polygamy is not common in the Shire Highlands and is most prevalent in the Lower Shire, Lilongwe, Dowa, Momberas, West Nyasa and Kasungu districts,[3] the tribes most addicted to the practice appearing to be the Chikunda, Ngoni and Chewa-Chipeta. . . . In the six districts mentioned above there were 1,436 married women to each 1,000 married men; for the whole Protectorate the proportion was 1,228.

But here again some figures arouse suspicion. In the Lilongwe District the ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 125·3 in 1921, 123·3 in 1931, but 139·8 in 1926, and in the six districts combined the ratio dropped from 143·6 in 1926 to 129·5 in 1931. Moreover, the fact that the excess of wives was highest in these six districts is no proof that polygamy was there most prevalent. Thousands of husbands, every year, leave the Northern Province in search of work and quite a few of them never return. Polygamy is certainly more frequent in the Northern than in the Southern Province but the difference is not so great as the ratios of wives to husbands indicate.[4]

[1] In all other districts the ratio varied between 103·9 and 146·0.

[2] *Census Report 1926*, p. xxxvi. The 1931 census report does not discuss conjugal condition.

[3] Of these 6 districts all but Lower Shire are in the Northern Province.

[4] See also in this connexion Eric Smith, *Report on the Direct Taxation of Natives in the Nyasaland Protectorate*, p. 25:

'Great difficulty has been experienced throughout the enquiry in obtaining reliable statistics regarding cases of plural wives. It was hoped that accurate figures would be forthcoming in regard to the number of Hut and Poll Taxes due for payment by individual Natives, but with one exception [Cholo] the District Census records give no cross-reference particulars regarding plural wives. Wives of a man often reside in different villages, under different Native Authorities, and sometimes in different Districts. All District Officers made a percentage count in their Districts, taking different areas with different groups of people. The estimated average percentage of plural wives in each District is as follows:—

Cholo	3·6	Fort Manning	9·5	West Nyasa	17	Ncheu	22·75
Lower Shire	5	North Nyasa	9·7	Mzimba	20	Blantyre	23
Zomba	5·35	Upper Shire	10	Kasungu	20	Dowa	25
Chikwawa	6	Mlanje	10	Dedza	20	Lilongwe	25'
South Nyasa	6·4	Chiradzulu	10	Kota-Kota	22·5		

2. *1945*

The report on the 1945 count throws a much clearer light on the composition of the native population than any earlier report. As shown above,[1] 'the count was a *de facto* count of the persons actually living in any given District, and a record of those absent abroad was taken separately'. The Superintendent of Census says: 'In any comparative examination of the figures of the various censuses it is, therefore, necessary to include the absentees shown separately in the present census.'[2] But the *de jure* population shown in the 1945 report is in fact not wholly comparable with that returned at earlier counts. The latter excluded people temporarily present and probably excluded almost all absentees who had been absent for more than a few years. The 1945 *de jure* population included persons temporarily present, and included tens of thousands of absentees who had been absent for many years. These differences tend to swell the number of men in the *de jure* population of 1945 as compared with earlier counts.

Sex. The ratio of females to 100 males was 115·8 among the *de facto* population and 103·3 among the *de jure* population.

Thus the percentage figures of females to males in the 1945 census do not show a close approximation to the corresponding figures in 1921 and 1931, unless it is assumed that the previous censuses, which purported to be *de jure* counts of the whole domiciled African population, failed to include a large number of absentees.[3]

But the differences between the sex ratios among the *de jure* population are so great that they can be explained only in part by omissions of absentees at the earlier counts.[3]

Age. The age data are again most uncertain.

. . . this census of the African population, like all previous censuses, has been taken by African enumerators, who have had to assess the ages of the population as best they could. The taking of the census has extended over a period of time ranging from three to ten weeks, and during this period there must have been considerable internal movement of the population: persons have been away at work or visiting on the day when the village was counted and to some extent enumerators have had to rely on information supplied by the headman. Even where the whole population of a village has been interviewed, enumerators have been faced with the well nigh impossible problem of sorting into age groups people who seldom have knowledge of the dates of their own birth or of those of their children.[4]

As shown above,[5] the 1945 count distinguished four age-groups: 0–1 year, 1–5 years, 5–18 years, 18 years and over.

0–1 year:—Enumerators were instructed to count all children who could not walk and were still carried on their mothers' backs. In view of the fact that few mothers have any record of the date of birth of their children, this was the best yardstick

It is noteworthy that Fort Manning and North Nyasa are the only Northern districts where the percentage was estimated at less than 10 per cent. while Blantyre is the only Southern district where it was estimated at more than 10 per cent. The value of the estimates is, of course, dubious; Mr. Smith thinks 'that the Southern Province estimate is nearer the mark'.

[1] See p. 531.

[2] *Census Report 1945*, p. 2.

[3] 'The 1945 returns show an excess of 35,719 females over males as compared with an excess of females of no less than 95,454 in 1931' (ibid., p. 14).

[4] Ibid., p. 11.

[5] See p. 531.

available. But it is a fact that most infants are carried long after their first birthday. It is, therefore, a virtual certainty that the numbers recorded in this age group are far too high.[1]

Since 8·4 per cent. of the *de facto* population were returned in this age-group it seems safe to assume that at least as many children over 1 as under 1 were included.

1 to 5 Age Group:—This age group presented an even greater problem to the enumerators. The yardstick to determine whether a child was or was not under the age of 5 years was to ask whether a child had been born before or after the year that the European war broke out. Unfortunately the beginning of the European war is not a fixed date to the majority of the African population, least of all to the women. Experimental counts proved that, in practice, enumerators would have to judge the age of 5 years by eye. Here the various parasitic diseases, which retard growth and development, play an important part. In test cases, where the parents have known the correct ages of their children, boys and girls, who looked no more than 4 or 5 years of age, turned out to be 6, 7 or even older. It is a certainty, therefore, that the returns submitted, through no fault of the enumerators, are far too high in this age group. The figure of 25%, which is the percentage of the 0–5 years age group to the total *de facto* population, should be disregarded.[2]

Since so many children over 1 were counted as under 1 it might have been expected that the number of children allocated to the age group 1–5 would not have been very large even if numerous children over 5 had been included. But the number of children over 5 counted as under 5 was so enormous that the proportion of children under 5 was overstated about as grossly as at the earlier counts.

(5 to 18 Age-Group). In some cases the more competent enumerators have made an honest effort to judge the age of 18 years and have included married persons under the age of 18 years in the 5–18 years age group. In most cases, however, enumerators have found this too difficult for them and have taken actual marriage as their yardstick. This has meant that numbers of married women under the age of 18 years have been classified as adults, while numbers of single men up to 19 and 20 years of age have been included in the lower age group. The fact remains that enumerators have been faced with problems of classification that would have baffled the best trained statisticians.[3]

The returns showed 542,423 persons between 5 and 18 as compared with 546,995 under 5. It seems that something like one-half of the children between 5 and 10 years were wrongly allocated to the lower age-group. But the total number of non-adults may have come near the truth. The ratio of females to 100 males under 18 was 94·7. The apparent excess of males was due to the wrong allocation mentioned by the Superintendent.

Adult Age Group. The ratio of females to 100 males over 18 was 146·3 for the *de facto* population and 112·7 for the *de jure* population.[4] The Superintendent rightly points out that part of the apparent excess of female adults is due to the defective distinction between non-adults and

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., p. 12. The percentage exceeded 20 in each of the 20 Districts, and it exceeded 30 in 5 (Fort Johnston, Liwonde, Chiradzulu, Cholo, Mlanje); see ibid., Table 1.

[3] Ibid., p. 13.

[4] In the Northern Province the figures were 194·1 and 121·4, in the Central Province 152·0 and 117·2, and in the Southern Province 131·6 and 106·9 respectively; see ibid., Tables 1, 3.

adults and (in the case of the *de jure* population) to the omissions of absentees.[1]

The value of the new sex and age returns for the Administration may perhaps best be illustrated by comparing them with the 'estimates' given in the Report of the Post-War Development Committee:

	Under 18		*18 and over*		*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Count[1] . . .	559,426	529,992	511,721	576,874	1,071,147	1,106,866	2,178,013
Report P.-W.D.C.[2] .	481,600	441,300	525,200	691,900	1,006,800	1,133,200	2,140,000

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, pp. 12–13.
[2] See *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 40. The estimate refers to 1942.

The Development Committee estimated the proportion of non-adults at 43 per cent. while the count showed 50 per cent. The Development Committee estimated the ratio of female to 100 male adults at 132 while the count (which *overstated* the excess of females) showed 113.

Conjugal Condition. The Superintendent of Census reports:

> The table showing the marital state of the African population is of limited value for the number of women with absentee husbands is not known. Of the 123,000 absentee males a considerable proportion are unmarried for many emigrate with the object of acquiring money before marriage, and the problem is further confused by the entry of an unknown number of immigrants, some married and some unmarried. The excess of married women over married men is 127,459, but this figure in itself does not indicate the extent of polygamous marriages in the Protectorate. No such deduction can be made without an exact knowledge of the marital state of absentees and immigrants—information which it is not possible to obtain.[2]

TABLE 11. *African Population by Sex, Age, and Conjugal Condition, Nyasaland, 1945*[1]

Age (Years)	*Conjugal condition*	*Northern Province*		*Central Province*		*Southern Province*		*Total*	
		M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
Under 1	Single	11,110	11,436	32,537	34,054	41,106	42,502	84,753	87,992
1–5	Single	23,964	23,880	62,553	62,451	102,081	99,321	188,598	185,652
5–18	Single	43,274	37,991	99,850	83,530	122,021	98,446	265,145	219,967
	Married	666	1,860	12,081	18,180	8,107	16,217	20,854	36,257
	Widowed	—	1	14	63	62	60	76	124
	Total	43,940	39,852	111,945	101,773	130,190	114,723	286,075	256,348
Over 18	Single	4,853	4,772	10,115	15,490	19,246	30,843	34,214	51,105
	Married	40,143	71,491	124,823	172,986	181,314	213,859	346,280	458,336
	Widowed	1,428	13,856	1,974	19,671	3,965	24,460	7,367	57,987
	Total	46,424	90,119	136,912	208,147	204,525	269,162	387,861	567,428

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, Tables 1, 2.

Between 1931 and 1945 the number of men returned as widowers decreased from 12,491 to 7,443 while the number of women returned as widows increased from 55,796 to 58,111. The Superintendent offers as an

[1] See ibid., p. 13. [2] Ibid., p. 15.

explanation of the disproportion shown at the recent count 'that the absence of so many males has created an excess of marriageable females left behind in the Protectorate and that elderly widowers tend to marry women much younger than themselves, rather than widows of their own age'.[1]

V. Composition of the Non-Native Population

1. *1921–43*

Race. The European population grew from 1,486 in 1921 to 1,656 in 1926, and 1,975 in 1931, an increase of 33 per cent. in the decade. The Asiatic population rose from 563 in 1921 to 850 in 1926, and 1,591 in 1931, an increase of 183 per cent. in those ten years.[2] Since 1931 the European and Asiatic population at 31 December has been estimated as follows:[3]

	1932	*1933*	*1934*	*1935*	*1936*	*1937*	*1938*	*1939*	*1940*	*1941*	*1942*	*1943*
Europeans . .	1,901	1,817	1,800	1,781	1,838	1,894	1,847	1,953	1,738	1,815	1,851	1,812
Asiatics . .	1,583	1,474	1,401	1,400	1,558	1,631	1,748	1,656	1,851	2,017	2,039	2,177

While there was a considerable net immigration of Europeans in 1926–31 and a very large net immigration of Asiatics in 1921–31, total emigration apparently exceeded total immigration from 1931 to 1939 in both groups, and for Europeans also in subsequent years.[4]

Birthplace. Of the 1,975 Europeans enumerated in 1931, 226 were born in Nyasaland, 290 in the Union of South Africa, 25 in other British possessions in Africa, 11 in Portuguese East Africa, 1,138 in British possessions in Europe, 166 elsewhere in Europe, 55 in British possessions in Asia, 25 in British possessions in America, 14 elsewhere in America, and 25 in British possessions in Oceania. Of the 1,591 Asiatics 105 were born in Nyasaland, 5 in Portuguese East Africa, 1,412 in British India, 58 in Portuguese India, and 11 in other countries.[5]

Nationality. Of the 1,975 Europeans 1,743 were British, 5 Belgian, 89 Dutch, 54 French, 8 German, 12 Greek, 41 Italian, 6 Portuguese, 2 Russian, 2 Swede, 2 Swiss, and 11 U.S.A. citizens.[6] Of the 1,591 Asiatics 1,509 were returned as British Indian, 5 as Singalese, 1 as Arab, 3 as Chinese, and 73 as Portuguese Indian.[7]

Sex. The figures of the total European population at the censuses of 1921, 1926, and 1931 give the impression of a notable steady increase, but this increase was mainly due to a growth of the female population.

[1] *Census Report 1945*, p. 15.

[2] See ibid. *1931*, pp. 9, 12. In 1901 there were 314 Europeans and 115 Asiatics in Nyasaland, and in 1911, 766 Europeans and 481 Asiatics; see ibid. *1911*, p. 3.

[3] See *Blue Book 1932*, Section 15, p. 2, to *1941*, Section 15, p. 2; *Medical Report 1943*, p. 7, *1944*, p. 4.

[4] This, however, apparently does not take account of Jewish refugees who came in 1941. See ibid. *1941*, p. 4: 'A number of Jewish refugees from Central European countries arrived in Nyasaland towards the end of the year and have been accommodated in a special camp.'

[5] See *Census Report 1931*, Table I.

[6] See ibid., Table A.

[7] See ibid., Table H. I suspect, however, that these figures refer to race rather than nationality.

TABLE 12. *European Population by Country of Birth, Nyasaland, 1931*[1]

Country of birth	*Europeans*	*Country of birth*	*Europeans*	*Country of birth*	*Europeans*
Nyasaland .	226	France . .	56	Straits Settl. .	2
Kenya . .	1	Germany . .	10	Asia Total .	55
Rhodesia . .	23	Greece . .	9		
St. Helena .	1	Holland . .	37	British Guiana .	2
Union of S. Africa	290	Italy . . .	39	Canada . .	16
Port. East Africa	11	Madeira . .	1	Br. West Indies .	7
Africa Total .	552	Portugal . .	3	Argentine . .	2
		Poland . .	1	Brazil . .	1
		Russia . .	2	U.S. America .	11
England . .	706	Spain . .	1	America Total	39
Wales . .	21	Sweden . .	2		
Scotland . .	351	Europe Total .	1,304	Australia . .	19
Ireland . .	54			New Zealand .	6
Channel Islands	5	Burma . .	2	Oceania Total .	25
Malta . .	1	Ceylon . .	10		
Austria . .	1	Cyprus . .	4	Total . .	1,975
Belgium . .	4	India . .	37		

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Table B.

The number of males rose only from 1,034 in 1921 to 1,168 in 1931, and this increase was probably not larger than the excess of births over deaths.[1] It should be noted, moreover, that according to the official population estimates the number of males was higher in 1931 than ever before and ever thereafter. For 31 December 1939 it is given as 1,133.[2] When the number of male Europeans had declined from 1,034 in 1921 to 1,016 in 1926 (and the number of adult males from 920 to 888) the Superintendent gave as an explanation that 'a certain number of Nyasaland residents are temporarily absent on the gold fields in Tanganyika Territory',[3] but after having realized that the only group which showed a decline (from 399 to 324) were the 'Planters and Agriculturists', who could hardly be suspected of being temporarily absent on the gold fields in Tanganyika Territory, he stated:[4]

> The decline in the numbers occupied in agriculture may be accounted for by the fact that many Europeans who came to the country during the period immediately following the war, when prices were high,[5] have since been compelled to relinquish their intention of settling in the country. It looks, indeed, as though the country had absorbed as many Europeans as can be supported in the existing state of development.

The permanent emigration of planters and agriculturists continued in 1926–31. Their number decreased from 324 to 290 while at the same time the number of Government officials increased from 153 to 199, the number

[1] Births and deaths are not shown by sex. The total excess of births over deaths in 1921–30 was 295.

[2] See *Blue Book 1939*, Section 15, p. 2. For 31 Dec. 1941 it is given as 980; see ibid. *1941*, Section 15, p. 2.

[3] *Census Report 1926*, p. vii. [4] Ibid., p. x.

[5] The number of planters and agriculturists was only 107 in 1911; see *Census Report 1921*, p. 3.

of missionaries from 120 to 153, and the number engaged in trade, commerce, and industry from 236 to 276.[1]

Since the number of female Europeans has increased all the time—from 452 in 1921 to 640 in 1926, 807 in 1931, and 820 in 1939—the ratio of females to 100 males has risen steadily; it was 43·7, 63·0, 69·1 and 72·4 respectively.[2]

The preponderance of males is much larger among the Asiatics. The ratio of females to 100 males was here in 1921, 1926, and 1931 9·5, 15·2, and 16·0 respectively. According to the official estimate for 31 December 1939 the figure has risen to 33·3, but this may be an overstatement.[3]

Age. In 1931 the proportion of children (under 15) among the total European population was 14·9 per cent., among the Asiatic population 11·6 per cent. The proportion of women at child-bearing age (15–49 years) was 29·7 and 9·2 per cent. respectively; the proportion of old people (60 years and over) was 2·3 and 0·9 per cent. Both among the Europeans and the Asiatics the proportion of children and old people was small. But while among the Europeans the proportion of women at child-bearing age was very high it was extraordinarily low among the Asiatics. A very peculiar characteristic of the European population of Nyasaland is the scarcity of young men, the number of males between 20 and 35 years having dropped from 481 in 1921 to 401 in 1931 while the number of men over 35 increased from 431 to 606. Referring to the decrease in the number of people between 20 and 30 the census report states:[4]

> This somewhat disquieting feature is probably due to the fact that a succession of bad seasons during the intercensal period has compelled young adult settlers to seek their fortunes elsewhere. Concomitantly, Government and other bodies have refrained from increasing their staffs by the importation of young adults of this age group while those already in the country have of course passed on. The revival of prosperity which is bound to come will soon convert into an increase the present decrease in the number of youthful immigrants.

This prediction has not been fulfilled, and the available statistics concerning Government officials indicate a further considerable ageing since 1931.

Among the Asiatics, on the other hand, the preponderance of young men is very marked. The number of those between 15 and 35 was 891,

[1] See *Census Report 1926*, p. ix; *1931*, p. 11. However, the Bledisloe Commission overestimated the proportion of officials and missionaries by stating: '. . . the European population . . . of Nyasaland is largely confined to Government officials and missionaries. The tea and tobacco planters and the commercial interests centred in Blantyre and Limbe represent only a small proportion of the total.' (*Report*, p. 4.)

[2] In 1941 there were 835 females or 85·2 to every 100 males.

[3] The estimates of the Asiatics by sex inspire little confidence. The number of males is given for 31 Dec. 1936–9 as 1,227, 1,299, 1,406, and 1,242 respectively, the number of females as 331, 332, 342, and 414 (see *Blue Book 1936*, Section 15, p. 2, to *1939*, Section 15, p. 2). It is unlikely that the number of males should have increased in 1936–8 by 179 and the number of females by only 11, and it is still more unlikely that in the course of 1939 the number of males should have decreased by 164 while the number of females increased by 72.

On 31 Dec. 1941 the number of males is said to have been 1,370 and the number of females 647. This would indicate a ratio of 47·2 females to every 100 males.

[4] *Census Report 1931*, p. 10.

the number of those over 35 only 366.[1] As regards women only 3 were reported as being over 45.

TABLE 13. *Non-Native Population by Sex, Age, and Race, and by Sex, Conjugal Condition, and Race, Nyasaland, 1931*[1]

Age Years	Europeans			Asiatics		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
0–4	83	78	161	46	40	86
5–9	49	49	98	20	19	39
10–14	18	18	36	48	12	60
15–19	11	20	31	125	23	148
20–4	66	57	123	294	39	333
25–9	153	101	254	258	38	296
30–4	182	141	323	214	22	236
35–9	170	107	277	135	11	146
40–4	156	85	241	90	13	103
45–9	111	76	187	74	—	74
50–4	91	35	126	42	—	42
55–9	44	28	72	13	1	14
60–4	22	4	26	8	1	9
65–9	8	4	12	2	1	3
70 and more	4	4	8	2	—	2
Total	1,168	807	1,975	1,371	220	1,591
Single	594	319	913	545	73	618
Married	555	463	1,018	807	144	951
Widowed	16	22	38	17	3	20
Divorced	3	3	6	2	—	2

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Tables C, D, J, K.

Conjugal condition. Of the male Europeans 15 years and over in 1931, 43·6 per cent. were bachelors, 54·5 per cent. husbands, and 1·9 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Europeans 15 years and over 26·3 per

TABLE 14. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Nyasaland, 1930–41*[1]

Date	20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
1 Jan.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
1930	6	—	24	—	46	2	45	2	42	4	27	1	15	—	8	—	6	3	219	12
1931	4	—	35	1	44	5	49	—	51	3	27	2	21	—	5	—	14	4	250	15
1932	4	—	34	—	51	4	46	2	55	4	24	2	21	1	4	—	22	3	261	16
1933	4	—	26	—	57	1	49	4	49	4	29	2	23	1	5	—	23	3	265	15
1934	6[2]	—	26	—	51	—	55	5	45	3	36	3	22	1	7	—	9	3	257	15
1935	5[2]	—	24	2	48	1	59	2	43	3	39	4	16	1	14	—	22	3	270	16
1936	7	—	20	2	44	1	53	—	48	3	39	4	19	2	14	—	26	5	270	17
1937	6	—	23	4	36	2	48	1	41	1	47	3	17	2	16	—	38	5	272	18
1938	4	—	22	2	32	3	47	1	40	1	42	3	20	2	17	—	47	3	271	15
1939	5	—	20	2	36	7	41	1	45	1	38	2	27	3	20	—	45	4	277	20
1940	9	—	18	3	35	7	42	2	46	—	38	1	22	3	9	—	3	1	222	17
1941	7	—	25	4	32	9	50	1	41	2	34	—	27	2	9	—	4	1	229	19

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.
[2] Including 1 under 20 years of age.

[1] The corresponding figures for Europeans were 412 and 606 respectively.

cent. were single, 69·9 per cent. wives, and 3·8 per cent. widows or divorced. With the ageing of the males the number of bachelors had fallen considerably. It dropped from 565 in 1921 to 444 in 1931, while the number of husbands increased from 332 to 555. Among the male Asiatics 15 years and over in 1931, 34·3 per cent. were single, 64·2 per cent. husbands, and 1·5 per cent. widowers or divorced. The female Asiatics over 15 years, with the exception of 2 spinsters and 3 widows, were all wives. The ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 80 among Europeans and 18 among Asiatics. In 1921 the ratios had been 59 and 12 respectively. It has become quite an exception for a married European to stay in Nyasaland without his wife, while among Asiatics the practice of leaving a wife behind is still the rule.

2. *1945*

Race. The classification of the non-African population differed somewhat from that made in earlier reports.

The method adopted in 1931 of classification by race into Europeans (including Americans), Asiatics and Africans has been followed, with the exception that returns have been submitted for 'Other Non-Africans'. This latter classification includes persons of British Euro-African and Indo-African and Portuguese Euro-African stock, who pay the Protectorate Poll Tax, as opposed to the African Poll Tax, or who are members of a household where the 'Head' does so. It in no way purports to represent the number of persons of mixed race in the Protectorate.[1]

There were 1,948 Europeans, 2,804 Asiatics, and 455 'Other Non-Africans'. The number of Europeans was larger than at the preceding population estimates,[2] but by 27 smaller than at the census of 1931. The Superintendent of Census makes the following comment:

The census was taken on the night of the 29th April, 1945, before the cessation of hostilities with Germany. The European War had created certain abnormal conditions in Nyasaland. On the one hand numbers of males, ordinarily resident in the country, were still absent on duty, either with the armed forces or with the military administrations of enemy occupied territory: on the other, Nyasaland had given sanctuary to numbers of refugees from Central Europe, while the strength of military personnel was very much greater than in peace time. Thus the 1945 returns show 84 males and 4 females under the heading 'Armed Forces' as against 9 males under the heading 'Military, King's African Rifles' in 1931. Moreover, the majority of the 84 males, being British Army personnel, were temporary residents only. The figure 1·37%, therefore, does not give a true picture of the decrease in the European population during the intercensal period. The total figure of Europeans does not, however, include 88 males and 68 females between the ages of 5 and 19 years, who, at the date of the census, were away at school or college in neighbouring territories but who normally return to Nyasaland for the holidays.[3]

The number of Asiatics was very much larger than at the preceding population estimates, and it exceeded the 1931 figure by 76 per cent.

The 'Other Non-Africans' numbered 455. They comprised 184 Euro-Africans, 263 Indo-Africans, and 8 Mauritians.[4]

[1] *Census Report 1945*, pp. 3–4. The persons of mixed race who pay the African Poll Tax, or who are members of a household where the 'Head' does so, are included in the African population (see ibid., p. 10).

[2] These estimates probably excluded the military.

[3] Ibid., p. 4.

[4] See ibid., Table V.

Birthplace. Of the 1,948 Europeans enumerated in 1945, 278 were born in Nyasaland, 258 in the Union of South Africa, 49 in Southern Rhodesia, 30 in other British possessions in Africa, 30 elsewhere in Africa, 870 in British possessions in Europe, 275 elsewhere in Europe, 43 in British possessions in Asia, 2 in China, 55 in British possessions in America, 34 elsewhere in America, and 21 in British possessions in Oceania.[1] Of the 2,804 Asiatics, 931 were born in Nyasaland, 5 in Kenya, 2 in Rhodesia, 3 in Tanganyika, 8 in the Union of South Africa, 3 in Madagascar, 2 in Portuguese East Africa, 1,789 in British India, 60 in Portuguese India, and 1 at sea.[2] Of the 455 'Other Non-Africans', 406 were born in Nyasaland, 6 in Mauritius, 11 in Northern Rhodesia, 4 in Southern Rhodesia, 1 in Tanganyika, 2 in the Union of South Africa, 24 in Portuguese East Africa, and 1 in British Guiana.[3]

Nationality. Of the 1,948 Europeans, 1,581 were British, 23 were Austrian, 4 Belgian, 1 Czechoslovakian, 2 Danish, 41 French, 20 German, 42 Greek, 37 Dutch, 20 Hungarian, 64 Italian, 1 Luxembourg, 7 Polish, 35 Portuguese, 1 Swedish, 2 Swiss, 44 U.S.A. citizens, 17 Stateless, and 6 not specified.[4] The increase in the number of foreigners from 232 in 1931 to 367 in 1945 was due largely to the presence of 87 refugees from Central Europe.[5] Of the 2,804 Asiatics, 2,715 were British Indian and 89 Portuguese Indian.[6] Of the 455 'Other Non-Africans', 438 were British and 17 Portuguese.[7]

Sex. The decrease in the number of Europeans since 1931 was confined to the males. Their number declined from 1,168 to 1,086, while the number of females rose from 807 to 862. The ratio of females to 100 males was 79·4. Excluding the military, the ratio was 85·6 to 100. The number of male 'Planters and Agriculturists', which had declined from 399 in 1921 to 290 in 1931, dropped to 171 in 1945,[8] but the decrease in the latter period was due partly to military service abroad.

The increase in the number of Asiatics since 1931 was largely due to the rise in the number of females. The number of males increased from 1,371 to 1,776 and the number of females from 220 to 1,028. The increase in the Asiatic population is to be explained by 'economic pressure in India that has induced more and more Indians to call for their wives and families to join them in Nyasaland',[9] and by a large excess of births over deaths.

[1] Of the 156 'Scholars attending School in neighbouring territories but who return to Nyasaland for the holidays' 97 were born in Nyasaland, 5 in Northern Rhodesia, 11 in Southern Rhodesia, 4 in Tanganyika, 7 in the Union of South Africa, 1 in Zanzibar, 1 in Portuguese East Africa, 18 in Great Britain, 2 in Ireland, 2 in Germany, 2 in Madeira, 1 in Poland, 1 in Burma, 1 in India, 1 in British West Indies, and 2 in the United States of America. See ibid., Table I.

[2] See ibid., Table M.

[3] See ibid., Table T.

[4] See ibid., Table A. Of the 156 Scholars not present, 150 were British, 3 German, 2 American, and 1 Stateless; see ibid., Table H.

[5] See ibid., p. 5.

[6] See ibid., Table O.

[7] See ibid., Table V.

[8] See ibid., p. 6.

[9] Ibid., p. 7. The number of males born in British India decreased from 1,257 to 1,247, while the number of females born there increased from 155 to 542.

TABLE 15. *European Population by Country of Birth and Sex, Nyasaland, 1945*[1]

Country of birth	*M.*	*F.*	*Country of birth*	*M.*	*F.*
Nyasaland	136	142	Madeira	3	5
Basutoland	—	1	Poland	8	1
Bechuanaland	3	1	Portugal	10	5
Kenya	3	2	Rumania	2	2
Northern Rhodesia	7	6	Russia	1	2
St. Helena	—	2	Sweden	—	2
Seychelles	—	2	Yugoslavia	—	1
Southern Rhodesia	24	25	Europe Total	698	447
Tanganyika	2	1			
Union of South Africa	114	144	Burma	2	—
Belgian Congo	1	3	Ceylon	3	5
Egypt	3	3	Cyprus	2	6
Portuguese East Africa[2]	7	11	India	14	11
Portuguese West Africa	1	1	China	1	1
African Total	301	344	Asia Total	22	23
England	326	217			
Wales	14	8	Br. West Indies	5	4
Scotland	146	104	Canada	35	11
Ireland	35	17	Argentine	—	2
Channel Islands	1	1	Brazil	—	4
Malta	1	—	U.S. America	14	13
Austria	8	9	Uruguay	—	1
Belgium	1	2	America Total	54	35
Czechoslovakia	—	4			
Danzig Free City	1	—	Australia	5	6
Denmark	1	—	New Zealand	4	6
France	27	12	Oceania Total	9	12
Germany	15	13			
Greece	19	8	At Sea	—	1
Holland	28	11	Not specified	2	—
Hungary	10	10			
Italy	40	13	Total	1,086	862
Luxembourg	1	—			

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, Table B.
[2] Including Chinde Brit. Concess.

Age. The proportion of children (under 15) among the European population was 17·1 per cent.,[1] among the Asiatic population 37·2 per cent. The proportion of women of child-bearing age (15–49 years) was 27·0 and 16·6 per cent. respectively; the proportion of old people (60 years and over) was 9·5 and 1·9 per cent. The most startling changes since 1931 were the large increase of old people among Europeans and the enormous increase of children and of women at child-bearing age among Asiatics. The proportion of men between 15 and 60 among the total European population dropped from 49·8 per cent. to 40·3 per cent., and among the total Asiatic population from 78·3 per cent. to 43·8 per cent. The decrease in the proportion of European men was due largely to the fact that

[1] Including 'Scholars attending School in neighbouring territories but who return to Nyasaland for the holidays' the proportion was 21·3 per cent. See *Census Report 1945*, Table J.

'few of Nyasaland's young men had returned from duty with the armed forces at the time when the census was taken'.[1] The main cause for the decrease in the proportion of Asiatic men was immigration of women and children.

TABLE 16. *Non-African Population by Sex, Age, and Race, and by Sex, Conjugal Condition, and Race, Nyasaland, 1945*[1]

Age Years	*Europeans*			*Asiatics*			*Other Non-Africans*		
	M.	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
0–4	101	96	197	265	291	556	73	58	131
5–9	64	50	114	164	181	345	54	45	99
10–14	13	10	23	76	67	143	42	17	59
15–19	10	15	25	85	62	147	17	22	39
20–4	20	35	55	148	104	252	10	25	35
25–9	70	58	128	174	110	284	10	10	20
30–4	130	102	232	194	87	281	17	12	29
35–9	129	116	245	221	52	273	11	12	23
40–4	136	113	249	176	34	210	10	8	18
45–9	104	87	191	113	16	129	2	—	2
50–4	88	65	153	70	6	76	—	—	—
55–9	98	52	150	46	10	56	—	—	—
60–4	64	30	94				—	—	—
65–9	41	24	65	44	8	52	—	—	—
70 and more	18	9	27				—	—	—
Total	1,086	862	1,948	1,776	1,028	2,804	246	209	455
Single	320	162	482	300	36	336	33	21	54
Married	568	493	1,061	924	429	1,353	44	61	105
Widowed	16	42	58	39	23	62	4	3	7
Divorced	2	6	8	3	4	7	3	2	5

[1] See *Census Report 1945*, Tables C, D, L, N, S, U. The figures relating to conjugal condition are stated to refer to persons '16 years and over' in the case of Europeans, and to persons 'over 15 years' in the case of Asiatics and 'Other Non-Africans'.

Conjugal condition. Of the male Europeans 16 years and over 35·3 per cent. were bachelors, 62·7 per cent. husbands, and 2·0 per cent. widowers or divorced. The decrease in the proportion of bachelors since 1931 was due largely to absence in the armed forces. Of the female Europeans 16 years and over 23·1 per cent. were spinsters, 70·1 per cent. wives, and 6·8 per cent. widows or divorced. Among the male Asiatics over 15 years 23·7 per cent. were bachelors, 73·0 per cent. husbands, and 3·3 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the female Asiatics over 15 years 7·3 per cent. were spinsters, 87·2 per cent. wives, and 5·5 per cent. widows or divorced. The ratio of wives to 100 husbands was 87 among Europeans and 46 among Asiatics. The rise in the ratio among Europeans since 1931 may have been due in part to the presence of wives whose husbands were absent in the forces; the enormous rise among Asiatics was due mainly to immigration of wives.

[1] Ibid., p. 5.

VI. Native Birth and Death Registration

'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904', which established compulsory registration of European births and deaths, provided optional registration of native births and deaths. But there is no evidence that any native has ever availed himself of this opportunity. 'The District Administration (Native) Ordinance, 1912'[1] provided:

5. Every Principal Headman shall:—

(5) If required to do so by the District Resident record and report all births, marriages in accordance with native law and custom and deaths and other statistical data which may occur in or refer to his section.

7. Every Village Headman shall be responsible to the District Resident and to the Principal Headman for:—

(4) The reporting if required to do so by the District Resident of all births, marriages in accordance with native law and custom and deaths in his village or villages.

But this provision was not put into effect, and interest in native birth and death registration appears to have arisen only when the results of the 1921 count seemed to show a decline in the indigenous population and an excessive child mortality. The Medical Report for 1920 recommended that a commencement should 'be made by Principal and Village Headmen reporting all births and deaths to their respective District Residents',[2] and the Provincial Commissioner for the Southern Province, in his capacity as Superintendent of the 1921 census, recommended 'That immediate steps be taken to inaugurate some system of reporting births and deaths, more especially deaths in the first year of life, and in early childhood after the first year'.[3] Referring to this recommendation, he related in the report on the 1926 count:[4]

For many and adequate reasons it was impossible to institute a system of registration of births and deaths such as exists in civilised countries, but continuous efforts were made to obtain reliable statistics from which the actual position in regard to infant and child mortality might be gauged with approximate accuracy.

In July, 1921, a Circular Letter was addressed to Provincial Commissioners asking them to consider and report on some workable scheme by which it might be possible to obtain more or less reliable figures of births and deaths, more especially of infantile mortality. The Provincial Commissioner, Southern Province, suggested that although little reliability could be placed on such returns in the first place, a start should be made in all districts by supplying each Principal Headman with two books, one to record births and one to record deaths. Both he and the Provincial Commissioner, Central Province, were of the opinion that it would be necessary to appoint native clerks, trained in their duties, to work in co-operation with the Principal Headmen. The Provincial Commissioner, Central Province, considered that registration books should also be issued to Councillors and Headmen of Village Areas, where they were responsible for definite sub-sections. The Provincial Commissioner, Northern Province, agreed with the system proposed by the Provincial Commissioner, Southern Province.

At a conference of Provincial Commissioners held in December, 1921, it was decided that it was impossible to proceed with the scheme at that time.

[1] No. 13 of 1912 (8 Nov.), reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate in Force 1913*, pp. 523–7.

[2] See *Medical Report 1920*, pp. 13, 38.

[3] *Census Report 1921*, p. 7.

[4] Ibid. *1926*, pp. xx–xxi.

A letter was, however, addressed to the Heads of the various missions asking whether they would be willing to assist the Government in the matter of obtaining more reliable statistics of births and deaths among the native population, and suggesting that a beginning could be made through the instrumentality of native mission teachers.[1] All the missions without exception expressed their willingness to assist the Government in every possible way and, as a result, a further letter was sent to each District Resident in July, 1922, enclosing copies of registration books and containing the following instructions as to the procedure to be adopted:—

(*a*) One book to be issued to each Village Headman where there is a mission school and you are to explain fully to him that he is to keep it carefully in his house and when there is any birth or death in his village to let the native teacher know at once and get him to come and enter it in the book.

(*b*) For the present, records will only be kept at villages where there are schools.

(*c*) Each book is to be examined by the Resident, or the Census capitaos, once a quarter if possible, or at any rate twice a year, the details are to be extracted in a note book and entered in the District Book on return to headquarters.

(*d*) A return is to be submitted to the Provincial Commissioner with your annual report.

(*e*) 'District', 'Village', 'Principal Headman', 'Section No.' is to be filled in by the Resident before the book is issued and the number of inhabitants in the village to be added after the name of the Village Headman.

Had it been found possible to carry this scheme into effective practice, sufficient data would by now have been available to compute the birth and death rates with some degree of accuracy. Unfortunately, one of the most important missions felt that the reporting of deaths would be unpopular among the natives, and that a certain feeling of hostility would arise against them if their native teachers were involved in the collection of mortality statistics. As a result it was decided at a Conference of the Provincial Commissioners in November, 1922, that they should use their own discrimination as to the method to be adopted for the registration of births and deaths and report in six months' time. At the expiration of a year, no reports had been received and statistics to date were called for. It was then found that the registers either had not been kept or had been kept in such a manner as to render the returns useless for the purpose of compiling reliable statistics.

In April, 1924, Provincial Commissioners were again asked for their recommendations as to the best lines on which an attempt should be made to obtain more reliable information, and to consider a suggestion by the Superintendent of Census that the rural dispensers might each take a fairly large village or a group of small ones in the vicinity of their headquarters and collect the following statistics only:—

(*a*) Live births;

(*b*) Deaths of babies before they are able to walk;

(*c*) All other deaths;

and that each Resident should collect the same information under his personal supervision in respect of a village near his station. It was felt, however, that rural dispensers would prove no more reliable than the mission teachers had been.

The Provincial Commissioners' Conference in September, 1924, resolved that as accurate figures as possible should be kept in respect of not less than four villages

[1] The Principal Medical Officer, in his Report for 1921 (see *Medical Report 1921*, p. 14), recommended another method:

'Steps are also being taken to ascertain the number of Births and Deaths among the native population. The simplest method with which I am acquainted for giving effect to this measure is by the employment of village policemen (as distinct from the native Police Force), who report weekly, in person, to the nearest Police Station or Magistrate the number of births and deaths during that period. In Africa, where villages as a rule are comparatively small and scattered, a group of villages could be assigned to each policeman.'

of not less than 50 huts in each district,[1] and that the Resident should attempt to check the figures personally as often as possible. The heads under which figures are recorded to be a few only to begin with, viz:—

A. Births;
B. Deaths; Children unable to walk;
C. Deaths; Children not owning huts;
D. Deaths; Adults.

In April, 1925, preliminary figures were called for, and were again found to be lacking in reliability, and at their conference in August, 1925, the Provincial Commissioners recorded their opinion that the figures so far available were not such as would form the basis of any reliable deductions, and they decided to continue the statistics for the same villages over an extended period.

It must be admitted that the efforts made during the last five years to collect reliable vital statistics relating to the native population have failed to attain their object. The heavy mortality rates among infants and children were already realised, and the figures obtained merely emphasised the fact without providing any precise information on the point.

Apart from these futile attempts to establish current birth and death registration the 1926 census report says that records of births and deaths kept by the White Fathers Mission and 'going back some 15 years' were examined.[2] 'The population is not a fixed one, but varies from year to year as more villages are brought under review, and it is possible that some deaths have been entered when the corresponding birth had taken place before the population involved was taken into account.'

The Marist Fathers have also kept records for their stations . . . but here again the question of changing total population is involved. It is impossible to say how accurate these figures are, or to what extent the natives report all births and deaths to the mission. It is possible to conceive reasons why natives might suppress the report of a birth to a mission especially if only one parent were a Christian, as readily as they would hide a death.

The report mentions furthermore some results of investigations made by medical officers in North Nyasa and in ten Ngoni villages, without saying how the data were obtained.[3] Finally, the report gives with great details the results of the first systematic sample study of fertility and mortality carried out in Nyasaland.

In connection with the present Census, however, a final effort along new lines was made to obtain some figures which, crude as they might be, would have the merit of providing concrete facts for consideration. All Residents, in their capacity as Census Officers, were asked in November, 1925, to obtain the following information regarding 100 married couples in their respective districts who were not likely to have any further children but who, on the other hand, were not so old as to have forgotten the details:—

(*a*) Number of children born;
(*b*) Number stillborn;

[1] It is possible (though the report does not mention it) that use was to be made of 'The District Administration (Native) Ordinance, 1924', No. 11 of 1924 (1 Feb., reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1924*, pp. 64–70), which repealed the Ordinance of 1912 and provided:

'4. A village headman shall within his village area and subject to the orders of the District Resident:—

(*c*) If required, report all births, deaths and marriages . . . .'

[2] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxv; see also *Medical Report 1924*, p. 43.

[3] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxv.

(*c*) Number born alive;
(*d*) Number who died before they could walk;
(*e*) Number who died as children.

The Residents were particularly requested not to exclude barren couples and were asked to give their personal attention to the matter in order that the information obtained might be as reliable as circumstances permitted. Returns were obtained in respect of every district except Chikwawa, where a succession of Residents apparently found themselves unable to prosecute the task. It was apparent when the returns were received that the great majority of the Residents had devoted considerable trouble to the enquiry, and in many instances the matter undoubtedly enlisted their interest to a degree that ensured as much accuracy as could be expected from the method adopted. (The information was collected for Dedza, but did not come to hand and copies have been unobtainable in time.)

It will be observed that the information asked for was, in effect, details of completed marriages, that is, marriages in which the whole period of child bearing had elapsed. The conditions revealed belong, therefore, rather to the past than to the present generation, although there is no reason to believe those conditions have changed materially of recent years. Again, although the term married couple is used, marital conditions among African natives make it obvious that the results obtained relate to the fertility of native women, irrespective of the male parent.[1]

But the Superintendent of Census was, of course, aware that such a sample study covering altogether 2,159 married couples constituted only an inadequate supplement to the general count.

It is impossible to make adequate use of the census figures unless they can be considered in conjunction with intercensal statistics of births and deaths and it is most strongly recommended that an intelligent and well paid native should be continually employed in a district where low lying and elevated areas and different tribes can be found in close proximity. He should record all births and deaths, differentiating the sexes and the ages by infants, children and adults. In order to provide a check on his work he should enter the full details regarding names of adults and parents of children and the exact date of the event. By this means it should be possible to institute a method which could gradually be extended to other areas, ascertaining approximately the birth and death rates, the exact age at which the infantile and child deaths most commonly occur, the sex ratio at birth, seasonal, climatic and tribal variations in birth and death rates, and all the similar information which is readily ascertained in countries with a systematic registration of births and deaths.[2]

No attempt whatsoever seems to have been made to carry out this recommendation. The Medical Reports for the second half of the 1920s do not refer to any investigation concerning vital statistics,[3] and the Colonial Reports mention only some efforts made by administrative officers in 1928.

During the year, further statistics were collected in various parts of the Protectorate in an endeavour to obtain figures relating to births and deaths among natives. Although the figures relate to small areas, they may be considered representative of the whole Protectorate, in so far as it is possible to obtain reliable statistics without

[1] Ibid., pp. xxi–xxii.

[2] Ibid., p. xxvi. See also ibid., p. xlii: '. . . in order that the fullest value may be derived from any census, it is essential that the most active steps should be taken to obtain and record all possible information between the various censuses. The most immediately important from the statistical point of view is probably the recommendation made in paragraph 126 regarding the collection of birth and death statistics.'

[3] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 12, says: 'No register of births or deaths is made, and as a large majority of the inhabitants are out of touch with this Department no statistics of any value can be compiled.'

creating an elaborate machinery for the purpose, such as a systematic registration of births and deaths.[1]

The data were collected in some villages in the Central Province and in the South Nyasa and the Liwonde Districts. They were apparently incomplete.

The District Commissioner, Liwonde, . . . made a special effort to get at the facts of infantile mortality. He pointed out that the collection of these statistics causes considerable annoyance to the people questioned, especially to the old women, who on occasion were seen to break down and wail when reminded of their dead children. It would appear that although the births may be accurately recorded, the deaths . . . are not so readily revealed.[1]

The sample study made in 1926 was not repeated in connexion with the count of 1931, and the Superintendent confined himself to repeating the recommendation of his predecessor:

Recommendations. I wish to make only one recommendation, in the hope that its very isolation will emphasise the need for its adoption. It is almost impossible to stress too strongly the necessity of more exact VITAL STATISTICS. . . . Attempts that have been made in the past to collect figures have met with scant success; renewed efforts should be made forthwith. In this I merely reiterate the recommendations of my predecessors and commend to the consideration of Government this, to my mind, the most salient feature of all the censuses of Nyasaland.[2]

But, taken as a whole, the vital statistics collected in the 1930s were *hardly more comprehensive than those obtained in the 1920s.*

(1) The only legislative effort to promote birth and death registration was made in connexion with the 'Native Authority Ordinance' of 14 June 1933[3] which provided:

8. Subject to the provisions of any law or Ordinance for the time being in force, and to the general or special directions of the Governor, a native authority[4] may, subject to the general or special directions of the native authority, if any, to whom it is subordinate, issue orders to be obeyed by the natives within the area—

(*k*) requiring the birth or death of any native within its jurisdiction to be reported to it or such other person as it may direct.

The number of orders in force at the end of the years 1935–9 was as follows:[5]

	Southern Province			*Northern Province*				
Year	*South Nyasa*	*Chikwawa*	*Zomba*	*Dedza*	*Kota Kota*	*West Nyasa*	*Mzimba*	*Total*
1935	6	7	—	3	—	—	—	16
1936	6	7	5	3	7	3	—	31
1937	6	7	5	7	6	—	—	31
1938	6	7	5	4	6	—	2	30
1939	6	7	5	—	6	—	2	26

[1] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1928*, p. 19. [2] *Census Report 1931*, p. 32.

[3] No. 13 of 1933, reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1933*, pp. 17–28, and in *Laws of Nyasaland in Force 1933*, vol. i, pp. 301–11 (cap. 41). This Ordinance, which repealed 'The District Administration (Native) Ordinance, 1924', was amended by the 'Native Authority (Amendment) Ordinance 1934', No. 10 of 1934 (2 July), reprinted in *Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1934*, p. 72.

[4] 'Native authority means any chief or other native or any native council or group of natives declared to be or established as a native authority under this Ordinance for the area concerned.'

[5] See *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1935*, pp. 27, 78; *1936*, pp. 33, 78; *1937*, pp. 36, 69; *1938*, pp. 39, 75; *1939*, pp. 29, 56.

In some cases the orders remained in force only for a short time.

In September 1936, three Native Authorities of the West Nyasa district requested permission to make an order under section 8 (*k*) Cap. 41 (Native Authority Ordinance) Laws of Nyasaland, to provide for the registration of births and deaths in their respective areas. The order was introduced on 1st July 1937 and remained in force until the end of the year. It was necessary to employ clerks who spent their whole time travelling from village to village collecting the returns and financial considerations will not allow this pioneer effort on the part of these Native Authorities to be continued in 1938.[1]

Only three persons (all in the Southern Province in 1938) have been convicted for offences against orders requiring the reporting of births and deaths.[2]

(2) In 1932 the Medical Department started to record births and deaths in the Fort Manning District with the help of chiefs and village headmen and kept up this system of voluntary registration for eleven years. Similar, but more ephemeral, attempts at collecting vital statistics were made in other small areas. At the same time the opinion that compulsory registration should be introduced gained ground.

1932. The registration of native births and deaths is not compulsory, indeed compulsion under the present circumstances would be futile, so that nothing very definite is known of the African population.

In May 1932 a purely departmental scheme for recording the births and deaths was started in the Fort Manning District. This District was selected because it comprises a comparatively small area, a population numerically sufficient (34,075) to provide reliable data, and an age and sex distribution which is fairly typical of the country as a whole.

The rates given below[3] are based upon data obtained during 8 months only and those the dry weather months. Moreover the native recording officers were at the commencement ignorant of their duties and made many mistakes; the reliability of the figures is therefore questionable. It may be expected however, that as the recording officers become more conversant with their duties, and the natives less distrustful of their visits, reliable data of considerable value will be obtained.

Unfortunately the resources of the Medical Department are insufficient to extend the scheme to other districts and it is unlikely that vital statistics for the whole country will be available.[4]

A departmental scheme for the registration of births and deaths was started in Fort Manning District in May, 1932. This promises to provide very valuable information in regard to African vital statistics. The District Commissioner at Ncheu has started registration on the same lines in his District, and it would undoubtedly be of great ultimate advantage to the natives if some scheme of registration could be applied to the whole country, but unfortunately the resources of the Medical Department are not sufficient to enable it to undertake the work.[5]

1933. The registration of native births and deaths is not compulsory, so that vital statistics are unfortunately not available. The experiment in registration commenced in May 1932 in the Fort Manning district was however continued. This

[1] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 29. See also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 44: '... the Atonga of West Nyasa show the utmost zeal in preventing the emigration of their women for immoral purposes, but even the prospect of more revenue does not stir them to insist upon the registration of births and deaths which was suggested to them from outside.'

[2] See ibid. *1934*, pp. 19, 54; *1935*, pp. 22, 70; *1936*, pp. 27, 72; *1937*, pp. 30, 63; *1938*, pp. 33, 69; *1939*, pp. 23, 50.

[3] The results of this and other investigations will be discussed in Section VIII of this chapter.

[4] *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 12–13; see also ibid., p. 25.

[5] *Report on Native Affairs 1932*, p. 20.

system is in no sense official except that the individual compiling the figures is a Medical Officer and the recording officers are native officials of the Medical Department; chiefs and village headmen have no legal obligations in connection with the registration, nor can any steps be taken against a native who knowingly gives false information. These facts coupled with the lack of experience of the native recording officers, imply that the calculated rates are subject to a fairly wide margin of error, indeed, the rates for 1933, differ considerably from those of the previous year, except for the birth-rate, which is practically the same.[1]

1934. Registration is now (1935) to be undertaken also in the Karonga district, so that in the course of a few years another set of figures relating to a population differing in tribal habits and customs and in geographical situation will be available for comparison.[2]

1935. During 1935 the recording of births and deaths in the Fort Manning district was continued, and it was commenced in two sections of the Karonga district, one at high altitude (3,500 feet–5,000 feet), and the other at Lake level (about 1,700 feet).

As mentioned in previous reports, deductions made from figures obtained must be accepted with great reserve, but nevertheless the results are interesting.[3]

1936. The recording of births and deaths in the Karonga district had to be given up or at least curtailed, owing to the fact that it was found impossible for the medical officer to give sufficient supervision to the native recording-officers working at a distance from his station. It is much to be regretted that the collection of vital statistics is confined to one small district but the unaided resources of the medical department do not permit of further extension.

It is difficult if not impossible to assess the effectiveness of the work of the Medical Department in regard to the general health of the population except by reference to its vital statistics. Medical surveys it is true give a clear indication of the extent of invalidity, and improvement in the survey figures would no doubt indicate that the various preventive measures were becoming effective; but the scope of medical surveys is necessarily small, and affects only a minute proportion of the population in any one year.[4]

1937. Fort Manning continues to be the only administrative district in which records of births and deaths for the whole area were collected throughout the year.[5]

The collection of records of births and deaths throughout this district [Karonga] had to be abandoned in 1936. During 1937, the recording of births and deaths was restricted to twenty-four villages with a population of 4,757 adults and children, situated within a 5 mile radius of the town of Karonga, which is the administrative and medical headquarters of the district.[6]

Registration of births and deaths is not compulsory in this country and with the exception of the isolated effort in the Chinteche area referred to above,[7] official recognition, so far as vital statistics of Africans are concerned, has been given to the census enumeration only. The collection of returns of births and deaths during the past five years has been a departmental experiment and as such has been applied merely to a limited area. As an experimental endeavour to obtain statistics relating to a primitive people, it has been successful,[8] but, being restricted in its application

[1] *Medical Report 1933*, p. 14. See also *Report on Native Affairs 1933*, p. 29.
[2] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 14.
[3] Ibid. *1935*, p. 17.
[4] Ibid. *1936*, p. 17; see also ibid., p. 34.
[5] Ibid. *1937*, p. 28.
[6] Ibid., p. 29.
[7] The District Commissioner, Chinteche, analysed the birth and death records kept by three Native Authorities in the West Nyasa District from July to Dec. 1937 (see ibid., pp. 29–30).
[8] It is difficult to see on what grounds the Medical Department called this experimental endeavour successful. Many deaths, and probably the majority of infant deaths, had not been recorded. The infant mortality rates ascertained in 1932–7 were 141, 97, 155, 73, 82, and 62 respectively. 'The infantile mortality rate [for 1937] is the lowest returned since the collection of records commenced in this district, and, in view of the risks to infant life in a primitive community it is suspected that the returns upon which the rate is based, are far from complete' (ibid., p. 29).

to only one complete administrative district the results are of little or no departmental value. Unless there is some prospect of compulsory registration being introduced for the whole country there would appear to be no object in prolonging an interesting though valueless experiment.

Vital statistics are a measuring rod of the sanitary progress of a country, they have become an essential for every properly organised community. The Statistics Ordinance, 1935, provided for the collection of information relating to births and deaths[1] and in 'Indirect Rule' there is the mechanism capable of ensuring its successful application throughout the Protectorate. It is recommended that compulsory registration of births and deaths should be introduced without further delay. Despite legal support, it will not be possible to depend on the accuracy of the records for some years and it is desirable to ensure that the scheme will be functioning efficiently before the date of the next census.[2]

1938. No records are available of births and deaths throughout the Protectorate, but this department has continued to attempt to keep records in certain limited areas using native vaccinators, individuals usually of some intelligence but no special training, who in the course of touring villages obtain the necessary data. In submitting these figures it is not claimed that they are very accurate.

The recording of births and deaths has been attempted in this district [Fort Manning] since May 1933 and although the staff employed has changed over the period, the method of recording has remained comparatively the same.[3]

The Sub-Assistant Surgeon who instituted the keeping of vital statistics in the Fort Manning District, during 1938 attempted to obtain figures in one Native Authority's area in the Lower Shire district, in which he is now posted. The method of collection of figures adopted is that in force in the Fort Manning District.

The keeping of records of births and deaths amongst the population resident within a five mile radius of Karonga, the Boma station of the North Nyasa district, was attempted during the year.[4]

1939. The registration of births and deaths amongst the general African population is not yet attempted but since 1933 the Medical Department has tried to keep records of the population in the Fort Manning district. The figures are obtained by rural Sanitary Inspectors with the co-operation of Native Authorities. In 1938 the keeping of statistics was started also in a part of the Lower Shire district. The complete accuracy of the figures obtained by our methods is not claimed.[5]

1940. General registration of Births and Deaths amongst Africans is not yet attempted, but in three limited areas which are widely separated, enumerators employed by the Medical Department attempt to keep records collecting data from Village headmen.[6]

1941. The rates given below are compiled from records kept by African enumerators working under the direction of Officers of the Medical Department.[7]

While the Medical Department demanded most emphatically the introduction of compulsory registration of births and deaths the Native Welfare

[1] The Statistics Ordinance does not *provide* for the collection of information relating to births and deaths, but merely mentions 'vital matters' among the matters concerning which statistics *may* be collected annually.

[2] Ibid., p. 31; see also ibid., p. 52.

[3] However, 'no attempt was made to record deaths in age groups', so that infant mortality was not ascertained in 1938.

[4] Ibid. *1938*, pp. 18–19.

[5] Ibid. *1939*, p. 12.

[6] Ibid. *1940*, p. 5. Literally the same, ibid. *1942*, p. 7.

[7] Ibid. *1941*, p. 8. In 1940–2 registration was effected in the Fort Manning District, within a five-mile radius of Karonga Town, and in part of the Lower Shire District; in 1941 also in part of the Chikwawa District. No such registration was carried on in subsequent years. *Medical Report 1943* said (p. 7): 'Registration of births and deaths of Africans is not compulsory, and so far as this section of the community is concerned, the collection of vital statistics is restricted to the census enumeration only.'

Committee doubted the practicability of such a scheme and rather favoured the making of sample studies.

1938. The Committee considered a recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Education that Government should institute an investigation as to the best means by which registration of all births and deaths could be carried out. Although it appreciated the desirability of such vital statistics the Native Welfare Committee doubted the practicability of obtaining them, more particularly in regard to deaths; it suggested, however, that the matter might be considered in connection with the census to be taken in 1941.[1]

1939. At the suggestion of the Director of Medical Services the Committee considered at their June meeting the pamphlet 'A Study of the Population in Ulanga, Tanganyika Territory' by Mr. and Mrs. A. T. Culwick,[2] with a view to suggesting to Government that a survey of a similar nature might be carried out in Nyasaland.

The Committee recommended to Government that it should consider carrying out a similar survey locally in connection with the 1941 general census.[3]

(3) According to the Medical Reports the following sample studies were made in the 1930s:

1932. Investigations of infant mortality by Medical Officers in the North Nyasa, Kota Kota, Mlanje, and Karonga Districts.[4]

1934. Analysis of the Registers of Baptisms and Deaths of the Ntakataka Mission of the White Fathers by the Medical Officer of the Dedza District.[5]

1936. The Medical Officer of the West Nyasa District questioned 472 Atonga mothers concerning the number of children they had borne and the number of children they had lost.[6] An attempt to make a similar inquiry among the Asisya living in this district failed.

The people are very independent, they did not want me to come, when porters were sent to bring in my hospital stores, some six miles back, they were stopped by their companions and told they were not to bring in my loads, as the Asisya were not going to be carriers, this was directly opposed to the orders of their principal headman; they then held a meeting to say that they would not have allowed the District Commissioner to send me if they had realised that I wanted to ask their women how many live and dead children they had had, and to examine everyone, they wanted, they said a doctor, who would give them medicines they asked for without any questioning.[7]

1937. The Medical Officer of the Dedza District effected a Survey in which he made also an inquiry concerning child mortality.[8]

The Medical Report for 1937 summarized the character of these sample studies as follows:[9]

Unfortunately the somewhat isolated efforts made by the Department to collect vital statistics have not, as yet, furnished sufficiently reliable information to enable any authoritative statements to be made with regard to infantile and maternal mortality rates . . . .

[1] *Report of the Native Welfare Committee 1938*, p. 4.
[2] See pp. 373–4 above.
[3] Ibid. *1939*, p. 4.
[4] See *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 23–4, 28, 65–6. The investigation in the Kota Kota District was continued in 1933; see ibid. *1933*, p. 35.
[5] See ibid. *1934*, pp. 14–15. The Report mentions also (p. 27) that in the Cholo District the rural dispensers 'are required to keep a record of all births and deaths in their area', but says nothing about the methods or results.
[6] See ibid. *1936*, pp. 89–94.
[7] Ibid., p. 95.
[8] See ibid. *1937*, p. 39.
[9] Ibid., p. 15.

VII. Non-Native Birth and Death Registration

Registration of births and deaths was regulated in the Protectorate through 'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance, 1904'.[1] This Ordinance, which was very similar to the Ordinance enacted two months earlier in Kenya, made compulsory the registration of the birth of a child 'if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent'. For all other births and for all deaths registration was to be optional, but the Commissioner was authorized to extend by order published in the *Gazette* the provisions 'relating to compulsory registration of births and deaths to all persons in the Protectorate of any particular race, class, tribe, or other group, or to all or some of the inhabitants of any particular town, district, or other area'. The Commissioner never made such order, but the Ordinance itself has been amended twice. 'The Births and Deaths Registration Amending Ordinance, 1905'[2] rendered compulsory 'the registration of the death of any person of European or American or Asiatic race or origin', and 'The General Revision Ordinance, 1912'[3] rendered compulsory the registration of 'the birth of a child if either one or both parents are of Asiatic race or origin'.[4]

In accordance with the Ordinance of 30 June 1904 Rules were issued on the same day.[5] They have been amended once.[6] The main rules as they stand to-day read as follows:

1. The Registrar-General of Marriages at Blantyre is hereby appointed Registrar-General of Births and Deaths under this Ordinance.

3. The place in each District at which births and deaths may be registered and registers inspected shall be the Office of the District Commissioner at the Chief Station in each District, and the hours at which such registration and inspection may be effected shall be the ordinary office hours on such days as the District Commissioner is in attendance.

4. Births and deaths may be registered under this Ordinance, without personal attendance, by letter addressed to the District Commissioner of the district in which the birth or death takes place. Forms of registration will be supplied gratis by the District Commissioner. The prescribed fee shall, in every case, be paid in advance.

[1] No. 2 of 1904 (30 June), reprinted in *Ordinances, &c., Promulgated in the British Central Africa Protectorate 1904*, pp. 2–4. The Ordinance came into force on 1 July 1904; see Notice of 30 June 1904, reprinted ibid., p. 22. As in other Dependencies, Europeans had the opportunity of registering births and deaths before a special Ordinance was enacted. See Commissioner Johnston's *Report of the First Three Years' Administration of the Eastern Portion of British Central Africa*, p. 31: '. . . during the twelve months from the 1st March, 1893, to the 1st March, 1894, there have been ten deaths registered. I believe that three other deaths occurred which were not registered.'

[2] No. 8 of 1905 (31 Oct.), reprinted in *Orders in Council, &c., Promulgated in the British Central Africa Protectorate 1905*, p. 24.

[3] No. 12 of 1912 (8 Nov.), reprinted in *Ordinances of Nyasaland Protectorate in Force 1913*, pp. 600–35.

[4] The Ordinance as it stands to-day is reprinted ibid., pp. 412–17, and also in *Laws of Nyasaland in Force 1933*, vol. ii, pp. 671–6 (cap. 78).

[5] See Notice of 30 June, reprinted in *Ordinances, &c., Promulgated in the British Central Africa Protectorate 1904*, p. 19.

[6] Government Notice No. 119 of 1914 (30 June). The Rules as they stood after the enactment of this amendment are reprinted in *Proclamations, Rules and Notices Nyasaland Protectorate in Force 1914*, pp. 99–100, and in *Laws of Nyasaland in Force 1933*, vol. iii, p. 316.

5. All registers, returns and other documents required for the purposes of this Ordinance shall be in such form as the Governor may from time to time direct.

6. Any register, return or index in the custody of the Registrar shall be open to inspection subject to the consent of the Registrar, or failing such consent by order of a Judge of the High Court.

8. Births and deaths on board ships while within the territorial waters of the Protectorate shall be registered at the next port of call.

The main provisions of the Ordinance ensuring registration of births and deaths, as they now stand, are as follows:

Birth and Death Registration

18. (1) The registration of the birth of a child shall be compulsory if either one or both parents are of European, American or Asiatic race or origin or, in the case of an illegitimate child not recognized by its father, if the mother is of European, American or Asiatic race or origin.

(2) The registration of the death of any person of European, American or Asiatic race or origin shall be compulsory . . . .

In case of a birth the registration of which is compulsory (1) the father and the mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred and each person present at the birth and the person having charge of the child shall within three months register the birth or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £2.

In case of a death the registration of which is compulsory (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) any inmate of the house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried shall register the death within one month or shall be liable to a fine not exceeding £2.

Prescribed Particulars

Birth: Sex; name; date and place of birth; names, residence, occupations, and nationality of the parents.

Death: Name; age; sex; place of residence; length of residence in the Protectorate; occupation and nationality of the deceased; date, place, and cause of death.

The Registrar-General[1] and the District Commissioners receive no compensation for their work in this capacity. A fee of 2*s*. 6*d*. has to be paid for registration of a birth or death, for registration of a name subsequent to registration of birth or registration of alteration in name, for inspection of register, return, or index, and for a certified copy of an entry in the register of births or deaths.[2]

[1] 'The Registrar of the High Court, in addition to his duties as such, is also—The Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, Administrator-General of Deceased's Estates, Registrar-General for Births, Marriages and Deaths, Registrar of Patents, Designs and Trade Marks, Registrar of Companies, Registrar of Business Names, Registrar of Banking, and Sheriff' (*Handbook of Nyasaland*, pp. 144–5).

[2] The Rules stipulate: 'The Registrar may in any case, if he thinks fit, on account of the poverty of a party or for any other reason, dispense in whole or in part with the payment of any of the above fees.'

VIII. Native Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. The first public document which discussed fertility was apparently the report on the 1921 census. The Superintendent (Senior Provincial Commissioner) believed that the population was declining and he attributed this largely to low fertility. He saw the main causes of this alleged low fertility in venereal disease, absence of men from home, and wilful restriction of families.

Venereal Disease. No doubt this was fairly prevalent in Nyasaland before the war, as a result of infection by natives carrying the disease back with them from Rhodesia and South Africa. But, with the call for native soldiers and carriers during the war; the passing to and fro through districts of strange natives in unusual numbers; the prostitution to which native women resorted whose husbands or prospective husbands were away for years at a time; the promiscuous intercourse of soldiers and followers with women in the surrounding territories through which they passed; all tended to spread venereal disease to an extent it may be doubted is even now fully realised. Many of the women who became infected as prostitutes during the war have since married and spread the disease even further afield. The type of disease may not be so virulent as among Europeans, and to that extent its seriousness may possibly be overlooked. But it is beyond question that an enormous proportion of the native population is infected, and the results from a census point of view are that one type of the disease produces sterility, and the other type is the most potent cause of infantile mortality.[1]

Absence from Home. The absence from home, often of long duration, of men working either abroad or in the Shire Highlands, must tend to give rise to the evils above discussed; and, in addition, by lengthening the interval between successive births (a serious matter if the period of fertility of native women is relatively short) must to that extent restrict the size of the family. During the war this cause was of course accentuated . . . .

Wilful Restriction of Families. There appears to be no doubt that the Yao women object to the trouble of rearing children, and deliberately restrict the size of their families. South Nyasa is the most important Yao district, and there the number of non-adults for each married or widowed woman is 1·2, as against 1·37 for the whole Protectorate. Liwonde, another Yao district, only shows 1 non-adult for each married or widowed woman.[2]

Three years later the Medical Officer of the Dedza District likewise expressed the opinion that fertility was rather low.

It is generally assumed that the African negro is a prolific race, and that assumption is apparently confirmed by the number of children invariably seen in native villages. But closer acquaintance with the natives and the actual facts of the case definitely negative this view, at any rate so far as it applies to the native living his own life in his own country.[3]

In support of this statement he gave the following data derived from the records of the White Fathers at Bimbechi and Ntakataka:

Number of children per family. 734 families included 1,644 children = 2·2 children born per family . . . .

[1] The Superintendent recommended 'That an enquiry be set on foot to obtain reliable data as to the prevalence of venereal diseases, and their actual and potential effects upon the vital statistics of the population, both from a positive and a negative point of view' (*Census Report 1921*, p. 7).

[2] Ibid., p. 5. The low ratio of non-adults to married and widowed women in South Nyasa was actually due to the fact that by mistake all adult females in this District had been counted as either married or widowed. (In Zomba, where the proportion of Yao was not very much lower than in Liwonde, the ratio was 1·5.)

[3] *Medical Report 1924*, p. 43.

Fertility of marriages. Of 1,841 married couples 693 were without living children = 37·6%. Of these 693 couples, 537 had never had children = 29·1%.[1]

These figures would indeed indicate a low fertility if a considerable proportion of the wives were past child-bearing age, but it may well be that in the families controlled by the White Fathers young couples are particularly numerous.[2] It would be wrong, therefore, to draw any general conclusions from these returns even if in other respects a Christian community could be considered as representative of 'the native living his own life in his own country'.[3]

In his report on the 1926 census the Superintendent continued the discussion on the factors unfavourably affecting fertility which he had started five years earlier.

It appears to be the general opinion that the natives of Nyasaland are naturally prolific,[4] and that conditions are favourable to a high birth rate. On the face of it, their early marriage, light regard for the marriage vow, and the fact that unmarried mothers are not regarded with any general disfavour, would all tend to a high birth rate. The figures that will be quoted certainly appear to show that the birth rate is at least as high as that in India and that it is probably high enough to cause a rapid increase in the population if the death rates could be reduced to a more normal standard, more especially if the expectation of life in adults could be increased concurrently. The figures do not, however, indicate an exceptionally high general birth rate, and it seems apparent that causes are operating which tend to counteract the natural fertility, at any rate, in some areas or among some tribes, and a considerable number of natives complain of having no children and no obvious reason for their barrenness appears to exist.

A cause that has been suggested by experienced observers is early marriage or co-habitation[5] combined with excessive sexual intercourse among young married couples, due in great part to the desire of the woman to bear a child and avoid the disgrace of barrenness. A medical practitioner who worked for a great number of years among the natives has stated that he was often approached for medicine to induce fertility, that he invariably recommended the husband to undertake a long journey, and that this generally brought about the desired result. Some authorities are of the opinion that, chiefly owing to the increased price of cloth in recent years, marriages between very young natives are on the decrease, and if that is the case, the effect on the birth rate should be beneficial. Early marriage is not allowed

[1] I do not know on the basis of which data the Superintendent of the 1926 census said that the records of the White Fathers 'show a declining birth rate of recent years' (*Census Report 1926*, p. xxxiii).

[2] The Medical Officer of the Dedza District in commenting ten years later on the records of the White Fathers said: 'Such a christian community may only be compared within narrow limits to the general population, because the christian community increases more rapidly by the addition of converts who are for statistical purposes, immigrants. Again, the Mission is not yet thirty years old so that sufficient numbers of completed lives are not yet available. It is therefore of little use, under the circumstances, to try to work out birth and death rates.' (*Medical Report 1934*, p. 14.)

[3] It should be noted, however, that the Medical Officer in charge of the Dedza District in 1924 did not hold this view and said explicitly that 'the population concerned differed in no material circumstances from neighbouring communities'.

[4] See also *Census Report 1926*, p. iv.

[5] See also the quotation of a statement by a Provincial Commissioner in the Dispatch from the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 19 July 1930: 'Cohabitation, or at any rate sexual intercourse, with young girls of the Nkhonde tribe is common and, I think, not uncommon amongst other tribes, and it is quite possible that this practice may have an adverse effect on the physique of the race and also upon the birth-rate' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 81).

among the natives of the Nyika Plateau in North Nyasa and it is said that large families are more common among them than among other tribes.

The use of drugs to prevent child birth or to cause abortion is stated to be very rare among the Ngoni or Chewa-Chipeta tribes except in cases of adultery. Among the population living in the neighbourhood of townships or large settlements, however, and especially among the Yaos, the women are said to indulge in the procuring of abortion to a considerable extent. The Yaos are notoriously lax in their morals in comparison with most of the other native tribes and it is alleged that a considerable number of women now married are permanently barren through the use of medicine taken to prevent conception at a time when they were engaged in prostitution. Although Yaos are the chief, they are not the only, offenders in this respect. It is also recorded that medical practitioners in the Central Province have, of late, received enquiries from more educated natives, who have at some time or another been to Southern Rhodesia, for medicine or instruction for birth control, as apart from abortion,[1] but such modern ideas have not as yet affected the ordinary villager.

On the whole artificial abortion and contraception are not considered to be common practices in ordinary marital life (except, perhaps, among the Yaos where marriages are made and unmade with great facility and among whom, also, the women are said to be averse from child bearing), as child bearing is honoured in wedlock, and out of wedlock there is less temptation to prevent conception or to the cut short pregnancy than there is among Europeans since, generally speaking, morality is less strict. The knowledge of chemical abortifacients as well as of mechanical methods is mainly in the hands of native midwives.

On page 46 of the Report of the East Africa Commission it is stated that 'we cannot conclude the general chapter on labour without reference to an allegation sometimes made that the employment of male adult labour outside the reserves is having a serious effect on the birth rate. We are definitely of opinion that this contention cannot be substantiated in fact.' If, by this, the Commission refer to the annual exodus of natives in search of work for a few months within the confines of their own country, their opinion is doubtless correct. But they probably had not in mind the peculiar circumstances of Nyasaland, where thousands of adult natives, many of them married, leave the Protectorate each year in search of work and adventure in Southern Rhodesia, where they often remain for long periods frequently extending up to ten years and whence they seldom return before three years have elapsed.

Experienced opinion, official and unofficial, medical and lay, is unanimous in putting this emigration among the forefront of the causes tending to reduce the native birth rate below its normal figure.[2] Strong opinions are held that Government should take some action in the matter, which is regarded by many as constituting a serious social problem. It is among the wives of these absentees that there is the greatest temptation to adultery and, in order to conceal the fact, to the measures to prevent births taking place that have been dealt with above.[3]

Disease greatly affects the birth rate by causing abortion. Malaria, hookworm and tick fever do not ordinarily cause sterility, but they may be expected to predispose to abortion. Venereal disease and yaws have the same effect in some areas of the Protectorate, notably South Nyasa and other parts of the Lake shore. As regards malaria it has been pointed out that where women suffer much from fever, their vitality is naturally lowered and, as a consequence, their reproductive functions are interfered with. This results in longer periods elapsing between successive births and more frequent cases of abortion. . . .

There is a general consensus of opinion that polygamy is an important factor in lowering the birth rate, especially among the Ngoni, Tumbuka and Tonga tribes. It is reasonable to suppose that a given number of women are likely to bear a higher

[1] On the other hand, the Native Reserves Commission (North Nyasa District) said in their 1929 Report (p. 28): 'The birth rate continues to be as high among the better educated natives as among the raw natives . . . .'

[2] See also *Census Report 1926*, p. xxviii.

[3] Ibid., pp. x–xi.

aggregate number of children if they each have separate husbands than if they have only one husband between them. The numerical superiority of women in Nyasaland is, moreover, not exceptionally great. If rich or powerful men marry two or more wives, and some chiefs have a great number, it must mean that many virile young men are condemned to bachelorhood,[1] and that in itself must result in social evils. To the extent that polygamy directly or indirectly tends to keep down the birth rate, it may be expected that there will be a gradual increase in the number of births as Christianity with its insistence on monogamy increases its hold on the native population.

Another cause which to a certain extent hinders the frequency of births is the prolonged period of suckling, extending up to two or three years, which is common throughout the Protectorate, and various native customs and superstitions concerning intercourse between husband and wife during this period.

The various tendencies indicated above are those which have been noted by competent observers, but they are, of course, incapable of accurate measurement. Their cumulative effect in counteracting the natural fertility of the native races of Nyasaland must, however, be not inconsiderable. It may not be out of place to observe here that the frequent illnesses and deaths of children in a country where child mortality is so high reacts on the strength of the mothers and tends to check conception or to cause abortion, and that the ultimate loss of population through infantile and child mortality is not confined to the actual deaths alone.[2]

The Superintendent supplements these general statements by an analysis of the returns obtained at the special inquiry concerning fertility and child mortality which was made by the Residents in their capacity as Census Officers. The main results of this investigation—the most valuable ever effected in Nyasaland—were as shown in the table appearing at the top of the opposite page.[3]

The proportion of wives who had never borne a child was rather low (3·5 per cent.), and the Superintendent explains this by the fact that 'barrenness is a disgrace to a native woman and a sterile marriage would in all probability be dissolved or the woman, with or without the connivance of her husband, would take steps to get a child by another man'.[4] The average number of children born (alive or dead) to a wife was 6·32. It was lowest in a Kasungu sample (4·73) and highest in a Dowa sample (9·87) and was between 5 and 7 in 16 of the 21 samples. The average number of children born alive to a wife was 5·64, the minimum being 4·55 and the maximum 8·03; it was between 5 and 6 in 12 samples. The tribe was ascertained for 1,709 of the 2,159 wives.[5]

[1] It should be noted, however, that the number of bachelors in Nyasaland is very small. The 1911 census report had stated (p. 4): 'As regards state of marriage it may be said, broadly speaking, that every male native over 17 and every female native over 14 is married.' According to the 1926 census only 9·8 per cent. of the males over 15 (or possibly 16) years were single. In Mombera, where the Tumbuka and Ngoni, and in West Nyasa, where the Tonga constituted the great majority of the population, the percentages were 14·8 and 24·7. But in Ncheu, where nearly 99 per cent. of the population were Ngoni, the percentage of bachelors was only 10·0. It may be mentioned furthermore that the ratio of non-adults to married and widowed women was particularly large in Ncheu and that the sample study made in connexion with the 1926 census showed a particularly high fertility for the Ngoni women.

[2] *Census Report 1926*, pp. xi–xii.

[3] See ibid., p. xxii.

[4] Ibid., p. xxiii. This would indeed explain why in 7 of the 21 samples there was not a single married woman who had never borne a child.

[5] See ibid., p. xxv.

District	Wives questioned[1]	Children born			Children deceased		Barren wives
		Alive	Still-born	Total	Before walking	Later	
Lower Shire	100	679	7	686	167	208	5
Cholo	100	538	36	574	90	61	12
Mlanje	100	621	16	637	91	261	—
Blantyre and Central Shire	100	512	25	537	108	56	—
Chiradzulu	100	637	81	718	60	106	—
Zomba	100	552	127	679	84	92	7
Upper Shire	100	544	123	667	122	118	2
" "	100	648	103	751	113	163	—
South Nyasa	100	558	41	599	116	110	7
" "	100	555	53	608	143	93	—
Ncheu	100	516	102	618	70	230	15
Lilongwe	100	578	28	606	109	113	3
Fort Manning	100	573	70	643	81	152	1
Dowa	100	803	184	987	146	222	—
"	100	670	154	824	200	141	2
Kota Kota	50	257	20	277	62	73	1
Kasungu	100	455	18	473	61	77	3
"	100	483	34	517	131	164	7
Momberas	209	986	101	1,087	198	170	8
West Nyasa	100	512	68	580	44	252	—
North Nyasa	100	503	73	576	92	170	3
Total	2,159	12,180	1,464	13,644	2,288	3,032	76

[1] The Census Officers had been instructed to include only married couples 'who were not likely to have any further children but who, on the other hand, were not so old as to have forgotten the details'.

	Yao	Nyanja	Chikunda	Nguru	Ngoni	Chewa	Tonga	Nkonde	Tumbuka	Wemba
Wives	284	315	46	200	527	137	100	40	25	35
Children borne	1,771	1,934	279	1,518	3,526	742	580	237	148	191
Average	6·24	6·14	6·07	7·59	6·69	5·42	5·80	5·93	5·92	5·46

It would not appear that any of the tribes were appreciably more prolific than others, except perhaps the Nguru and Ngoni whose figures do stand out above the others. Incidentally it would appear that if there is any truth in the frequent allegation[1] that Yao women are unwilling to bear children, it must be a recent development forming part of the general demoralisation of the tribal spirit formerly so noticeable among the Yao.

For 16 samples comprising 1,822 wives the Census Officers showed the number of children born alive or dead to each woman.[2]

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Over 12
Total	63	37	85	132	179	244	223	218	180	145	107	147	23	39[1]

[1] The highest number of children was 12 in four samples, 13 in three, 14 in two, 15 in two, 16 in one, 17 in two, 20 in one, and 25 in one sample.

The Superintendent rightly says that 'these figures seem to indicate that natives are not particularly prolific'.

[1] The allegation was made by the Superintendent himself five years earlier (see p. 611 above).
[2] See ibid., p. xxiv.

The 1931 census report does not comment on fertility apart from saying that 'in order to account for the enormous drop in numbers from the first to the second age group, one must assume a very high infant mortality and also a high birth rate'.[1] But, as shown in Section I of this chapter, the fact that 27·7 per cent. of the total population were returned as under 5 years old and only 14·7 per cent. as between 5 and 15 is doubtless due to misjudgement of the age of children.

For 1932–42 birth-rates were ascertained as follows:[2]

Year	*Population*	*Births*	*Birth-rate*	*Deaths*	*Death-rate*
		Fort Manning District			
1932	34,075	..	67·2	..	33
1933	34,113	2,280	68·2	911	25·8
1934	35,500	2,044	57·6	983	27·7
1935	36,000	..	52·9	..	21·2
1936	35,000	..	46·8	..	21·8
1937	35,000	..	49·4	..	22·8
1938	34,070	1,410	41·4	910	26·7
1939	34,106	1,709	50·1	757	22·2
1940	34,070	..	52·9	..	31·3
1941	34,070	..	49·6	..	21·1
1942	34,080	..	47·8	..	20·4
		Karonga District (N. Nyasa)			
1935	..	..	55·0[1]	..	25·3[2]
1937[3]	4,757	..	42·4	..	28·5
1938[3]	3,257	214	65·7	92	28·2
1940[3]	6,380	..	34·9	..	19·4
1941[3]	4,669	..	39·83	..	31·05
1942[3]	4,669	..	38·8	..	30·05
		Mbwana Native Authority (W. Nyasa)			
1937	9,599[4]	229[5]	47·7	67	14·0
		Kabunduli Native Authority (W. Nyasa)			
1937	5,498[4]	237[5]	86·2	74	26·9
		Atonga Tribal Council (W. Nyasa)			
1937	33,966[4]	482[5]	28·4	291	17·1
		Tengani Native Authority (Lower Shire)			
1938	19,100	917	48·0	510	26·7
1939	19,100	..	55	638	33·4
1940	19,000	..	61·2	..	38·5
1941	19,400	..	52·8	..	33·6
1942	19,675	..	57·30	..	34
		Native Authority (Chikwawa)			
1941	11,813	..	65·5	..	23·7

[1] Section A (Low altitude) with 19,000 inhabitants, 52·2; Section B (High altitude) 61·0.
[2] Section A, 28·5; Section B, 18·4.
[3] Section A.
[4] According to 1931 census.
[5] 1 July to 31 Dec.

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 26.

[2] See *Medical Report 1932*, p. 13; *1933*, pp. 14, 37; *1934*, p. 14; *1935*, p. 17; *1936*, p. 17; *1937*, pp. 28–30; *1938*, pp. 18–19; *1939*, p. 12; *1940*, p. 5; *1941*, p. 8; *1942*, p. 7. The reports say that in Fort Manning the births in 1933 included still-births (214) and in 1938 and 1939 excluded still-births, and that the Tengani Native Authority (1938 and 1939) did not record still-births. In all other cases it is impossible to tell how still-births were dealt with.

The survey made in 1936 among the Atonga people in the West Nyasa District yielded the following results:[1]

Villages, Mother's age	*Mothers questioned*	*Children born*			*Children deceased*		
		Alive	*Still-born*	*Total*	*Under 2 years*	*2–10 years*	*10 years and over*
Hill villages	85	390	49	439	92	30	23
Lake Shore	387	1,308	205	1,513	341	114	100
Total	472	1,698	254	1,952	433	144	123
Under 20	51	82	10	92	21	—	—
20–25	105	256	24	280	60	7	—
25–35	201	802	121	923	230	65	16
Over 35	115	557	99	656	122	72	107

The average number of children born (alive or dead) to a woman over 35 was 5·7 and the average number of children born alive 4·8. These rates are low since women who had never borne a child were excluded. But it may be, of course, that the number of births was understated. The Medical Officer thinks that the table 'is probably accurate as to the number of births and deaths of children, if it errs, it errs because a mother has forgotten some of the births. I do not think that any women exaggerated'. He says that 'miscarriages appear to be very common', and found 'that the women are accustomed to take medicines towards the end of their pregnancy' in order to procure abortion.[2]

It is interesting to note the greater fecundity of the 'Hill' people, I think that their dietary is a little better than that of their relations on the Lake, as they get a little more protein, more maize, and perhaps more meat.[3]

The Medical Report for 1937 also emphasizes the greater fertility of the women in the Hill villages of West Nyasa.

The great prevalence of venereal disease in the Lake shore areas as compared with the hill country which is more free from it may account for the enormous difference shown in the birth rate of the natives of Native Authority Kabunduli as compared with those of Native Authority Mbwana and the Atonga Tribal Council.[4]

But the number of women questioned in 1936 in the Hill villages and the population of Kabunduli where births were recorded for six months in 1937 seem too small to permit the drawing of any final conclusions.

Complaints that absence of husbands working in the Shire Highlands or abroad tends to reduce the number of births have become more frequent, of course, with increasing migration. A few quotations from the 1935 Report on Emigration may serve as an illustration:

Evidence of an African Woman. 'They (the men) bring back a number of diseases some of them very bad ones which if they are caught by the woman, she cannot bear any children and even her body gets spoiled.'[5]

The wife has frequently to face the result of the husband's unfaithfulness abroad. When he returns she runs the risk of contracting venereal disease; in some districts we had evidence that a woman could obtain a divorce and compensation if this

[1] See ibid. *1936*, p. 91.
[2] See ibid., p. 90.
[3] Ibid., p. 91.
[4] Ibid. *1937*, p. 29.
[5] *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 32.

occurred. We were not surprised that divorce and compensation afforded little comfort to some of our women witnesses.[1]

If the immediate causes of emigration are not counteracted and if in no other way emigration is checked or controlled the following are some of the evils which the future holds in store.

... Home life will cease to exist; all belief in the sanctity of marriage will disappear. Immorality will be the rule. In consequence, venereal disease will affect one hundred per cent. of our Native population. The birth rate will fall.[2]

Official reports say over and over again that female births in Nyasaland exceed male births[3] but fail to afford conclusive evidence, the main reason being that the basic data are too unreliable or too small.

Whenever the number of still-births was ascertained the rate was very high. Thus, according to the sample studies made in 1926 and 1936 the percentage of children born dead to the mothers questioned was 10·7 and 13·0 respectively. But it is probable that a number of miscarriages were included among still-births,[4] and that a number of children who died shortly after birth were counted as still-born.[5]

General Mortality. In his report for the year 1901–2 the Principal Medical Officer stated:

On the whole, our native population is very free from the scourges which appear to affect many other parts of the African Continent; plague, cholera, yaws, sleeping sickness, yellow fever, &c., being unknown. . . . Leprosy is scarcely ever seen, and intestinal worms are present in very few of the cases that come for treatment.[6]

But smallpox and malaria seem to have claimed many victims.

Small-pox we have had more or less all over the country.[7]

A more intimate knowledge of diseases prevalent among natives tends to indicate that malaria and small-pox are the two, which, operating in conjunction, must be held mainly accountable for decreasing population, and this out of all proportion to other morbific agents.[8]

Small-pox is the greatest scourge among natives in this country . . . .[9]

Moreover, while sleeping-sickness was unknown at the beginning of this century it constituted a serious menace ten years later. The first case was discovered on 25 October 1908 in Chinteche, West Nyasa District. In his report for 1910–11 the Principal Medical Officer stated:

I regret to report a considerable increase in this infection. I cannot help expressing the opinion that had the seriousness of this question been more fully realised before this year something more might have been done to check it. I do not think the representations made by this department were properly appreciated till recently,

[1] *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 34.

[2] Ibid., pp. 37–8. See also pp. 624–5 below; *Medical Report 1935*, p. 17, *1938*, p. 18; *Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, pp. 6–7.

[3] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 25, *1945*, pp. 11–12; *Medical Report 1931*, Appendix III, *1933*, p. 14, *1934*, pp. 13–15, *1935*, p. 17, *1936*, p. 17, *1937*, p. 29.

[4] See *Report on Native Affairs 1933*, p. 29.

[5] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxii; *Medical Report 1933*, p. 14, *1935*, p. 17.

[6] *Report on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate 1901–2*, p. 25.

[7] Ibid. *1900–1*, p. 20.

[8] 'Medical Report' by the Principal Medical Officer, *Colonial Reports, British Central Africa Protectorate 1904–5*, p. 51.

[9] Ibid., p. 54.

and now I fear we must consider trypanosomiasis endemic and likely to spread to a serious extent.[1]

At the same time it was stated that syphilis was common and on the increase,[2] and that phthisis was gradually being introduced from South Africa by natives returning from the mines.[3] During the war bubonic plague (1916) and cerebrospinal meningitis (1917) were introduced from German East Africa.[4] In 1918–19 there was a severe influenza epidemic.[5]

It seems, therefore, that in the first two decades of this century, owing mainly to the greater mobility of the natives caused by the advent of the Europeans, the state of health deteriorated. Unfortunately the medical and sanitary staff was insufficient to cope with the situation. The Medical Report for 1927 stated:

The exiguity of the staff of medical officers has been commented upon for some years now.[6] Each year one or two medical officers have been necessary but, owing to lack of funds, have not been forthcoming. There were eleven medical officers in the year 1912, and this number up till now has not been increased.[7]

In a Dispatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 19 July 1930, the Governor wrote:

. . . there is the undoubted fact that the number of in-patients admitted to Government hospitals [1929: 3,438] is far less than it should be. I suggest that the reasons are, first, the deplorable condition of most of the buildings (I was informed by the Medical Officer at one station that Africans of the better type flatly refused to enter the hospital and that they had to be accommodated in a recently-built operating theatre); secondly, the inadequacy of the staff, which renders reasonable continuity in hospital administration impossible; and, thirdly, the instinctive aversion which the primitive native has from admission to hospital. The two first causes it is within

[1] *Medical Report 1910–11*, p. 7. See also ibid. *1911–12*, p. 5; *1912–13*, p. 12; *1913*, pp. 10, 14; *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1910–11*, p. 15; *1911–12*, p. 18.

[2] See *Medical Report 1910–11*, p. 6; *1911–12*, p. 6. In his report for 1903–4 the Acting Principal Medical Officer had said (p. 33): 'Venereal diseases are fairly prevalent in the more crowded settlements, but in ordinary village communities there is probably very little.'

[3] See ibid. *1911–12*, p. 6, *1912–13*, pp. 14–15; *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1912–13*, p. 23.

[4] See *Medical Report 1916*, p. 9, *1917*, p. 10; *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1916–17*, p. 6; *1917–18*, p. 9. There were, of course, also many war casualties, and the effects of the enrolment of an excessive number of natives as carriers, many of whom were unfit for such employment, were apparently noticeable still two decades later. In his *Report on Nyasaland Natives in the Union of South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia* (1937), the Senior Provincial Commissioner stated (p. 7): '. . . many of the youths of to-day are of poor stock since they were born during the War, their fathers being very C. 3 since all the available physically fit adult males were away from the village for years. Nyasaland supplied a quarter of a million men for carrier transport and similar service, in addition to soldiers . . . .' In his report on the Southern Province for 1937 he said with regard to the Yao: '. . . the cream of their manhood was on Active Service, from which many failed to return . . .' (*Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 8; see also ibid. *1934*, p. 43).

[5] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxvii: 'No records were kept of the native deaths, but so far as the figures supplied by the White Fathers give any indication on the point, the death rate jumped from the average of 42 per thousand to 64 per thousand during those two years. If the increased death rate of 22 per thousand were universal in the Protectorate, it would mean that over 50,000 natives died of influenza during the two years . . . .'

[6] See, for example, *Medical Report 1925*, p. 6; *1926*, p. 6.

[7] Ibid. *1927*, p. 5. See also ibid. *1928*, p. 16; *1929*, p. 13; *1934*, pp. 17, 30; *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 91–2. In 1931 the number of medical officers was raised to 13 and in 1937 to 14; see for details Bell Commission, *Report*, p. 210. According to *Medical Report 1935*, p. 7, the medical expenditure per head was 6·7*d.* in Nyasaland as compared with 9·1 in Tanganyika, 9·5 in Uganda, 11 in Northern Rhodesia, 15·8 in Kenya, and 50 in Zanzibar.

the power of the Government to rectify, and in undertaking this we shall do something to remove the third.[1]

1934. With regard to individual effort the Missions are almost solely responsible for any progress that has been made . . . .[2]

1936. The clamant demand for more and again more medical service cannot be over-emphasised. Without health the people are barred from effectual progress, for any advance will rest on an insecure foundation. In the confident feeling that the medical authorities realise the force of these words to be drawn not from sour criticism of their work but from lively sympathy with their aims and difficulties it may be said that actual endeavours are but as a scratching at the pimples on a disease-ridden body.[3]

1937. To realise more fully the implication of the present defective organization it may be of interest to survey the normal activities carried out at a Government medical station in Nyasaland and to estimate how far the requirements of the rural population are actually satisfied. To commence with, the medical officer is by himself, as at Zomba only is there more than one medical officer; he has a hospital of 50 or more beds to look after, assisted as a rule by a native hospital assistant who usually can be relied upon to attend to 'repeat' out-patients, to carry out instructions with regard to the administration of the hospital and who can treat, in a fairly satisfactory manner, the ordinary simple complaints. With the exceptions noted above, the medical officer has no clerk, all returns—and there are many—ledgers, correspondence, hospital fee accounts, vouchers, payments, etc., have to be attended to personally by the medical officer, for, if these duties are left to the native medical staff as they would have to be in the absence of trained clerical staff, chaos usually results. In the station the medical officer has to attend to all Government officials, their wives and children; he acts as police surgeon and performs medico-legal work when required; he is responsible for the sanitation of the station area, and, theoretically, for the whole district, but as there are no European sanitary inspectors, except at Blantyre and Zomba, and the natives trained in this branch of preventive medicine require considerable supervision, any aspirations he may have in this connection are in the nature of 'pious hopes' and seldom can be practically realised. He has to investigate all cases of epidemic disease.

He has to train, so far as he is able, his native subordinate staff, and as there are no European nursing sisters the medical officer, with the best will in the world, cannot ensure a very high standard of nursing attention at the average Native hospital.

He may have the doubtful assistance of a native woman, too frequently untrained and uneducated, in the women's wards. As the training of native nurses has only recently been commenced, such assistance is often unreliable, and technical duties have perforce to be carried out by the male dressers attached to the hospital; it is no wonder, therefore, that the women still fight shy of entering hospitals especially when pregnant or in labour or when suffering from venereal disease.

He attends to the needs of the non-official population (European or Indian) as at only a few stations are there mission doctors within call and there are no private practitioners in the Protectorate.

In the district there is a varying number of rural dispensaries (3-8) in charge of dressers or dispensers; in many instances these men are still ignorant, slovenly, careless and inefficient, and the work performed by them is at a corresponding level. Gradually these inefficients are being weeded out, but at the present rate of progress it will take years before the Department possesses a well trained and efficient subordinate staff. Some attempt has been made to increase the duties of the more intelligent of the rural dressers, who are instructed to visit villages, advise on elementary sanitation, to vaccinate all young children, etc., etc., but this work to be of value requires effective supervision which with the lack of staff is not available.

[1] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 77.
[2] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 32.
[3] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 44.

Occasionally, perhaps once or twice during the year, the medical officer gets out of the station and camps for a few days in a rural area, examines and treats the sick and advises headmen and Native Authorities on sanitary measures, he is, however, liable to instant recall if a European should fall sick, no other course could be contemplated. He, as a rule, possesses a car, and is expected to make monthly or bi-monthly visits to each dispensary, often the dispensary is 50 or 60 miles away, so the visit is hurried and generally unproductive; *he cannot afford to be away long from the station.*

With the exception of his annual camps, he has little opportunity of instructing or teaching hygiene or demonstrating sanitary measures in a practical manner; he has no European or Native sanitary staff for rural work, so that effort, in this direction, is stultified at its source. He may make, and often does make, suggestions with regard to the improvement of water supplies and the construction of latrines, but he is seldom able to observe personally the results of his efforts and has to rely on native reports which are notoriously unreliable.

Nutrition, generally, and the question of diets is practically untouched; some education in this direction is no doubt imparted automatically to patients by providing them with a reasonably adequate diet when in hospital, but the major problem of the diets for infants, children and women cannot, in the absence of health sisters, be tackled by the Medical Department. The medical officer during the course of the year, visits and inspects a native school or schools. Much valuable information is extracted from such visits, but after-treatment can seldom be carried out owing to other and more pressing duties. He also, from time to time, visits estates where labour is employed and advises the employer on dietetic questions, on the siting of huts, on the treatment and prevention of illness and so forth. Such visits are appreciated, but regular advice and inspection are out of the question.[1]

1938. The Medical Officers of the Department are engaged in doctoring the European population and in administering African hospitals and have deservedly earned not only the confidence of the immigrant population but a reputation amongst the indigenous population, resident within a short radius of native hospitals, for skill in minor surgery and for the successful treatment of many medical conditions. . . .

Although in recent years the Governments of other East African Territories have progressively given more attention to the preventive side of medicine, it cannot be said that a systematic beginning has yet been made in this field in this Protectorate, for, although most Medical Officers have in their stations directed the provision of improved sanitary conditions, they have not been able to make any serious impression on the general rural population, mainly because they were not able to travel around such areas and had to leave the village populations to the unsupervised care of incompetent, because poorly trained, subordinate staff.

There is no Medical Officer in the service of the Government who can be said to be engaged primarily on the preventive side and we have only two European Health Inspectors. These two last mentioned officers comprise the whole of our Health Department; one is employed at Zomba and the other at Limbe and Blantyre. Both spend their time directing and supervising township sanitary services, duties which could be performed equally well by intelligent overseers with no special training.[2]

1939. Progress in gaining the confidence of the African cannot be expected until Government finds it possible to station an European Medical Officer in every district, to staff all the large African hospitals with European Nursing Sisters who will assist the Medical Officers in developing ante-natal and child welfare clinics throughout the district, to undertake the training of African subordinate staff competent to help with the care of patients in the hospitals and to administer the dispensary units with a reasonable amount of skill and to make available sufficient funds for the

[1] *Medical Report 1937*, pp. 15–16. See also *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1937*, p. 8.

[2] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 24.

regular inspection of dispensary units and for the touring of rural areas by the European Medical Officers and Nursing Sisters.[1]

1944. Our hospitals and dispensaries are far from perfect, even though the buildings are said to compare favourably with similar institutions in other African territories. We lag behind our neighbours in the standard of nursing, diagnostic facilities, equipment and medical transport services. We are backward also in the development of Maternity and Child Welfare Clinics.

As regards the Rural Dispensaries, these have never been adequately supervised and the staffs are not capable of performing anything more than palliative treatment.[2]

Unfortunately death statistics are so scanty[3] that it is impossible to draw any conclusions concerning mortality. Opinions on health conditions in general are very unfavourable. The 1926 census report emphasized 'the undoubtedly bad state of the general health of the native community as a whole'.[4]

In some districts the chiefs and headmen report that such complaints as consumption, bronchitis and influenza as well as rheumatism and allied complaints are more prevalent and more fatal than they used to be. The number of people killed by lions is not inconsiderable as can readily be believed when it is known that some man-eaters have claimed a hundred victims before being despatched. It appears to be a common opinion that poison ordeals and secret murder of suspected witches is still more common among some tribes than is often believed to be the case and that they are responsible for a considerable number of deaths. The famines which occur intermittently cause numerous deaths at the extremes of life in the areas where food shortage becomes acute.

The native of Nyasaland is sodden with hookworm and malaria, he suffers from indigestion and pyorrhea, and is a martyr of sores and ulcers. . . . Leprosy and consumption are also common.[5]

1932. . . . the great triumvirate of diseases Ankylostomiasis, Schistosomiasis and Malaria, between them afflict probably nine-tenths of the people, and their incidence is but little affected by hospital treatment.[6]

1933. Natives suffering from diseases such as hookworm, bilharzia and malaria, are incapable of producing the same 'output' of work as if they were physically fit. In addition to the debility caused by these chronic diseases, the average native is still further handicapped by the insanitary conditions under which he lives, the poor water supply which he enjoys, the inadequate dietary upon which he subsists and his complete ignorance of the elementary principles of hygiene and of the simplest methods for the prevention of disease.[7]

1934. The sanitary problem presented by not only the larger townships, such as Zomba, but also the smaller stations such as Lilongwe and Port Herald is a very urgent and pressing one and the necessity for improvement and increased technical supervision has been brought home in the most forcible manner by investigations which have recently been made into the sanitary conditions obtaining in certain areas in this Protectorate.

It is no exaggeration to say that the conditions revealed by the reports are deplorable in every instance and unless remedial measures are taken at an early date such a state of affairs cannot fail to react unfavourably on the public health of the community.[8]

[1] *Report on Social and Economic Progress of Nyasaland 1939*, pp. 4–5.
[2] *Report of Post-War Development Committee*, p. 57. [3] See Table, p. 616 above.
[4] *Census Report 1926*, p. v. [5] Ibid., p. xiii. [6] *Report on Native Affairs 1932*, p. 19.
[7] Ibid. *1933*, p. 13. See also Governor's Address to Legislative Council, 24 Oct. 1934 (Supplement to *Nyasaland Government Gazette*, 10 Nov. 1934, p. 6), and *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 28.
[8] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 17.

The general conditions under which natives live in the rural areas of this Protectorate are without doubt unsatisfactory in the extreme.

They are born, live and die under the most insanitary conditions, they are, despite the benefits of education and the 'Pax Britannica' on the whole very poor and are ignorant even of the most elementary principles of hygiene.

They become as soon as they are born, infected with malaria, hookworm, bilharzia and other endemic diseases, all of which are preventable.

Water supplies are often foul and infected. Dietaries are, as a general rule, inadequate and food supplies are inefficiently stored. In short, conditions of life are such that every person is necessarily exposed to disease, spread of infection is assisted and ignorance and superstition play a large part in every native's existence.[1]

1937. . . . it is more than doubtful, if, with the exception of the areas controlled by Township Councils and Sanitary Boards, little, if any, real progress in preventive medicine has been accomplished throughout the country as a whole. This statement is not intended to belittle in any way the efforts made by the Department generally or to detract from the arduous and self-sacrificing work, more often than not, of great scientific interest and value, performed by individual officers, but is a plain statement of fact. There has been a vast amount of work done, and the seeds of hygiene have been sown well and truly and not altogether on stony ground, but there is no reason to suppose that the incidence of endemic diseases such as malaria, ankylostomiasis or schistosomiasis has been affected to any appreciable extent. Yaws, probably is not so prevalent, but the incidence of venereal disease and tuberculosis appears to be on the increase; leprosy despite the valiant efforts of the missions, shows no signs of being on the wane.[2]

A few quotations may serve as an illustration of the prevailing opinion on the spread of specific diseases.

Helminthic Diseases. Practically all natives suffer from hookworm (ankylostomiasis) and it is a cause of adult mortality both in itself and as weakening the constitution and thus predisposing to fatal diseases such as pneumonia and other chest complaints. Bilharzia which is said to be becoming more common also has the effect of lowering the power of resistance to disease.[3]

Malaria. Malaria is almost as universal as hookworm. It is rarely a fatal disease in adults but its debilitating effects are serious in lowering resistance to other diseases.[4]

Malaria is endemic over the whole Territory and the number of cases seen and treated is only a small proportion of that occurring. The problem presented is a vast one and up to the present very limited efforts have been made only in townships to abate its incidence.[5]

No part of the country is free from malaria. In the low lying areas infection apparently occurs throughout the year and the population develops, in time, a considerable immunity. In the foot-hills and highland areas there are definite epidemic seasons following the rains, and immunity does not develop so rapidly with the result that sickness may interfere with the planting season.[6]

Leprosy. . . . there would seem to be little doubt that there has been a considerable increase in the number of lepers since 1921.[7]

The leper problem is becoming prominent. Insufficient facilities exist at present to cope with it and some Native Authorities are embarrassed by the numbers of lepers in their areas for whom no room is available in established colonies.[8]

[1] Ibid., p. 31; see also ibid., pp. 7, 17.

[2] Ibid. *1937*, pp. 14–15; see also *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, pp. 47–8.

[3] *Census Report 1926*, p. xiii. See also ibid., p. xiv; *Report on the Nyasaland Railways 1927*, p. 49; *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 134; Hailey, p. 1147; *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), p. 60.

[4] *Census Report 1926*, p. xiv.

[5] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 24.

[6] Ibid. *1941*, p. 7.

[7] *Census Report 1926*, p. xiii.

[8] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 10; see also ibid., p. 36.

Leprosy is on the increase in this country, and it will certainly continue to increase because we are not taking any steps to prevent it.[1]

According to a census carried out by Native Authorities during the year there were 1,378 persons suffering from leprosy in the Northern Province and 2,131 in the Southern Province, apart from cases undergoing voluntary segregation in leprosy settlements. In the circumstances in which the census was taken these figures should be treated with the greatest reserve. It is probable that they include a number of burnt-out non-infectious cases, and that many early cases not showing obvious signs of the disease were excluded.[2]

Venereal Diseases. Such evidence as is available indicates that venereal disease is spreading;[3] and as the rural dispensaries are not competent to deal with such disease, it is probable that only a small percentage of the cases which occur come to the knowledge of the Medical Department. The Public Health Ordinance includes clauses providing for the compulsory treatment of venereal disease; but they are of little practical value, for on the one hand the penalties can seldom be enforced; and on the other a large majority of the reported cases are those who have voluntarily submitted to treatment.[4]

Although the figures available do not show any increase in the incidence of venereal diseases amongst those attending Government hospitals, most Medical Officers believe that syphilis and gonorrhoea are rapidly spreading in our native areas, due mainly to the introduction of new strains of infection by labourers returning to this country after working abroad, where males, separated from village control, are liable to contract infection. A further reason suggested for the supposed increase is the separation of wives from their husbands over long periods, tending to immorality amongst the former especially with the younger men returning from abroad or with strangers passing through their villages.

Native Authorities of the Atonga Tribe, West Nyasa District, have expressed their concern at the spread of venereal infections amongst their people and have suggested that every native returning to their areas should be compelled to submit to a medical examination prior to being permitted to enter.[5]

Venereal diseases continue to be a serious problem and it is generally believed that both syphilis and gonorrhoea are spreading amongst the population of the rural areas, being conveyed there by natives returning to village life after residence in towns, mines and other centres of work both within and without our boundaries.[6]

Reasonably accurate statistics relating to cases of venereal disease (which do not include cases treated in Military Hospitals, nor those treated at Mission Centres) are as follows:—

Year	*Syphilis*	*Gonorrhoea and its complications*	*Total*	*Year*	*Syphilis*	*Gonorrhoea and its complications*	*Total*
1933	846	359	1,205	1938	1,836	716	2,552
1934	1,319	626	1,945	1939	2,188	650	2,838
1935	1,508	753	2,261	1940	2,144	815	2,959
1936	1,771	716	2,487	1941	3,332	919	4,251
1937	2,100	731	2,831	1942	4,110	1,145	5,255

The increase during the years subsequent to the outbreak of war is significant.

[1] Acting Director of Medical Services, *Summary of Proceedings of Legislative Council*, 58th Session, 17 Nov. 1942, p. 65.

[2] *Medical Report 1943*, p. 6.

[3] See also ibid. *1935*, p. 15; *Report on Social and Economic Progress of Nyasaland 1939*, p. 5; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 9.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1938*, p. 10.

[5] *Medical Report 1938*, pp. 15–16. See also p. 617 above; *Report on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 108; *Medical Report 1937*, p. 45; *Report of Labour Department of Provincial Administration 1939*, p. 6.

[6] *Medical Report 1939*, p. 11. See also *Summary of Proceedings of Legislative Council*, 58th Session, 17 Nov. 1942, p. 57.

We regard these diseases as more a moral and social problem than a medical one, and we are convinced that the disintegration of tribal and family life and the unhealthily heavy temporary emigration of males are the most important factors in their spread.

. . . We are informed that the examination of medical returns over a number of years reveals that a very high proportion of cases have entered the secondary stage of syphilis before patients attend for treatment, and that patients suffering from gonorrhoea usually present themselves at hospitals after the disease has become chronic, or complications have occurred. Mention has been made of African methods of treatment, but there is no doubt that these methods are not successful.[1]

Tuberculosis. As was mentioned in the last Annual Report,[2] this disease is considered to be on the increase, it is not known however, even approximately what the incidence really is. Although it has been stated that the slow gradual infection of a whole population is a 'sufficient guarantee against a raging and disastrous epidemic', yet as such a high proportion of adult males emigrate with a view to obtaining work in neighbouring territories and as shown by the returns of those repatriated from Southern Rhodesia, a certain proportion become infected with tuberculosis, it is necessary to keep a careful watch on the situation and to take such measures as may be possible to investigate the incidence and to control and to treat the disease.[3]

Cases of tuberculosis are again recorded from almost every district, but we have little accurate information of the true incidence of the infection. Most medical officers record it as their opinion that the infection is spreading slowly but steadily. Many of the persons affected with the disease who seek hospital assistance are in a fairly advanced stage and for such persons very little can be done.[4]

Malnutrition. Among natives in general, the food supply annually alternates between plenty and semi-starvation, while their diet is at all times lacking in proteins and fruit.[5]

In this country, although there is a large variety of native foodstuffs and food shortage does not occur to any considerable extent, there is evidence that a proportion of the native population is on the verge of deficiency disease, cases of pellagra occur throughout the country, beriberi has been recognised, scurvy or a condition akin to scurvy has been noticed and as more than one medical officer has remarked there is, during the planting seasons and consequently at the time when food shortage is likely to occur an enormous increase of patients with catarrhal conditions attending the out-patient departments, evidence possibly of a lack of the essential protective vitamin A.[6]

The December–February food shortage on the Lower River occurs as regularly as ever—in good harvest years as well as bad, in dry years and wet years and flood years. In some years the hunger period commences earlier and lasts longer and in some it is alleviated by late dimba crops of maize and sweet potatoes; it is terminated

[1] *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), pp. 60–1. See also in this connexion *Medical Report 1941*, p. 8: 'Whether, as the figures appear to indicate, gonorrhoea is still comparatively the rarer venereal disease in this country is difficult to prove, for it is reported that those infected still seek treatment from practitioners in native medicines. The more regular use of M. and B. 693 in the treatment of the disease at Government hospitals, may in time bring infected persons in larger numbers to those institutions.'

[2] See ibid. *1936*, p. 14.

[3] Ibid. *1937*, p. 25. See also ibid., p. 45; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1939*, p. 9; *Medical Report 1943*, p. 8; *1944*, p. 5.

[4] Ibid. *1939*, p. 10. See also ibid. *1940*, p. 4; *1943*, p. 6; *Report of Post-War Development Committee*, p. 60.

[5] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 11. *Census Report 1926*, pp. xv–xx, deals very fully with 'starvation (not through food shortage but through mal-nutrition due to unsuitable diet) which is common to both children and adults and renders the system vulnerable to disease, and non-resistant to the attacks of parasites in the blood'. See also Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II, pp. 28–30.

[6] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 36.

by the *machewere* harvest in February. In good food crop years it is due to sheer improvidence; congested though the population of the Lower River undoubtedly is there is still just enough land available to support it, although the time is rapidly approaching when this will not be so.[1]

Although the number totally incapacitated by defective nutrition coming to our attention is comparatively small, evidence is accumulating that a very large proportion of our African population live on a diet that is deficient in some of the essentials for the maintenance of robust health and that our child population especially, but also adults, exhibit early signs of deficiency of vitamins A, B and C. It is difficult to foresee how the conditions found can be remedied for as has already been pointed out in this report, with the rapidly increasing numbers of adult males migrating out of the Protectorate the growing of sufficient foodstuffs around villages is becoming progressively more difficult.[2]

The report of the Nutrition Survey has not yet been published. In all interim reports issued by Dr. Platt, his observations indicated that the local African in his native surroundings was far from fit and lived for the greater part of each year on a diet which could only be expected to keep him very near the margin beyond which active signs of diet deficiency might be expected to occur.

The examination of recruits for the Army has brought confirmatory evidence of Dr. Platt's findings for the percentage rejected on medical grounds from all areas is high, but highest in those areas where the standard of living might be expected to be lowest.[3]

Finally, it should be noted that 'the lowest and unhealthiest regions are the most thickly populated on the whole, because the soil is fertile on the shores of the lakes and along the rivers, fish is plentiful, and because population always tends to settle along lines of communication and especially along waterways'.

The low lying levels on the Lake shore and along the river valleys are hot and malarious, much of the Protectorate is infested with tsetse fly,[4] and the highest levels, where the climate would doubtless be healthier and insect pests fewer, are as a rule sparsely inhabited either because they are difficult of access or because fertile areas are rare and scattered among the broken country or because they form forest reserves.[5]

Infant Mortality. The belief that infant mortality in Nyasaland is high dates from the beginning of this century.

There is no doubt that, normally, native infant mortality is very high, but there are no details on which to base a definite statement on the subject.[6]

No doubt, here as in other parts of Africa, there is a large mortality among infants and children, the chief causes being mismanagement at child-birth, grossly improper feeding, and the contagious and infective maladies to which the young are liable.[7]

The 1921 census report concluded from the sex and age composition of the population that 'the infantile mortality in Nyasaland must be

[1] *Report of the Department of Agriculture 1937*, p. 44; see also ibid. *1938*, p. 61. As regards local famines, see furthermore *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1936*, p. 5; *1937*, p. 22; *Report of Native Welfare Committee 1937*, Appendix II, p. 6.

[2] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 12. See also *Report of Post-War Development Committee* (1945), pp. 112, 115.

[3] *Medical Report 1940*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1941*, p. 9.

[4] See also Native Welfare Committee, *Memorandum on Native Policy in Nyasaland*, Jan. 1939, p. 18.

[5] *Census Report 1926*, p. xxix.

[6] *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1902–3*, p. 23.

[7] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 21; see also *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1913–14*, p. 29. *Colonial Report 1904–5*, p. 54, said that smallpox accounts 'for a very high infant mortality'.

enormous' and said that venereal disease 'is the most potent cause'.[1] The East Africa Commission reported that 'infantile mortality is high',[2] and the Medical Report for 1924 said that 'it is known in a general way . . . that the normal infantile death-rate is very high'.[3] This was the first report to give some infant mortality figures. The statistics collected in 1924 and subsequent years may be summarized as follows:[4]

Year	Births	Deceased under 1 year	Infant mortality rate
Bimbechi and Ntakataka (White Fathers)			
1914–23	711	129	181
1919–34	3,160	714[1]	226
Villages in Central Province			
1928	315	63[2]	200
6 villages in South Nyasa District			
1928	194	43[2]	222
Liwonde District			
1928	453	68[2]	150
50 villages in Mlanje District			
1931–2	395	124	314
Fort Manning District			
1932	..	245	141
1933	2,280	..	97
1934	2,044	316	155
1935	..	..	73
1936	..	..	82
1937	..	..	62
1939	1,709	208[1]	122
Karonga District			
1935	..	..	200
1937	..	..	272
Lower Shire District			
1938	917	330[1]	360

[1] Under 2 years. [2] 'Infants.'

Additional data were obtained through sample studies made by questioning women as regards the number of their children who died as infants. The inquiries effected in connexion with the 1926 count showed that of 12,180 children born alive 2,288 or 188 per 1,000 had 'died before they could walk'. According to the survey made ten years later among the Atonga people in the West Nyasa District, out of 1,698 children born alive 433 or 255 per 1,000 had died under 2 years of age. But neither the current records nor the sample surveys are trustworthy enough to permit the drawing of final conclusions. Both suffer from the fact that, on the one hand, many infant deaths were erroneously counted as still-births and that, on the other, the results were obviously vitiated by misunderstandings as to the upper age limit of infants.[5] Moreover, the current records, in particular, were incomplete.

The Superintendent of Census, who in 1921 had concluded from the sex and age composition of the population that infant mortality must be enormous, concluded from the results of the inquiries made in 1926 that infant mortality, while 'unduly great',[6] did not compare unfavourably

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, pp. 4–5. [2] *Report*, p. 104. [3] *Medical Report 1924*, p. 13.

[4] See ibid., p. 43; *1932*, pp. 13, 25, 28; *1933*, pp. 14, 37; *1934*, p. 14; *1935*, p. 17; *1936*, p. 17; *1937*, pp. 28–9; *1938*, p. 19; *1939*, p. 12; *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1928*, pp. 19–20.

[5] It so happened that both the 100 women questioned in 1926 in Blantyre and Central Shire and the 100 women questioned in West Nyasa had had 512 live-born children. But the former reported the deaths of 108 infants and only 56 older children while the latter stated they had lost only 44 infants and 252 older children!

[6] *Census Report 1926*, p. xii.

with that of other countries.[1] It is easy to understand that other (administrative and medical) officers did not accept these figures at their face value, but it is difficult to understand why they repeated the futile attempt to derive an infant mortality rate from the age data of the census. After having shown how small according to the 1931 census the number of children between 5 years and marriage age was as compared with the number of children under 5, the Senior Health Officer stated:

> It is therefore a fair deduction to make from the census figures that an enormous wastage of life occurs in the first quinquennial period: of 100 infants born probably not more than 30 survive the first year of life and not more than 10 live to be 6 years old. But the mortality alone does not represent the total damage done, because the same causes which bring about the deaths will also produce invalidity in a considerable proportion of the survivors, who are thus handicapped by more or less chronic ill-health at a period of life when its effects will be most lasting. Malaria for example which causes so large a number of infantile deaths, attacks a far larger number of children, and these probably seldom enjoy normal health until they achieve a stage of immunity in later life. Similarly many of the toddlers of 2 or 3 years old become infected with hookworm, which so lowers their resistance that many of them succumb to some ailment which a normally healthy child would survive.
>
> As stated above, in order to account for the enormous drop in numbers from the first to the second age group, one must assume a very high infantile mortality, and also a fairly high birth-rate. It is however probable that the total births do exceed the total deaths, and that the normal natural increase is not very far short of that indicated by the 1926 Census figures i.e. about 8% in 5 years.[2]

The Superintendent of the 1931 census incorporated this argument almost literally in his own report.[3]

If out of 100 infants born not more than 10 live to be 6 years, all that the Nyasaland women have to do in order to reproduce themselves is to bear on an average 10 girls or 20 children—provided all the girls who survive the age of 6 live till the end of the child-bearing period. But if, as the Senior Health Officer states, a considerable proportion of the survivors become invalid and succumb to some ailment—so that of the 10 girls who reach the age of 6, say, only 7 pass through child-bearing age, and if in spite of this high mortality the population increases by as much as 8 per cent. in five years, it is a 'fair deduction' that the Nyasaland women bear, on an average, something like 30 children (the sterile ones zero and the most prolific 50 or 60). If that were so it would indeed be justifiable to assume 'a fairly high birth-rate'.[4]

All subsequent reports which deal with infant mortality say that it is

[1] See *Census Report 1926*, p. xxiii. Of 12,180 children born alive 5,320 or 43·7 per cent. died as children. In his Dispatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies dated 19 July 1930, the Governor wrote: 'I have no doubt that by far the most distressing feature of native life is the high rate of infant and child mortality. Our statistics are very incomplete, but figures obtained by test examinations in certain districts, though they may not be quite exact, demonstrate that no fewer than 35 per cent. of the children die before reaching the age of puberty.' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 85.) I do not know to which test examinations the Governor referred, but if in fact not more than 35 per cent. of the children died before reaching the age of puberty this would not imply a particularly high mortality.

[2] *Medical Report 1931*, Appendix III. [3] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 26.

[4] In his report for the year 1903–4 the Acting Principal Medical Officer wrote: 'Natives. The majority of births appear to take place about the month of November' (*Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1903–4*, p. 33). If he had known that only 10 per cent. of the children

high,[1] and not a single one speaks of an improvement. The causes of infant mortality are discussed very fully. I shall confine myself to quoting here from a few recent reports.[2]

1936. (Fort Manning) Infant deaths are attributed mainly to malaria, diarrhoea, bronchitis and pneumonia, but the causes of infantile mortality require investigation, for relatively few infants are seen either before or after death by any qualified person. There can be little doubt but that improper feeding is an important contributory cause.[3]

(West Nyasa District) . . . I think malaria responsible largely for the high infantile mortality, probably concurrently with some other disease, after the children begin to walk they seem to have acquired a fairly useful immunity to this disease. In our present stage we can only give medicine and hope for the best, and I do not think that we will be able to attempt serious control of this for many years.[4]

1937. The infant mortality from malaria, particularly on the Lake shore, remains very high, and the Medical Officer in North Nyasa has estimated it at one in seven among the Lake shore children in that District. Much can be done, no doubt, by the natives themselves by care and attention to hygiene and sanitation to reduce that mortality but really effective measures such as the provision of mosquito-proof rooms on even the cheapest and most elementary lines are beyond the financial resources of the average villager.[5]

Native infants are, as a rule, breast-fed. At a very early age—with some tribes on the first day of life—infants are given sweet beer and feeds of *phala*, a thin gruel made from maize flour and water; frequently the first gruel is uncooked. A spoon is rarely available for feeding purposes. The cupped hand is filled with gruel and attempts are made to empty the contents into the infant's mouth. Resistance is useless, the gruel flows down the nostrils and in the choking and spluttering which follows, a quantity is swallowed by the infant. This is repeated 2 or 3 times daily and sometimes at night. Gradually the gruel is thickened until by the time the infant is able to walk it is receiving the porridge given to adults. This unsuitable and unnecessary addition to the diet of infants is largely responsible for the high infantile mortality from enteritis.[6]

Population Growth. In his report for the year 1895–6 Commissioner Johnston said that in the autumn of 1895 he 'endeavoured to make a correct computation of the population of the Protectorate, and from Returns sent in by the Collectors of the various districts' arrived at an estimate of 844,420 natives.[7]

born live to be 6 years he might have written: The majority of native women appear to have two children each year, one in May and one in November.

From what strange evidence far-reaching conclusions regarding child mortality have been drawn in Nyasaland may be illustrated by another example. After having reproduced the results of the inquiry made in 1926 in North Nyasa (see p. 615 above), the Native Reserves Commission (North Nyasa District) stated in their 1929 *Report* (p. 26): 'This shews a death rate for infant and children (including stillborn) of 58·1 per hundred. As this return is only from 100 women it is not conclusive, and its reliability as a criterion depends on whether the 100 women chosen are representative of the whole district. We made a point of asking at random several natives we met on the road or at the meetings about their own experience, and we think that the death rate is higher, perhaps 60 to 65 per cent and that we are safe in placing it at not less than 60 per cent.'

[1] See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1932*, p. 8; *Medical Report 1934*, pp. 15, 30, *1936*, p. 93; *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1934*, pp. 11, 43; Bell Commission, *Report*, p. 14.

[2] For earlier reports see, for example, *Census Report 1926*, pp. xii–xiii; *Medical Report 1932*, pp. 65–6.

[3] Ibid. *1936*, p. 17.

[4] Ibid., p. 93.

[5] *Reports of Provincial Commissioners 1937*, p. 47.

[6] *Medical Report 1937*, Appendix IV, 'The Native Welfare Committee Report on Nutrition', p. 6. See also ibid. *1936*, p. 90.

[7] See *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1895–6*, p. 2.

From this calculation it will be seen that the approximate native population of the Protectorate is considerably less than that which was foreshadowed in previous Reports.[1] This difference in the figures arises from a more careful calculation, this latter being based to a great extent on counting the huts in each district, and estimating the population at an average of three persons to a hut. Nevertheless, though the total native population is less than that of previous estimates, it in reality represents a considerable increase over former years. In the Lower Shiré district the native population has risen from about 1,000 in 1891 to 14,385 in 1896. The native population is markedly increased in the Mlanje, Zomba, Blantyre, and South Nyasa districts consequent on the suppression of the Slave Trade[2] and the settling down of the natives to peaceful occupations.[3]

We must encourage the unchecked increase of the negro population in British Central Africa, for the presence of millions of men with strong arms, and relatively proof against malarial fever, or, at any rate, amongst whom life is very cheap, will soon dispel malaria, the tsetse fly, and other drawbacks to the utility of British Central Africa.[4]

One year later, Acting-Commissioner Sharpe wrote:

Some census taking has been carried out in different districts, the most elaborate one having been made by Mr. R. Codrington, the Collector for Central Angoniland. Mr. Codrington has obtained the exact number of houses within an extent of about one-third of his district, the population, at three persons to the hut, being 98,691. The remaining portions of Central Angoniland are fully as populous as that over which Mr. Codrington's census was taken, and I estimate the whole district as probably containing over 200,000 inhabitants.[5] This would seem to show, therefore, that possibly our previous estimates of the population of this Protectorate may be somewhat under the mark.[6]

The reports for the following years stated that the population was increasing very much through immigration, mainly of Anguru from Portu-

[1] In his *Report of the First Three Years' Administration of the Eastern Portion of British Central Africa* (1894), p. 25, Commissioner Johnston had put the combined population of the Protectorate and the adjoining territories to the west administered under the Charter of the British South Africa Company (North-Eastern Rhodesia) at 2,499,000.

[2] In his earlier Report (1894), p. 25, Commissioner Johnston had said that 'a large proportion of British Central Africa has been of late years practically depopulated, and that almost entirely by the Slave Trade'—a statement which is the more surprising as he had added (ibid.): 'I should say that possibly, before my Administration took active steps to stop the Slave Trade, at least 2,500 slaves were exported annually from the eastern half of British Central Africa.' (An annual export of something like 2 per 1,000 of the natives can hardly have depopulated a large proportion of the country.) The *Colonial Office List* stated likewise in each edition from 1894 to 1905 that large portions of British Central Africa are devoid of a single human inhabitant owing to the fearful devastation caused in the past by slave raids.

As regards the effects of intertribal wars in British Central Africa Sir Harry Johnston took a much more cautious view: 'It is doubtful whether in this part of Africa great loss of life occurs in any of the wars amongst the natives. The party that has least stomach for the fight is so good at running away and can so soon get out of range of the guns, spears, assegais or arrows of the attacking party that not many dead bodies are usually left on the field of battle' (Johnston, *British Central Africa*, p. 470). But he lost all sense of proportion when discussing mortality from poison ordeals in British Central Africa: 'I should think, until the British Protectorate became effective, five per cent. of the Negro population of these countries was killed every year by the poison ordeal' (Johnston, *The Uganda Protectorate*, vol. i, p. 279).

[3] *Report 1895–6*, p. 2. [4] Ibid., p. 12.

[5] Sir Harry Johnston had estimated the native population of Central Angoniland at 80,000 (see ibid., p. 3).

[6] Ibid. *1896–7*, p. 1. See also Duff, p. 203: 'The native population of British Central Africa was reckoned a few years ago at 845,000, but this estimate is a very rough one and probably below the true figures.'

guese East Africa.[1] Seldom was it suggested that natural increase also played a part:

> A naturally high birth-rate, coupled with a steady improvement in the conditions of existence, continues to operate towards the rapid increase of the native population, and this tendency is further accelerated by a sustained flow of immigration from adjoining territories. Welcome as this circumstance may be upon general grounds, it cannot fail to cast upon the Protectorate Government, very shortly, the necessity of dealing on a comprehensive scale with the whole question of native settlements and of providing definite reserves for the accommodation of this great and increasing populace.[2]

In *Statistical Tables, British Colonies*, the native population in 1897–1911 has been given as follows:[3]

1897	*Mar. 1902*	*Mar. 1903*	*Mar. 1904*	*Mar. 1905*	*Mar. 1906*
687,752[1]	705,591[2]	736,719[3]	792,726[4]	923,500[5]	976,641[6]

Mar. 1907	*Mar. 1908*	*Mar. 1909*	*Mar. 1910*	*Mar. 1911*
927,355[7]	947,168[8]	996,166	922,313	969,183

[1] 'Exclusive of the population of the northern portion of Central N'goniland.'

[2] 'The coloured population has been estimated at 3,000,000, but no reliable information is available' (this is a mistake; the estimate of 3,000,000 included Northern Rhodesia). The figure 706,000 has been often quoted as '1901 census' figure; see, for example, *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire 1898 to 1912*, p. 1.

[3] See also *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1902–3*, p. 22: 'Careful enumerations of the population are made by District Collectors periodically, but the numbers must, of course, be accepted as approximate only. According to this estimate, the native population of the Protectorate in the year under report was 736,724.'

[4] 'Exclusive of the population of that portion of West Nyasa District known as "Mombera's Angoniland", for which no reliable returns have been available. A rough estimate, however, places the number at 200,000.' *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1903–4*, pp. 38–9, gives as estimated native population in 1904, 727,390 excluding and 927,390 including Mombera's Angoni.

[5] See also *Colonial Reports, British Central Africa Protectorate 1904–5*, p. 28: 'The native population is estimated at 923,500, an increase of 130,774, due partly to a revision of census, and partly to the inclusion of Northern Angoniland (or Mombera's), not previously estimated.'

[6] See also ibid. *1905–6*, p. 30: '. . . an increase of 53,141, due chiefly to the immigration of natives from territories beyond the limits of the Protectorate.'

[7] See also ibid. *1906–7*, p. 29: 'This apparent decrease is probably due to a more accurate census being obtained, especially in the case of the Mombera District' (for details see ibid., p. 21).

[8] See also *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1907–8*, p. 18: '. . . an increase of 19,813, due chiefly to continued immigration from neighbouring territories, and to more accurate statistics being available.'

---

[1] See *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1898–9*, p. 3; *1899–1900*, pp. 13, 18; *1901–2*, p. 21; *1902–3*, pp. 23–4; *1903–4*, pp. 16, 19. See also, for example, *Colonial Reports, British Central Africa Protectorate 1904–5*, pp. 21–2, 24; *1905–6*, pp. 21–2, 30; *1907–8*, p. 18.

[2] Ibid. *1909–10*, p. 16.

[3] See *Statistical Tables 1900*, p. 704; *1901*, p. 757; *1902*, p. 844; *1903*, p. 836; *1904*, p. 443; *1905*, p. 408; *1906*, p. 352; *1907*, p. 358; *1908*, p. 367; *1909*, p. 374; *1910*, p. 368. The *Colonial Office List* (*1906*, p. 93; *1907*, p. 93; *1908*, p. 297; *1909*, p. 296; *1910*, p. 300; *1911*, p. 265; *1912*, p. 267) gave practically the same figures for 1905–11. Earlier editions gave quite fantastic estimates of the combined native population of the British Central Africa Protectorate and Northern Rhodesia:

List 1894, p. 282: about 4,000,000.
List 1895, p. 284; *1896*, p. 290: about 5,000,000.
List 1897, p. 286; *1898*, p. 280; *1899*, p. 311; *1900*, p. 294; *1901*, p. 309; *1902*, p. 328; *1903*, p. 351; *1904*, p. 361: about 3,000,000.
List 1905, p. 90: about 1,090,000.

Lists 1902, *1903*, and *1904* say that the estimates refer to Nyasaland and North-Eastern

In view of the no doubt considerable immigration the population increase appears so moderate[1] that there is no reason to assume that in the first twenty years of British Administration births exceeded deaths. But the estimates are too uncertain to permit the drawing of any final conclusions.

For 1912–20 the native population has been estimated as follows:[2]

1912	*1913*	*1914*	*1915*	*1916*	*1917*	*1918*	*1919*	*1920*
1,000,659	1,020,537	1,065,119	1,088,057	1,137,572	1,137,266	1,227,442	1,215,976	1,202,208

The official reports of the second decade of this century apparently did not deal with population increase, but the Land Commission of 1920 and the Superintendent of the 1921 census expressed opinions which, however, differed widely. The Land Commission reported:

> In the Blue Book for the year ending on the 31st March, 1919, the total native population is given as 1,215,976. . . .
>
> The general census of the population of the Protectorate which is about to be taken will doubtless show an increase of population above these figures . . . .
>
> The period for which statistics of the increase of the native population are available is too short to enable an accurate estimate to be formed, but, in the light of figures compiled in relation to similar peoples in other parts of Africa, we shall assume that the native population in this country will double itself by natural increase in thirty years. A similar absence of statistics in regard to emigration and immigration obliges us to leave those factors out of account. So far as we can form an opinion we believe that their present effect on the total number of the population over the whole Protectorate is not great.[3]

The count which was made the day before this report was signed did not fulfil the expectations of the Commission. It showed a total of 1,199,934 or 23·8 per cent. more than the estimate of 1911. The Superintendent of Census made the following comment:

> It must . . . be remembered that the results should now be felt of the protection and peace brought into the country since 1891 by the British rule. The suppression of tribal wars and slave raids, and the help afforded by Government to forestall famines and alleviate the sufferings entailed by those that could not be prevented, should by now have been reflected in a far greater increase of the native population. Again, the factor of immigration must be taken into account. . . . On the whole it may, perhaps, be confidently stated that the indigenous native population of Nyasaland is dwindling numerically. The estimates in the past have been based on hut taxes, and a considerable portion of the recorded increase in the population must be attributed to more accurate counting in recent years, as hitherto exempted and remote tribes and villages gradually came within the scope of the tax. Better count-

Rhodesia; *List 1905* says that the estimate refers to 'the whole of British Central Africa', but meant probably to say that it refers to the British Central Africa Protectorate.

[1] The *Census Report 1921* (p. 3) grossly overstated the increase by saying: 'In 1901 the native population was estimated at 736,724, so that the increase in the decennial period 1901–11 was 232,459 or 31·5%.' The Superintendent of Census was probably misled by the fact that *Census of the British Empire 1901* (published in 1906) had stated (p. 178): 'No Census was taken in this Protectorate. The area has been estimated at 42,217 square miles, and the population at 736,724.' Actually, the population had been estimated at 736,724 in 1903, and this figure did not cover the whole Protectorate.

[2] See *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland Protectorate 1911–12*, p. 16; *1912–13*, p. 20; *1913–14*, p. 27; *1914–15*, p. 15; *1915–16*, p. 10; *1916–17*, p. 6; *1917–18*, p. 8; *Medical Report 1918*, p. 10; *1920*, p. 9.

[3] Land Commission, *Report*, pp. 2–3.

ing and immigration combined probably account for the whole increase since 1911; and, apart from these accidental circumstances, the Protectorate may be regarded as being faced with a declining population and . . . the rate of decline may be expected to experience a considerable acceleration in the next decade, when the forces which are tending to produce this result[1] have had time to exert their full effect.[2]

The assumptions made by the Land Commission were certainly wrong. For decades immigration had had a great effect on the total number of the population of the Protectorate, and if any 'figures compiled in relation to similar peoples in other parts of Africa' showed a doubling of the population by natural increase in thirty years they were probably not correct and certainly not conclusive. As regards the argument of the census report it is difficult to appraise its validity. If the population had actually risen by 230,000 in ten years, immigration alone, large as it was, could not account for such an increase. But if, as the report says, the rise was not all genuine but was due in part to better counting, it may well be that there was no natural increase. Since mortality, owing mainly to the war and the influenza epidemic, had been high, it is easy to believe that births in that decade again did not exceed deaths.[3] On the other hand, there is no evidence whatsoever that the indigenous native population was dwindling and that without immigration 'the Protectorate may be regarded as being faced with a declining population'.[4]

For 31 December 1921–5 the native population was estimated at 1,203,060, 1,185,653, 1,173,808, 1,210,344, and 1,205,801 respectively.[5] As immigration went on all the time, these figures were apt to confirm the pessimistic view taken in the 1921 census report. Mr. F. C. Linfield in his Supplementary Memorandum to the Report of the East Africa Commission pointed out that from April 1921 to December 1923 the native population had declined by 26,000 'despite a permanent settlement of immigrants from Portuguese East Africa of 2,147 in 1922 and 4,772 in 1923', and concluded that 'the decline in the indigenous population has not been arrested since 1921'.[6] The Commission itself said that the native population 'seems to be declining, especially in the undeveloped areas'.[7] When the population estimate for 31 December 1924 exceeded

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, p. 5: 'The causes of the decline in the native population which the census figures appear to show conclusively may be stated in the order of their importance to be:—
(*a*) Venereal Disease.
(*b*) The long absences of males from home.
(*c*) The decline of the powers of hereditary chiefs.
(*d*) Wilful restriction of size of families.
(*e*) Contact with European civilisation.'

[2] Ibid., pp. 3–4.

[3] It may seem at first sight that if the population in 1911 had been understated the increase in 1895–1911 may have been larger than indicated by the population estimates, and that therefore there may have been an excess of births over deaths in this period. But it may just as well be that the population was understated both in 1895 and 1911.

[4] The Superintendent drew these conclusions from the age data of the census. But even if these figures had been correct, which they actually were not, they would not prove a population decline either in the past or in the future.

[5] See *Medical Report 1921*, p. 10; *1922*, p. 18; *1923*, p. 17; *1924*, p. 17; *1925*, p. 16.

[6] *Report of the East Africa Commission*, p. 184.

[7] Ibid., p. 104.

the 1921 census figure by about 10,000, the Annual Colonial Report stated:

> The increase in the native population in the three and a half years between the census and the end of 1924 would probably have been shown as a decrease had it not been for the considerable numbers of natives who have settled permanently in the Protectorate from Portuguese East Africa during the past few years.[1]

But the 1926 count showed an increase of 90,951 or 7·6 per cent. over the 1921 figure and the Superintendent of Census now took a slightly more optimistic view. He apparently still believed that the indigenous population had been declining in 1911–21, but he now thought that in forecasting future mortality he had not sufficiently taken account of the fact that of the deaths in 1911–21 something like 50,000 had been due to the influenza epidemic. After having discussed the immigration statistics for the intercensal period he came to the conclusion:

> On the whole, therefore, it would appear that 60,000 to 65,000 is the lowest at which the total number of immigrants can be reckoned from 1921 to 1926, thus leaving a natural increase of 26,000 to 31,000 or 2·3 per cent. to 2·8 per cent. during 5 years. These figures would not generally be regarded as indicating a satisfactory increase but they do indicate, always assuming that both censuses were approximately correct, that the native population is making slow headway. The tone of the 1921 report was, perhaps, unduly pessimistic on this point, but it is probable that too little stress was laid on the effects of the influenza pandemic in 1918–19.[2]

The opinion that if there was any natural increase it was very small seems to have persisted all through the intercensal period 1926–31.[3] In its report of January 1931 the Empire Marketing Board stated:[4]

> In contrast with the rate of growth of population in the provinces of Kenya and Uganda, records of population show increases of over 90 per cent. since 1901,[5] and of 13 per cent. since 1921, but the increases are due rather to the greater accuracy of recent figures than to any excess of native births over deaths.[6] It is pointed out in the Report of the East Africa Commission that, as in the case of Kenya, the native population appears to be declining.

The count of April 1931 completely changed in some quarters the opinion on population growth in Nyasaland. It showed a native population of 1,599,888 as against an estimate of 1,392,742 for 31 December 1930. The apparent increase was 309,003 or 23·9 per cent. since 1926, and 399,954 or 33·3 per cent. since 1921. The Superintendent of Census, quoting the assumption of the Land Commission 'that the native population in this country will double itself by natural increase in thirty years', said:

> That assumed rate of increase is substantiated by the present census to within a decimal point,[7] but the increase cannot be ascribed solely to natural increase. It

[1] *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1924*, p. 5. [2] *Census Report 1926*, p. xxvii.

[3] The Dispatch from the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 19 July 1930, might be interpreted in a different sense, but this, I think, was not his intention. (See *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 78, 84–5.)

[4] *Production and Trade of Nyasaland*, p. 7.

[5] The Board assumed that the population in 1901 had been 706,000. This assumption was wrong (see p. 631 above). The estimates for the whole Protectorate showed an increase of 60 per cent. since 1895. [6] The Board did not realize that immigration had been the decisive factor.

[7] This, of course, is a mistake. If a population increases every ten years by 33·3 per cent. it is after 30 years not twice as large but 2·37 times as large. In order to double within 30 years, a population must increase every ten years by 26 per cent.

will be demonstrated in paragraph 91 dealing with vital statistics, that the natural increase is probably about 16 per cent, and that the causes of the rest of the increase must be sought elsewhere. Immigration is undoubtedly the other principal cause and it is reasonably safe to ascribe the increase approximately half to natural increase, and half to immigration.[1]

91. As stated above, in order to account for the enormous drop in numbers from the first to the second age group, one must assume a very high infantile mortality and also a high birth-rate. It is however probable that the total births do exceed the total deaths, and that the normal natural increase is approximately represented by the 1926 figures i.e. about 8 per cent in 5 years or 16 per cent in the decennial period.[2]

This argument is by no means convincing. The Superintendent of the 1926 census, on the basis of the migration statistics kept for 1922–5, had come to the conclusion that '60,000 to 65,000 is the lowest at which the total number of immigrants can be reckoned from 1921 to 1926'. No migration records seem to have been kept for later years,[3] but it is quite possible that net immigration in 1921–31 amounted to 200,000[4] or one-half of the apparent population increase. There is, however, not the slightest evidence that there was a natural increase of something like 200,000. The Superintendent of the 1931 census seemed to have assumed that the population growth of 91,000 or nearly 8 per cent. in 1921–6 was due entirely to natural increase. But this, of course, was not the case. The Superintendent of the 1926 census had reckoned it at '26,000 to 31,000 or 2·3 per cent. to 2·8 per cent', and it is, of course, out of the question that it could have been anything like 170,000 or 13 per cent. in 1926–31. It is much more likely that the natural increase was still quite moderate in 1926–31 and that the apparent enormous rise in the number of natives was due in a large measure to an understatement of the population of the Northern Province in 1921 and 1926.[5]

The 1931 census report contained two startling statements, which contradicted each other and which were both wrong: (1) that of 100 infants born not more than 10 live to be 6 years old, and (2) that the decennial natural increase was about 16 per cent. The former statement attracted little attention, but the latter was widely quoted,[6] and the feeling that the population was reproducing itself at a rapid rate has persisted in some quarters up to the present time. Two quotations may serve as an illustration.

One great fact stands out as a monument to European protection and that is the increase of the native population which in 1912, was just under one million and is now well over 1½ millions, but even this state of affairs may be attributed to the *Pax Britannica* rather than to the developmental efforts of the medical services.[7]

There has been a very great natural increase in the population of the Protectorate during recent times and this has been almost equalled by the settlement, mainly in the Southern Province, of immigrants from Portuguese East Africa and to a much smaller extent from other neighbouring territories.[8]

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 14. [2] Ibid., p. 26. See also *Medical Report 1931*, Appendix III.

[3] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 14.

[4] Between 1921 and 1931 the Nguru are reported to have increased from 120,776 to 235,616, and the Chikunda (who likewise came from Portuguese East Africa) from 21,893 to 47,438. See p. 587 above. [5] See p. 527 above.

[6] See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1931*, p. 7; *1932*, p. 7.

[7] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 15.

[8] Native Welfare Committee, *Memorandum on Native Policy in Nyasaland*, Jan. 1939, p. 18.

But the population estimates in the decade following the 1931 count suggested an increase which, considering the large amount of immigration,[1] was extraordinarily small. It amounted up to 31 December 1939 to 77,000 or 4·8 per cent. The Bledisloe Commission was certainly right in stating in 1939 that 'statistics do not indicate that there is any very rapid increase in the native population'.[2]

However, a new estimate made for the end of 1942 raised the population by 400,000 over the figure of the preceding year, and the count of 1945 supported the view that the increase had been grossly understated prior to 1942. The total increase in the intercensal period (1931–45) amounted to 580,000 or 36 per cent. Referring to the increase of the African population the Superintendent of Census says:

> Thus in 14 years the population has increased by 36·14% or approximately 26% for a decennial period. . . . The recorded increase in the decennial period 1921 to 1931 was 33·3%. The 1931 report concluded that, in spite of an appalling infantile death rate, natural increase was approximately 16% in the decennial period and that the balance was accounted for by immigration. Certainly a large influx from Portuguese East Africa took place between the years 1921 and 1931, and it is known that immigration has slowed considerably since 1931. Unfortunately there are no recorded statistics of African immigrants and, in their absence, there is no statistical proof of the figure of 16% to cover normal increase. The most that can be said is that the overall increase is 36% over the intercensal period of 14 years. To draw any more exact conclusions would be sheer guess work.[3]

In certain Districts, variations over the intercensal period are so unusual that they deserve special study. Comparisons are complicated by the fact that certain District boundaries have been drastically revised since 1931. . . . The Karonga and Chinteche Districts of the Northern Province, after making due allowance for populations lost or gained, show that in the former there has been an increase of about 90%, whereas in the latter District the population is static. As regards the Karonga District there seems to have been no particular reason for this tremendous increase. It is, however, worth placing on record that the returns submitted have been exceedingly well compiled: arithmetical errors have been few and far between, and the returns in each sub-division of the District show a remarkable consistency. It is clear that enumerators with a high standard of education and intelligence have been employed in the conduct of the census. In Chinteche, where for long emigration has been the industry of the District, the population is not only static, but has an absentee adult male population that exceeds the adult males actually counted in the District. Of the total *de jure* adult male population over 18 years of age of 17,867, no less than 10,750 are shown as absent abroad. In 1936 a Government Medical Officer conducted a medical survey of this District. In his report (published as an Appendix to the 1936 Annual Report of the Medical Department) he painted a gloomy picture of the conditions of health and lack of stamina of the population caused partly by an indifferently balanced diet chiefly consisting of cassava, which he attributed to a decline in agriculture brought about by the absence of so many young adult males, and partly by a high rate of infection from parasitic and venereal diseases. The fact

[1] The official statistics, it is true, showed for 1931–8 an excess of African emigrants over immigrants (see *Report of the Police Department 1935*, p. 17; *1938*, p. 18). But these figures comprise only those persons who have entered or left the Protectorate at an immigration post. 'The figures pertaining to native migrants must not be accepted as reflecting the true migration of natives as the majority of native migrants pass to and from adjacent territories without reporting their arrival or departure' (ibid. *1933*, p. 19; see also ibid. *1934*, p. 19). In the early 1920s these statistics were much more complete.

[2] Bledisloe Commission, *Report*, p. 4.

[3] *Census Report 1945*, p. 14.

that the population of this District has not increased in 14 years is disturbing. In the Central Province the increase in the Lilongwe District of 109,738 is largely attributable to the revision of boundaries since 1931, though there has probably been a drift from the Dedza District to the tobacco producing lands in the Lilongwe plain. In the Southern Province, four Districts show interesting returns. These are Port Herald and Chikwawa Districts, situated in the valley of the Shire River, and Mlanje and Cholo in the southern portion of the Shire Highlands. The two former Districts should be considered together as the distribution of the population in both of them is influenced by the vagaries of the Shire River. . . . The following table records the respective increase and decrease in the populations of these Districts:—

	1931	*1945*	*Increase*	*Decrease*
Port Herald	81,410	66,746	—	14,664
Chikwawa	35,892	59,664	23,772	—

The net increase is, therefore, 9,108 or 7·76% during the intercensal period. The low rate of increase can partly be accounted for by a drift to the neighbouring Districts of Mlanje and Cholo in search of employment. The population of the Mlanje District has increased by 55·9% and of the Cholo District by 102·4% since 1931. These very great increases must be due to the movement of families in search of employment on the European owned tea, tung and tobacco estates. There is little doubt that a big proportion of the increase is attributable to immigration from the neighbouring territory of Portuguese East Africa. At the same time a movement of population from adjoining Districts of the Protectorate must also be a contributory factor. For example, the Chiradzulu District, where the density is 309·77 to the square mile, has increased by 4·38% only in 14 years. Land shortage in this District has compelled many to seek their living elsewhere, and it is to be supposed that many have gone to work and settle in Cholo and Mlanje.[1]

It is impossible, of course, to say anything definite concerning the growth of the African population in the period 1931–45. If 'it is known that immigration has slowed considerably since 1931' it is most unlikely that the population has increased by 36 per cent. Even if immigration had not slowed considerably but only slightly since 1931,[2] an increase of 36 per cent. within 14 years would presuppose a very high excess of births over deaths. Assuming that the population was not overstated in 1945, I am inclined to think that it was understated in 1931. It seems in fact likely that a considerable number of absentees were then omitted. The above quotation from the 1945 census report suggests moreover, for example, that many inhabitants of the Karonga District were not counted in 1931.

The Committee on Emigrant Labour viewed the population trends with particular concern. It mentioned among the evils which the future holds in store if the immediate causes of emigration are not counteracted and if in no other way emigration is checked or controlled:

> Large tracts of land will be rendered unfit for habitation and in consequence the economic life of the whole country will suffer seriously. As the Native population will be dwindling, the country may be able to sustain, along the Lake Shore and river banks, the remaining inhabitants.[3]

The situation may be summarized as follows: In the period preceding the proclamation of the British Protectorate the native population was

[1] Ibid., pp. 14–15. See also ibid., p. 16.
[2] See pp. 542–3 above.
[3] *Committee on Emigrant Labour, 1935*, p. 38; see also ibid., p. 63.

probably declining. During the fifty years of British administration there was a net immigration of several hundred thousands. In the first three decades births probably did not exceed deaths. In the last two decades there may have been a natural increase but it certainly was not large.

IX. Non-Native Births and Deaths Statistics

Europeans. Birth and death registration became compulsory in 1904. Birth statistics have been published for every year from 1904–5 on,[1] except 1916, 1917, and 1919. Fertility seems to have been moderately high until 1930 but has been low since. Death statistics have been published for every year from 1894–5 on, again except 1916, 1917, and 1919. In the 1890s mortality was excessive.[2] It was still high among men in the first decade of this century,[3] but has been low ever since.

Table 17. *Registered Non-Native Births and Deaths, Nyasaland, 1904/5–1940*[1]

Year	Europeans		Asiatics		Year	Europeans		Asiatics	
	Births	Deaths	Births	Deaths		Births	Deaths	Births	Deaths
1904–5	17	10	..	..	1924	42	15	14	12
1905–6	18	21	..	..	1925	48	19	10	17
1906–7	19	28	..	7	1926	37	10	10	8
1907–8	15	13	..	..	1927	53	17	10	28
1908–9	14	17	..	10	1928	47	12	29	14
1909–10	18	10	..	6[3]	1929	57	16	18	20
1910–11	21	9	1	3	1930	31	18	30	14
1911–12	24	7	..	8	1931	47	19	28	27
1912–13	27	11	1	7	1932	45	18	31	12
1913	25	7	1	4	1933	46	14	46	8
1914	32	12	3	2	1934	40	13	48	16
1915	21	13	..	..	1935	44	11	63	16
1918	17	11	..	..	1936	35	18	71	18
1920	29	21	8	10	1937	29	18	83	19
1921	38	13	14	6	1938	34	13	93	14
1922	51	14	7	2	1939	48	11	87	17
1923	33	8	13	10	1940	41	8	95	23

[1] See *Colonial Reports, British Central Africa Protectorate 1904–5*, p. 46; *1905–6*, p. 30; *1906–7*, p. 48; *1907–8*, p. 19; *1908–9*, p. 14; *1909–10*, p. 13; *1915–16*, p. 10; *Medical Report 1910–11*, p. 4; *1911–12*, p. 4; *1912–13*, p. 9; *1913*, p. 9; *1914*, p. 10; *1918*, p. 10; *1920*, p. 9; *1921*, p. 10; *1922*, p. 18; *1923*, p. 17; *1924*, p. 17; *1925*, p. 16; *1926*, p. 14; *1927*, p. 15; *1928*, p. 23; *1929*, p. 25; *1930*, pp. 12, 27; *1931*, p. 33; *1932*, p. 33; *1933*, p. 43; *1934*, p. 46; *1935*, p. 63; *1936*, p. 57; *1937*, p. 65; *1938*, p. 61; *1939*, p. 35; *1940*, p. 5.

[3] Including 2 Eurasians.

[1] For 1899–1900 and 1902–3 the number of reported births is given as 8 and 15 respectively. See *Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate 1899–1900*, p. 28; *1902–3*, p. 43.

[2] The number of deaths reported for 1894–5 to 1903–4 was 19, 28, 21, 32, 16, 31, 16, 12, 13, and 17 respectively (see ibid. *1897–8*, p. 2; *1902–3*, p. 43; *1903–4*, p. 31). It is doubtful whether all deaths were recorded. The European population in 1895–1900 was only about 300; the number of children and old people was negligible.

[3] Mortality of women seems to have been remarkably low (provided the records were complete). See ibid. *1903–4*, p. 31: 'Although ladies number 99, there has not been a single death amongst them.' The number of reported deaths of women in 1906–7, 1908–9, 1909–10, and 1910–11 was 1, 0, 0, and 0 respectively (see *Colonial Reports, Nyasaland 1906–7*, p. 48; *1908–9*, p. 14; *1909–10*, p. 13; *1910–11*, p. 14).

TABLE 18. *Deaths of European Officials, Nyasaland, 1918–39*[1]

Year	Number		Deaths	Year	Number		Deaths
	Total	Average			Total	Average	
1918	111	86	—	1929	244	186	1
1919	137	83	—	1930	257	192	2
1920	164	97	2	1931	270	213	1
1921	169	138	—	1932	267	212	2
1922	222	173	—	1933	282	203	2
1923	217	169	—	1934	276	206	—
1924	214	160	—	1935	266	205	—
1925	209	159	—	1936	269	206	1
1926	229	180	—	1937	279	225	1
1927	235	185	1	1938	290	215	1
1928	241	184	2	1939	289	223	2

[1] See *Medical Report 1920*, p. 13; *1921*, p. 13; *1924*, p. 10; *1927*, p. 8; *1930*, p. 13; *1933*, p. 15; *1937*, p. 32; *1939*, p. 13.

Asiatics. Death registration became compulsory in 1905, birth registration in 1912, and it seems that at first births and deaths were registered, although inadequately. It is doubtful, however, whether any registrations were effected in 1915–19. From 1920 on, records are again available, but the figures show that death registration has been incomplete throughout. Birth registration was apparently satisfactory in the 1930s; the figures suggest a high fertility.

CHAPTER XIII

SOMALILAND[1]

I. Census-taking

No census of the native population has as yet been taken.

The first census ever taken in the Protectorate was an enumeration of the alien population in the three principal coast towns (Berbera, Bulhar, and Zeyla) in 1911.[2] The first complete census of the Non-Somali population was taken on 24 April 1921.[3] Another census was taken on 26 April 1931 in accordance with the following Ordinance:[4]

1. This Ordinance may be cited as 'The Somaliland Census Ordinance, 1930'.

2. A census shall be taken of the non-Somali inhabitants of the Protectorate on the night of Sunday, the 26th day of April, 1931.

3. For the purpose of taking such census the Governor may make all such regulations as shall be necessary and the Governor shall cause to be appointed all such officers and enumerators as may be necessary to take the census.

4. Schedules shall be prepared under the direction of the Governor for the purpose of being filled up by or on behalf of the several occupiers of every dwelling-house or place of residence in the Protectorate with such particulars as to the Governor may seem fit, and such schedules may be in different forms for persons of different creeds or castes.

5. Every occupier of any dwelling-house or of any portion of a dwelling-house, and the master or person in charge of every vessel lying within the Protectorate waters, with or for whom any such schedule shall have been left as aforesaid, shall fill up the said schedule to the best of his knowledge or belief, and shall deliver the schedule so filled up or cause the same to be delivered to the enumerator when required so to do.

Any such occupier who shall wilfully refuse or without lawful excuse neglect to fill up the said schedule to the best of his knowledge and belief, or to deliver the same as herein required or who shall wilfully make, sign or deliver or cause to be made, signed or delivered any false return of all or any of the matters specified in the said schedule shall upon conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Rs. 100 (one hundred rupees).

6. The Governor shall make provision for obtaining, in such ways as shall appear to him best adapted for the purpose, such returns as he shall think fit with respect to all persons who at the time of the taking of the said census are travelling or for any other reason are not abiding in any house or place of residence in respect of the inhabitants of which a schedule is to be filled up.

7. The enumerators and all officers appointed under this Ordinance shall be authorized to ask all such questions as shall be necessary for obtaining the information required by the Governor in respect of this Ordinance.

[1] A British Protectorate was established in 1884. Until 1898 the Somaliland Protectorate was administered by the Resident of Aden, as a Dependency of the Government of India. In that year it was transferred to the charge of the Foreign Office, and in 1905 to that of the Colonial Office. The country was evacuated by the British in 1940. The reoccupation took place on 21 Mar. 1941 by an expeditionary force concentrated for the purpose at Aden, and a Military Administration was set up under an Order in Council dated 9 May 1941.

This chapter was written in 1941. No material was available to bring it up to date.

[2] See *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1911–12*, p. 16; *1913–14*, p. 13.

[3] It was authorized by Ordinance No. 6 of 1920 (26 Nov.), *Somaliland Ordinances 1910–1922*.

[4] No. 9 of 1930 (22 Sept.), *Supplement to The Laws of Somaliland 1930–32*, pp. 5–6.

Any person refusing to answer or wilfully giving a false answer to such questions, or any of them, shall for every such refusal or wilfully false answer upon conviction be liable to a fine not exceeding Rs. 100 (one hundred rupees).

In exercise of the powers conferred upon him by Section 3 of this Ordinance the (Acting) Governor, by Notice of 27 December 1930,[1] appointed a Chief Census Officer and eight District Census Officers.

II. Total Population

From 1907 on the native population has been usually put at about 344,700,[2] but this is probably merely a guess.[3] The Non-Somali population enumerated at the censuses of 1921 and 1931 was 2,205 and 2,683 respectively;[4] no estimate seems to have been made for recent years. The area of the Protectorate is about 68,000 square miles, and there are about 5 inhabitants to the square mile.

III. Composition of the Population

1. *Somali Population*

The native male population for about twenty years has been estimated at 148,000 and the native female population at 196,700.[5] This would indicate a ratio of 133 females to 100 males. Even if such an excess of females should have existed at one time it is difficult to see how it could possibly have been maintained.

2. *Non-Somali Population*

Race. According to the 1931 census there were in the Protectorate 68 Europeans and other Whites, 520 East Indians, 1,644 'Coloured' (mainly Arabs), and 451 Black.[6] The Europeans were nearly all

[1] No. 76 of 1930, ibid., p. 79.

[2] The Annual *Blue Books* for many years have published an estimate of 344,700 natives. Prior to 1908 the estimates varied greatly. The *Statistical Tables*, for example, gave the following figures:

Year 1901	*31 Mar.* 1902	*31 Mar.* 1903	*31 Dec.* 1903	*31 Mar.* 1905	*31 Mar.* 1906	*31 Mar.* 1907	*31 Mar.* 1908	*31 Mar.* 1909	*31 Mar.* 1910	*31 Mar.* 1911
500,000	153,000	153,000	300,000	153,000	352,000	363,300	348,000	348,000	340,500	344,300

See *Statistical Tables, British Colonies 1900*, p. 700; *1901*, p. 750; *1902*, p. 833; *1903*, p. 824; *1904*, p. 470; *1905*, p. 434; *1906*, p. 378; *1907*, p. 384; *1908*, p. 395; *1909*, p. 403; *1910*, p. 400.

[3] See also *Colonial Office List 1946*, p. 201: '. . . the Somaliland population was estimated in 1937 at 344,700. More recently it has been thought to approximate to double this figure.'

[4] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 4. According to the 1911 *Census Returns* the alien population in Berbera, Bulhar, and Zeilah was 2,859 (see *Returns of Census 1911*, Table III). But *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1913–14*, p. 13, showed a total of 3,413 (including 'mixed population, 789').

[5] See, for example, *Blue Book 1928*, Section 15, p. 1; *1938*, Section 15, p. 1. *Statistical Abstract for the British Overseas Dominions and Protectorates 1907 to 1921*, p. 7, gave as total male population 149,413 and as total female population 197,587.

[6] The Black, according to *Colonial Reports* (*1931*, p. 5; *1932*, p. 5; *1933*, p. 6; *1934*, p. 6; *1935*, p. 6; *1936*, p. 6; *1937*, p. 6) included '258 Nyasaland natives of the Somaliland Camel Corps'. But according to *Census Report 1931*, pp. 4, 6, the 258 'Natives of Nyasaland' consisted of 95 soldiers, 88 wives, and 75 children (of whom 55 were born in British Somaliland). In 1921 there had been no Natives of Nyasaland in the Protectorate and the addition of these 258 people was the main cause of the increase in the number of Non-Somalis from 1921 to 1931. (The Nyasaland Contingent joined the Somaliland Camel Corps in 1922; see *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1922*, p. 8.)

officials and their families.[1] By 1938 their number had increased to 80.[2]

TABLE 1. *Non-Somali Population by Race and Sex, Somaliland, 1921 and 1931*[1]

Year	Sex	Europeans	East Indians	Coloured				Black				Total
				Persians	Arabs	Turkish	Egyptians	Abyssinians	Soudanese	Natives of Nyasaland	Swahilis	
1921	Male	41	338	1	953	—	—	30	53	—	—	1,416
	Female	5	131	—	566	—	—	40	47	—	—	789
	Total	46	469	1	1,519	—	—	70	100	—	—	2,205
1931	Male	55	310	6	971	6	4	50	54	134	2	1,592
	Female	13	210	6	643	5	3	50	35	124	2	1,091
	Total	68	520	12	1,614	11	7	100	89	258	4	2,683

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 3.

Country of Birth. Of the 68 Europeans enumerated in 1931 56 were born in the British Isles, 11 elsewhere in the British Empire, and 1 outside the Empire. Of the 520 East Indians 195 were born in British Somaliland, 234 in British India, 82 in Arabia, 6 in Goa, and 3 elsewhere. Of the 1,644 Coloured 933 were born in British Somaliland, 697 in Arabia, and 14 elsewhere. Of the 451 Black 166 were born in British Somaliland, 202 in Nyasaland, 13 in the Sudan, 66 in Abyssinia, 2 in Arabia, and 2 elsewhere.[3]

TABLE 2. *Non-Somali Population by Race, Sex, and Age, and by Race, Sex, and Conjugal Condition, Somaliland, 1931*[1]

Age, Conjugal condition	Europeans		East Indians		Coloured		Black		Total		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total
0–10	3	2	75	56	375	297	85	74	509	474	1,043
10–20			31	45							
20–40	36	9	144	86	361	237	135	129	676	461	1,137
40–60	16	2	53	15	201	89	14	5	284	111	395
Over 60	—	—	7	8	50	34	6	3	63	45	108
Total	55	13	310	210	987	657	240	211	1,592	1,091	2,683
Single	32	2	151	93	465	283	100	78	748	456	1,204
Married	23	11	155	104	485	272	137	121	800	508	1,308
Widowed	—	—	4	12	24	82	2	10	30	104	134
Divorced	—	—	—	1	13	20	1	2	14	23	37

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 6–9.

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1937*, p. 4: 'There are no European private residents in British Somaliland, and it is necessary for all intending visitors to obtain permission from the Secretary to the Government to enter the Protectorate. It is essential for such visitors to arrive completely self-contained, unless they have made arrangements privately for accommodation with officers of the Protectorate.' The number of non-official Europeans who 'visited the country for business or pleasure' decreased from 37 in 1936 to 18 in 1937 and to 2 in 1938; see *Medical Report 1936*, p. 15; *1937*, p. 13; *1938*, p. 15.

[2] See *Blue Book 1938*, Section 15, p. 1.

[3] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 6–9.

Nationality. The Europeans were all British born. Of the East Indians 512 were British born and 8 foreign born. Of the Coloured 1,237 were British born, 2 naturalized British subjects, and 405 foreign born. Of the Black 384 were British born and 67 foreign born.[1]

Sex. The ratio of Non-Somali females to 100 males increased from 56 in 1921 to 69 in 1931. Of the Europeans 55 were males in 1931 and 13 females; the East Indians consisted of 310 males and 210 females, the Coloured of 987 males and 657 females, the Black of 240 males and 211 females. In 1938 there were 57 male and 23 female Europeans in the Protectorate.

Age. There were no Europeans over 60 and no Nyasalanders over 40. Most old people were Arabs.

Conjugal condition. There was a large excess of husbands over wives among the Europeans, the East Indians, and the Coloured.

TABLE 3. *European Officials by Age, Somaliland, 1930–9*[1]

Date 1 Jan.	*20–24 years*	*25–29 years*	*30–34 years*	*35–39 years*	*40–44 years*	*45–49 years*	*50–54 years*	*55– years*	*Age unknown*	*Total*
1930	—	7	17	8	6	5	4	1	1	49
1931	4	6	17	11	7	5	3	3	—	56
1932	2	10	11	10	8	7	3	4	1	56
1933	1	8	11	9	10	7	3	1	—	50
1934	—	9	10	11	9	6	5	—	—	50
1935	1	8	10	9	10	6	3	1	—	48
1936	4	10	11	13	11	5	3	2	—	59
1937	4	8	11	14	10	5	3	2	—	57
1938	1	8	10	13	8	10	3	2	1	56
1939	—	10	8	12	11	9	1	3	1	55

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1939*, p. 1. All European officials were male.

IV. BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION

Registration of births and deaths was provided in the Protectorate through King's Regulations made by His Majesty's Commissioner in 1904.[2] These regulations made registration of births compulsory 'if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent'. For all other births and for all deaths registration was to be optional, but the Commissioner was authorized to extend by Order the provisions relating to compulsory registration to the births and deaths of all persons in the Protectorate of any particular race, class, tribe, or other group, or of all or some of the inhabitants of any particular town, district, or other area. He issued one such Order in 1912[3] by which he made the registration of

[1] See ibid.

[2] No. 2 of 1904 (22 Mar.), 'The Births and Deaths Registration Regulations, 1904', Somaliland Protectorate, *Ordinances 1900–1905*, pp. 141–4, reprinted as 'The Births and Deaths Registration Ordinance' in *Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate in Force 1930*, pp. 275–9 (cap. 17). The Ordinance has since been amended by 'The Administrative Officers (Change of Titles) Ordinance, 1932' (No. 16 of 1932, 22 Aug., *Supplement to The Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate 1930–32*, p. 9). The Regulations were made under Article 32 of 'The Somaliland Order in Council, 1899'; see Somaliland Protectorate, *Ordinances 1900–1905*, pp. 1–15.

[3] Notice 31 Jan. 1912, reprinted in *Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate in Force 1922*, p. 104.

the deaths of all persons of European or American origin or descent compulsory from 1 January 1912 onwards.

In accordance with the Regulations of 1904 the Commissioner, in 1907, made Rules,[1] the most important of which were the following:

1. The Secretary to the Government is hereby appointed Registrar General of Births and Deaths under the Ordinance.

3. The place in each District and the hours during which births and deaths may be registered, and registers inspected, are as follows:—

Berbera .. Berbera District } During office hours on such days as the District
Zeilah .. Zeilah District } Officer is in attendance.

4. Births and deaths may be registered under this Ordinance, without personal attendance, by letter addressed to the District Officer of the District in which, or nearest to which, the birth or death takes place. Forms for registration will be supplied gratis by the District Officer. The prescribed fee shall in every case be paid in advance.

5. All registers, returns and other documents required for the purpose of the Ordinance shall be in such form as the Governor may from time to time direct.

6. Any register, return or index in the custody of the Registrar, shall be open to inspection, subject to the consent of the Registrar, or by order of the Governor.

8. Births and deaths on board ships well within the territorial waters of the Protectorate shall be registered at the nearest port of call, either Berbera or Zeilah.

The main provisions ensuring birth and death registration as they stand to-day are as follows:

Registration of Births and Deaths

The registration of the birth of a child shall be compulsory if either one or both parents are of European or American origin or descent, or, in the case of an illegitimate child not recognised by its father, if the mother is of European or American origin or descent.

The registration of the deaths of all persons of European or American origin or descent occurring within the Somaliland Protectorate shall be compulsory.

In case of a birth (1) the father and mother, (2) the occupier of the house in which the birth occurred, each person present at the birth, and the person having charge of the child shall register the birth within three months or be liable to a fine not exceeding 100 rupees or to a month's imprisonment or to both.

In case of a death (1) the nearest relatives present at the death or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, (2) every other relative dwelling within the district, (3) each person present at the death and the occupier of the house in which the death occurred, (4) any inmate of the house or any person finding or taking charge of the body or causing the body to be buried shall register the death within one month or be liable to a fine not exceeding 100 rupees or to a month's imprisonment or to both.

Particulars to be Reported to the Registrar

Birth: Sex; name; date; place of birth; names, residence, occupations, and nationality of the parents.

[1] See Notice 24 Jan. 1907, Somaliland Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations 1906–1907*, p. 27, reprinted in Somaliland Protectorate, *Notices &c., in Force 1930*, pp. 10–11. The Notice has since been amended by 'The Administrative Officers (Change of Titles) Ordinance, 1932'.

Death: Name; age; sex; residence; occupation; nationality; date, place, and cause of death.

Registration of births and deaths of persons not of European or American origin or descent is optional, and the district registrar shall register every such birth or death occurring within his district whereof the prescribed particulars are reported to him.

The Registrar General of Births and Deaths and the District Registrars receive no compensation for their services as such. A fee of Rs. 2 is charged on registration of birth or death; on registration or alteration of name after registration of birth; on inspection of a register, return or index; and on a certified copy of any entry in the register of births and deaths.

All these regulations and rules have, of course, so far been practically irrelevant, as compulsory registration applies only to the few scores of Europeans, and as hardly ever has any use been made of optional registration. A year without registration of a birth or death is certainly nothing unusual in the Protectorate.[1]

The first attempt to obtain native death records was made in Berbera. Its history can be traced in the annual Medical Reports:

1925. The Medical Department has requested that registration should be instituted but the expense is considered too great.[2]

1926. It is proposed next year to attempt to gain a little information about deaths in the larger settlements.[3]

1927. In Berbera the District Commissioner has been requested to obtain information as to the number of burials per week. He has accordingly instructed the guards on the gate leading to the cemetery to count the funeral processions that pass.[4]

1928. In Berbera some attempt was first made last year to record the deaths. The results expected from asking the relatives of a deceased person to report the fact were so poor as to make it inadvisable to rely on such a method.

The township is surrounded by a barbed wire perimeter (put up during the coastal concentration period) through which are various numbered gateways at which stand sentries, and this year the sentries were instructed to report every funeral party that passed. We now began to register large numbers weekly. One day a member of the hospital staff saw a funeral proceeding from the town to the cemetery not through a gate but through a gap in the wire and subsequently numerous gaps were found. The authorities considered it too expensive to repair the perimeter, for which there is not the urgent need that existed when it was put up and were not very sure that the benefit to be obtained by knowing the number of deaths justified the expense of finding out; they, however, arranged to post two policemen at each cemetery to count the interments. We now had larger numbers still but it was difficult to know whether the rise was due to more deaths or increased percentage of recording.

In 1927 the weekly average found was 2·15 and in 1928 it was shown to be 10·63. It is not easy to obtain reliable statistics as shown above nor to estimate their value as the population of Berbera varies so much with year and season and with prosperity

[1] The Annual Colonial Reports for 1904–5 to 1912 mention the registration of 2 births (1 Goanese in 1905, 1 European in 1911) and the registration of 8 deaths (2 European in 1904–5, 1 Goanese and 1 Eurasian in 1905, 2 European in 1911, and 2 European in 1912); see *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1904–5*, p. 36, *1905–6*, p. 18, *1911–12*, p. 16, *1912–13*, p. 14. No deaths of Europeans were registered in 1923–6; see ibid. *1923*, p. 7, *1924*, p. 6, *1925*, p. 9, *1926*, p. 8. The number of European officials who died in the Protectorate in 1915–38 was 9 (two in 1915 and one each in 1916, 1922, 1927, 1928, 1929, 1930, and 1937); see *Medical Report 1916*, p. 2, *1923*, p. 5, *1929*, p. 9, *1930*, p. 10, *1933*, p. 10, *1936*, p. 16, *1938*, p. 15.

[2] Ibid. *1925*, p. 11. [3] Ibid. *1926*, p. 15. [4] Ibid. *1927*, p. 15.

or the reverse in the interior. There is no doubt in my mind that this death rate, 10·63 per week, is much in excess of normal and due to the influx of starving and sick people owing to the drought in the interior.[1]

The number of burials ascertained in the 31 weeks ending 31 December 1927 was 56,[2] and there cannot be any doubt that many burials escaped the attention of the guards. The numbers ascertained in 1928–30 were 559, 208, and 126.[3] The figures for 1928 and 1929 were swelled by the arrival of fugitives from famine-stricken areas. The figure for 1930 was suspiciously low.

As indicated in the Medical Report for 1928 quoted above notification of deaths through relatives of the deceased had been instituted in Berbera. When, after a few years of resistance, this system looked more promising, such notification was formally prescribed for Berbera and six other towns under Section 7 of 'The Townships Ordinance' of 1924,[4] which provided:

> The Governor shall have the power to make rules for the health, order, and good government of Townships and may apply any or all of such rules to any Township or may make special rules in regard to particular Townships.

In accordance with this provision, the Governor, on 10 October 1930, made the following Regulation:[5]

> Within the townships of Berbera, Burao, Buramo, Erigavo, Hargeisa, Sheikh, and Zeilah, every death shall be notified to the local medical authority by the nearest relative of the deceased. Failing a relative this notification must be made by the guardian or person in charge of or responsible in any way for the deceased.
>
> This notification must be made in sufficient time to enable a medical representative to view the body; and no burial shall be permitted until the body has been so viewed.

The Medical Report for 1930 made the following comment:

> It has been remarked in previous reports that an attempt was being made to find the normal death rate in Berbera. This, after meeting a good deal of opposition, had some success by insisting on the report of deaths in sufficient time to allow inspection of the body by a medical representative, and Berbera does not now present much difficulty in this matter. The system was extended during 1930 to other townships . . . .[6]

The numbers of notifications in 1931–5 were as follows:[7]

Year	*Berbera*	*Buramo*	*Burao*	*Erigavo*	*Hargeisa*	*Sheikh*	*Zeilah*	*Total*
1931	68	32	83	3	93	19	35	333
1932	81	26	84	—	157	20	34	402
1933	63	21	39	11	100	28	31	293
1934	118	28	27	33	119	18	73	416
1935	68	28	6	22	86	16	71	297

[1] *Medical Report 1928*, pp. 6–7.

[2] The Medical Department, in arriving at a weekly average of 2·15 deaths, wrongly assumed that the records started only at the beginning of July; they actually started in the week ending 4 June.

[3] See ibid. *1932*, p. 12.

[4] No. 6 of 1924 (24 July), reprinted in *Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate in Force 1930*, pp. 475–6 (cap. 41).

[5] Notice No. 71 of 1930, *Supplement to The Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate 1930–32*, p. 139.

[6] *Medical Report 1930*, pp. 20–1.

[7] See ibid. *1934*, pp. 11–12; *1935*, p. 11.

The Medical Report for 1935 stated:

There has been some slackness in the reporting of deaths at Berbera. The matter has been taken up with the District Officer and it is hoped the figures for 1936 would be more correct.[1]

But this hope was not fulfilled, and no figures showing the numbers of notifications were published in subsequent years. The last reference to this subject is to be found in the following passage of the Medical Report for 1936:

The system of notifying deaths to the medical authorities instituted in Berbera and, in 1930, extended to other townships (Notice No. 7 of 10th October, 1930) was primarily a preventive measure against the spread of disease, but it was hoped also that it would be a means of ascertaining the normal death rates and the main causes of deaths in the townships. It has, however, failed fully to achieve its objects as many deaths are not reported and burials take place without examination. An effort is being made to obtain a more strict observance of the system without giving offence to religious principles.[2]

A new attempt to obtain vital statistics was made in 1937:

As from the 1st July 1937 an experiment was started whereby the Akils were required to render to their District Officer a return each month of the number of births and deaths which had occurred in their tribes. The returns were to be collated by the District Officer concerned, and forwarded by him to the Senior Medical Officer.

The following table shows the returns covering the period 1st July to 31st December. It will be seen that in some cases relatively full returns have been obtained, whereas in others nil returns have been rendered.

There appears little reason to suppose that even the full returns bear any relationship to the truth.[3]

The totals for the period from July to December 1937 were as follows:[4]

	Berbera		*Buramo*		*Burao*		*Erigavo*		*Hargeisa*		*Zeilah*		*Total*	
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
Live-born	322	201	309	224	13	1	15	4	293	157	90	69	1,042	656
Still-born	11	5	2	7	—	—	3	4	—	—	5	14	21	30
Deaths	101	64	98	42	—	—	30	8	144	66	54	33	427	213

The returns seem to have been particularly defective for the female sex and the experiment was discontinued as from 1 June 1938.

The experiment which started in 1937, whereby Akils were required to render each month a return of the number of births and deaths which had occurred in their tribes, was discontinued as from the 1st June, as the returns received were clearly hopelessly incomplete and inaccurate.[5]

[1] Ibid.
[2] Ibid. *1936*, p. 15.
[3] Ibid. *1937*, pp. 11–12.
[4] The table in the Report shows the results for Berbera District by months and for the other Districts by quarters. It appears that no returns were provided from the Burao District for July to Sept. and from the Erigavo District for Oct. to Dec.
[5] Ibid. *1938*, pp. 14–15.

V. Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

1. *Somali Population*

Fertility. The Annual Colonial Report for 1906–7 stated:

> Birth Rate. No actual figures are known, but an estimate taken at the coast towns shews that this is 10 per cent. among the married women.[1]

This would indicate a rather low fertility, but the basis of the estimate was probably quite uncertain.[2] No more recent official report apparently mentions fertility.[3]

Mortality. Nothing is known about mortality, and the medical services are very limited. 'The population follows the grass, which follows the rains, and there is not the medical staff to follow the population . . . .'[4]

Population Growth. Some of the early Colonial Reports discuss population increase:

1905–6.[5] . . . owing to the ravages of the small-pox epidemic in 1904–5, it is probable that there has been no increase during the present year.

1906–7.[6] The population, owing to the quiet which has existed during the last two years, is probably on the increase, though the outbreak of small-pox in 1904–5 rendered any increase during 1904 at least problematical.

1907–8.[7] The population is increasing, but not in geometrical ratio, even at the present time, when the general conditions are favourable. The increase may be more correctly estimated as in arithmetical ratio to the means of subsistence.

1908–9.[8] The population, owing to the naturally hard conditions of life, is increasing only in arithmetical ratio it is thought, even under favourable conditions, instead of the geometrical increase among more favoured races.

1909–10.[9] The population appears to be increasing at a slightly improved rate, probably owing to their increase in animal wealth under British protection.

1910–11.[10] The population is probably about stationary, owing to tribal disturbances affecting the general mortality. The country under present conditions is capable of sustaining a limited population only, owing to the limited water supply and lack of agriculture.

1911–12.[11] No reliable information is forthcoming as to the increase or decrease of the native population in the interior.

[1] *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1906–7*, p. 20; see also ibid. *1907–8*, p. 24.

[2] How little was known concerning the population of the coast towns may be inferred from the following statements in the *Colonial Reports* (*1905–6*, p. 17; *1906–7*, p. 20):

1905–6. 'In Berbera the population may vary from 40,000 in the cold season (October to April) to 20,000 or less during the "Kharif" (May to September).'

1906–7. 'There are some 3,000 to 4,000 Somalis in Berbera during the summer months, while during the winter months the population mounts up to 20,000 to 30,000.'

In the 1920s the native population of Berbera and some other towns was estimated monthly by the District Commissioner (see *Medical Report 1926*, p. 15). According to these estimates the population of Berbera declined from 13,000 in Jan., Feb., and Mar. 1924 to 9,000 in June 1924, rose to 13,500 in Jan. 1925, dropped to 8,000 in May, June, and July 1925, and rose to 12,000 in Nov. and Dec. 1925 (see ibid. *1925*, p. 11). No such figures seem to have been published for more recent years.

[3] For the spread of syphilis see in particular ibid. *1930*, pp. 132–7.

[4] Ibid., p. 18. The influenza epidemic of 1918 seems to have claimed a particularly large number of victims in Somaliland. See ibid. *1918*, p. 2: 'At least fifty per cent. of the Somali population suffered, and five per cent. died; the probability is that this estimate is low.'

[5] *Colonial Reports, Somaliland 1905–6*, p. 17. [6] Ibid. *1906–7*, p. 20. [7] Ibid. *1907–8*, p. 24.

[8] Ibid. *1908–9*, p. 20. [9] Ibid. *1909–10*, p. 19. [10] Ibid. *1910–11*, p. 17.

[11] Ibid. *1911–12*, p. 16. Literally the same ibid. *1912–13*, p. 14.

The country, owing to its arid nature, is capable of supporting only a sparse nomadic population.

None of the more recent reports discusses population growth but since the same number has been given for many years the administration is apparently of the opinion that the native population has not changed essentially.

2. *European Population*

Mortality of European officials has apparently been low in recent years.

CHAPTER XIV

ZANZIBAR

I. Census-taking

Three counts and one census have been effected in the Protectorate.[1] The count of 1910 covered the whole population. It was made in Zanzibar in April and in Pemba in August, without any legal enactment. The census of 30 April 1921 comprised only Non-Natives, i.e. excluded 'any person who by birth or adoption belongs to any aboriginal races or tribes of Africa or is an Arab, a Somali, Swahili, Comorian or Malagasy'. It was authorized by 'The Census Decree, 1921'.[2] The count of 1924, which 'was begun on March 11, and ended on May 23', comprised only Natives. 'It was not thought necessary to promulgate any legislation on this occasion.'[3] The count of 1931 covered again the whole population. 'A Decree to Make Provision for Taking the Census of the Zanzibar Protectorate as and when Required'[4] had been enacted on 18 March 1931. Three days later, the British Resident made an 'Order for Taking of Census'[5] in which he directed 'that a census be taken of the inhabitants of the Protectorate during the month of March, 1931', and that 'the time of taking the final enumeration shall be the night of the 28th–29th March, 1931'.

The report on the 1924 count states:

> The method of taking this census differed from that followed in 1910 and 1921, in that the work was undertaken by fifty trained native clerks to whom certain districts were allotted. These clerks were provided with census books in which they entered the particulars required regarding each house or hut. As soon as the occupants of a house had been counted a numbered metal disc was affixed on the door or some other conspicuous portion of the house.
>
> Constant inspections were made by the district officers and other members of the staff while the clerks were at work and all possible precautions were taken to avoid duplications and omissions.[6]

In 1931 particulars were not required regarding each house or hut, and the form used proved to be unsuitable.

[1] Prior to 1910 population figures were obtained through estimates.

[2] No. 3 of 1921 (21 Mar.), reprinted in Zanzibar, *Decrees, Regulations and Notices 1921*, pp. 41–2, and in *Report on the Non-Native Census 1921*, pp. 1–2. At the Second Reading of the 1931 Census Bill in the Legislative Council the Attorney-General said (6 Mar. 1931): 'The last non-native census was taken in 1921 and the last native census in 1924 without legislative authority in both cases' (*Debates of the Legislative Council 1930–1931*, p. 45). He was mistaken as to the 1921 census.

[3] *Report on the Native Census 1924*, p. 4.

[4] No. 7 of 1931, reprinted in *Zanzibar Legislation 1931*, Part I, pp. 11–13 (see also pp. 96–7 above). The Decree was amended by 'A Decree to Assign to his Highness the Sultan in Executive Council the Power to Make Rules heretofore Conferred upon the British Resident' (No. 23 of 1931, 24 Dec., reprinted ibid., pp. 64–5), and by the 'Currency Decree, 1935' (No. 21 of 1935, 16 Dec., reprinted in ibid. *1935*, Part I, pp. 101–12, and in *1935–1938 Supplement to Laws of Zanzibar*, pp. 157–67), which substituted as maximum fines 'seventy-five shillings' for 'fifty rupees'. The Census Decree as it stood after the enactment of Decree No. 23 of 1931 is reprinted in *Laws of the Zanzibar Protectorate in Force 1934*, vol. ii, pp. 646–7 (cap. 30).

[5] Government Notice No. 53 of 1931, reprinted in *Zanzibar Legislation 1931*, Part II, p. 14.

[6] *Census Report 1924*, p. 4. *Medical Report 1930*, p. 19, says that 'some doubt has been cast on the accuracy of the 1924 census figures'.

The Schedule adopted for enumeration purposes was a modified form of the Uganda Native Census Schedule. Experience of this Schedule in the present Zanzibar Census has shown that it is not suitable for use in the Protectorate. There appears to be no reason why the same form of schedule as that used for the Census of Great Britain should not be adopted in future. This form would provide for the enumeration of full details concerning each individual of the population instead of the group details given by the Uganda Native Schedule.[1]

According to the Approved Estimate for 1931 the amount provided for the count was Rs. 20,000.[2] If this was the actual cost it amounted to £6. 7*s*. 5*d*. per 1,000 enumerated persons.

II. Total Population

The population ascertained at the enumerations of 1921, 1924, and 1931 was as follows:[3]

Province	*1921* *Non-Natives*	*1924* *Natives*	*1931*		
			Natives	*Non-Natives*	*Total*
Zanzibar	..	115,016	124,593	13,148	137,741
Pemba	..	87,649	95,274	2,413	97,687
Total	14,132	202,665	219,867	15,561	235,428

The area of the Island of Zanzibar is 640 square miles, and there were in 1931 215 inhabitants to the square mile. The area of the Island of Pemba is 380 square miles, and there were 257 inhabitants to the square mile. Since the 'census' of 1931 attempts have been made to calculate the population for the end of each year but these computations have been effected in a quite chaotic manner.

The population on 31 December 1931 has been calculated by adding to the 'census' population the excess of births over deaths and the excess of arrivals over departures since the date of the 'census'.[4]

The population on 31 December 1932 has been calculated by adding to the 'census' population the excess of births over deaths during 1932![5]

The population on 31 December 1933 has been calculated by adding to the 'census' population the excess of births over deaths and the excess of arrivals over departures during 1933![6]

The population on 31 December 1934 is reported to have been 'obtained from the 1931 census figure by the addition of the number of births in excess of deaths and immigrants in excess of emigrants since the date of the census'.[7] But if it had really been calculated in this manner it would have been 241,752 instead of 244,104. How the result was actually obtained it is impossible to tell.

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 1. *Medical Report 1936*, p. 7, says: 'The accuracy of the 1931 census figures is not above suspicion.'

[2] See *Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure 1932*, p. 56. See also the statement of the British Resident in the Legislative Council, 4 Dec. 1931, *Debates 1931–1932*, p. 5.

[3] Computed from *Census Report 1921*, p. 4; *1931*, pp. 3, 8. Natives comprise Africans and Arabs. The population enumerated in 1910 was 197,199 (Zanzibar 114,069, Pemba 83,130), of whom 8,987 were Non-Africans; see ibid. *1910*, Inclosure 1, and ibid. *1921*, p. 3.

[4] See *Medical Report 1931*, p. 57.

[5] See ibid. *1932*, pp. 10, 57.

[6] See ibid. *1933*, p. 63.

[7] Ibid. *1934*, p. 10.

The population on 31 December 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 is reported to have been obtained by adding to the population computed for 31 December 1934 the excess of births over deaths and the excess of immigrants over emigrants since that date, but various errors were made in carrying out the calculation.

An arithmetically correct computation of the population obtained by adding to the 1931 'census' population the excess of registered births over registered deaths and the excess of recorded arrivals over recorded departures yields the following results:[1]

Year	*Excess of births over deaths*	*Excess of arrivals over departures*	*Population at end of year*	*Year*	*Excess of births over deaths*	*Excess of arrivals over departures*	*Population at end of year*
1931	−370[1]	902[1]	235,960	1938	−1,599	181	239,522
1932	−121	4,380	240,219	1939	1,188	1,860	242,570
1933	901	1,166	242,286	1940	1,075	−2,137	241,508
1934	179	−713	241,752	1941	668	−1,072	241,104
1935	−407	−720	240,625	1942	346	−3,917	237,533
1936	−131	−268	240,226	1943	830	−1,507	236,856
1937	13	701	240,940	1944	740	1,326	238,922

[1] 29 Mar. to 31 Dec.

These results, however, may be wide of the mark since registration of births and deaths is defective and since the records of arrivals and departures are probably also incomplete.

The total population of Zanzibar Town amounted in 1910 to 35,262 (15,522 men, 14,344 women, 5,396 children).[2] The native population in 1924 was 26,499 (12,696 men, 10,777 women, 1,542 boys, 1,484 girls).[3] The total population in 1931 was 45,276.[4] For 1938 it was put at 47,000.[5] In the Report on the Provincial Administration for 1941 it was estimated at 50,000.

The town of Zanzibar is divided into two parts—the Stone town with a population of some 20,000, and the Native town (called 'Ngambo') containing about 30,000 people.[6]

[1] I have taken the births, deaths, arrivals, and departures for 1931 from *Medical Report 1931*, p. 57, for 1932–44 from *Blue Book 1932*, p. 78; *1933*, p. 84; *1934*, p. 84; *1935*, p. 86; *1936*, p. 84; *1937*, p. 86; *1938*, p. 86; *1939*, p. 88; *1940*, p. 88; *1941*, p. 88; *1942*, p. 16; *1943*, p. 15; *1944*, p. 15. The figures for arrivals and departures vary somewhat in the various sources. The number of arrivals is given for 29 Mar. to 31 Dec. 1931 in *Medical Report 1931* as 14,974, in *Colonial Report 1931* (p. 7) as 15,228. The number of departures is given for 29 Mar. to 31 Dec. 1931 in *Police Report 1931* (p. 24) as 10,097, in *Medical Report 1931* as 14,072, in *Colonial Report 1931* as 13,521; for 1937 in *Police Report 1937* (p. 19) and *Blue Book 1937* as 14,830, in *Medical Report 1937* (p. 9) as 14,530; for 1938 in *Police Report 1938* (p. 26) and *Blue Book 1938* as 16,895, in *Medical Report 1938* (p. 8) as 17,114. The population figures vary still more. *Medical Report 1931*, p. 57, gives for 31 Dec. 1931 235,960 while *Statistical Abstract for the British Empire 1925–31* (p. 3) gives 245,842; *Medical Report 1935* (p. 16) gives for 31 Dec. 1935 242,977 while *Blue Book 1935* (p. 86) gives 234,261; *Blue Book 1939* (p. 88) gives for 31 Dec. 1939 244,765 while *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940* (p. 536) gives 249,954.

[2] See *Census Report 1910*, Inclosure 1.

[3] See ibid. *1924*, p. 6.

[4] See *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1938*, p. 6. In 1931, 12,057 or 77 per cent. of all Non-natives were enumerated in Zanzibar Town.

[5] See *Medical Report 1938*, p. 11.

[6] *Report 1941*, p. 5.

But the Report for 1942 said:

In the Town is to be found a mixed population of some 60,000 people, approximately 40,000 of whom live in the Native Town of N'gaambo and the remainder in the Stone Town to the West of the Salt Water Creek which divides the two areas.[1]

The Report gives the following explanation for the higher estimate:

With the falling off of shipping and consequently of employment in the Town, it was realised that this population would be a source of considerable embarrassment to the Government unless it could be made to support itself, partially at least, by cultivating its own food crops.

It was not an easy task to handle as these people for the most part are detribalized mainlanders and individualists owing no allegiance to any particular headman.

It was decided to approach the problem by undertaking the registration of all adult males in the Town regardless of race, and, at the time of registration, to serve compulsory cultivation orders on persons not fully employed who could reasonably be expected to maintain a garden.

The statistical result of the initial registration . . . shows a total of 19,740 adult males . . . .[2] At a conservative estimate of three to one, a total population of 60,000 is arrived at for the Town.[3]

The Report on the Department of Agriculture for 1944 speaks likewise of a 'non-producing population of about 60,000 people in Zanzibar town'.[4] But there is no conclusive evidence that the population was really as large as that. The proportion of adult males is probably very high in Zanzibar Town, and it may well be that with 19,740 males 15 years and over the total population did not exceed 50,000 considerably.

III. Composition of the Population

1. *Native Population*

Race. According to the enumerations of 1924 and 1931 the African population increased only from 183,781 to 186,466, but the Arab population from 18,884 to 33,401. 'It appears from these figures that a certain proportion of Africans have returned themselves erroneously as Arabs.'[5] The total native (African and Arab) population increased from 202,665 in 1924 to 219,867 in 1931 or by 8·5 per cent.[6] For 1939 it was estimated at about 234,200.[7]

[1] Ibid. *1942*, p. 9.

[2] Of the 19,740 males 15 years and over, 11,216 were 'Africans', 3,230 Arabs, and 5,294 others; there were 13,025 between 18 and 46. See ibid., Appendix.

[3] Ibid., pp. 9–10. For further details concerning the registration of all male adults in the Town (and of the African male adults in the remainder of the Protectorate) see ibid. *1943*, p. 6; *Report on the Department of Agriculture 1942*, p. 2, *1943*, p. 2; F. B. Wilson, 'Emergency Food Production in Zanzibar', pp. 93–5.

[4] *Report 1944*, p. 2.

[5] *Census Report 1931*, p. 1. See also in this connexion *Medical Report 1934*, p. 10: 'The local Arab and the African are readily distinguishable in the extremes of the two races, but quite impossible to tell apart in other cases, and a very large number of the local inhabitants of the Protectorate who designate themselves either Arab or African are, in fact, a mixture of the two.'

[6] A small part of the increase is due to the increase in the number of sailors from 1,666 to 3,247. 'The increase indicated for the occupation "Sailors" is due to the inclusion of the crews of dhows from the Persian Gulf and South Arabia who happened to be in Zanzibar at the time of the Census' (*Census Report 1931*, p. 8).

[7] See *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 536.

Sex. The number of males increased from 103,518 in 1924 to 112,874 in 1931, and the number of females from 99,147 to 106,993.[1] The ratio of females to 100 males was 95·8 in 1924 and 94·8 in 1931.[2] The preponderance of males was probably due to immigration.

Age. According to the 1924 count there were 25,263 boys, 22,823 girls, 78,255 men, and 76,324 women.[3] The report indicates that boys and girls were children under 12.[4] The apparently large preponderance of male children may be due to the practice of counting females as adults at an age where males are counted as children.

The 1931 report gives age data only for the total population. It contains no information whatsoever regarding conjugal condition or birthplace.

2. *Non-Native Population*

Race and Nationality. The 1921 census report gave the following details:[5]

Descriptions	Children		Adults		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
British (Europeans)	10	10	135	67	222
Other Europeans	1	2	34	13	50
British Indians: Hindus	403	290	1,267	399	2,359
Mohammedans	2,242	1,872	3,584	2,531	10,229
Parsees	42	38	95	41	216
Others	3	1	34	4	42
Cingalese	—	—	57	—	57
Portuguese Indians	124	91	534	120	869
Seychelles, Chinese, Japanese, Mauritians, French Colonials, and other Asiatics	—	—	44	44	88
Total	2,825	2,303	5,784	3,202	14,132

The 1931 report reveals merely the following facts:[6]

	Male	Female	Total
Europeans	183	95	278
British Indians	9,955	5,291	14,242
Portuguese Indians			1,004
Seychelles, Mauritians, Chinese, Japanese, and others	..	..	37

It appears that from 1921 to 1931 the number of Europeans increased only from 272 to 278 while the number of Indians increased from 13,772 to 15,246, and all others decreased from 88 to 37. For 1939 the number

[1] See *Census Report 1924*, p. 5; *1931*, p. 3. The figures given in the 1931 report include 37 'other Asiatics'; I have assumed that of these 19 were males and 18 females.

[2] The change in the ratio was due to the presence of an unusually large number of sailors on the census night 1931. (For 1939 the males were estimated at 122,100 and the females at 112,100; see *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 536. If this estimate is correct, which seems very doubtful, the ratio of females to 100 males would have dropped to 91·8.)

[3] See *Census Report 1924*, p. 5.

[4] See ibid., pp. 8, 11.

[5] See ibid. *1921*, p. 4. Totals sometimes do not tally with items.

[6] See ibid. *1931*, pp. 1, 3.

of Europeans is given as 254 while the number of Indians is estimated at 15,500.[1]

Sex. The number of males increased from 8,609 in 1921 to 10,157 in 1931 while the number of females decreased from 5,523 to 5,404.[2] The large increase of males was due to the immigration of Indians. The ratio of females to 100 males was 64 in 1924 and 53 in 1931.

Table 1 shows the numbers of European officials by sex and age on 1 January 1930 to 1 January 1941.

TABLE 1. *European Officials by Sex and Age, Zanzibar, 1930–41*[1]

Date 1 Jan.	20–24 years		25–29 years		30–34 years		35–39 years		40–44 years		45–49 years		50–54 years		55– years		Age unknown		Total	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
1930	2	—	11	1	21	1	22	1	19	2	11	2	11	1	3	—	1	1	101	9
1931	2	—	12	4	20	1	17	—	28	2	9	1	11	1	3	—	1	—	103	9
1932	2	—	10	3	18	1	19	2	28	2	11	1	13	—	3	1	1	—	105	10
1933	1	—	11	1	14	3	20	2	30	1	11	2	9	—	6	—	—	—	102	9
1934	—	—	9	1	14	3	18	2	25	1	17	2	8	—	4	—	—	—	95	9
1935	—	—	8	1	13	5	20	2	22	—	18	2	4	—	6	—	—	—	91	10
1936	1	—	4	1	16	4	15	4	17	—	20	1	7	1	7	—	—	—	87	11
1937	1	1	4	2	14	3	15	4	16	1	25	1	7	1	8	—	2	—	92	13
1938	1	1	5	3	10	2	12	4	14	1	30	—	7	2	7	—	2	—	88	13
1939	2	—	7	2	8	5	20	2	13	2	23	1	13	3	8	—	2	—	96	15
1940	2	—	4	3	7	3	16	3	14	1	22	—	7	1	1	—	2	3	75	14
1941	1	—	7	2	8	6	12	1	14	3	18	—	6	1	4	—	2	2	72	15

[1] See *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials 1930*, p. 1, to *1941*, p. 1.

3. *Total Population*

Sex and Age. The 1931 report gives the following details:[3]

Males			Females			Total		
0–1	1–15	15 and over	0–1	1–15	15 and over	0–1	1–15	15 and over
3,246	32,108	87,677	3,351	28,224	80,822	6,597	60,332	168,499

There were only 91·4 females per 100 males.[4] If the figures concerning age are accurate the children under 15 would constitute only 28·4 per cent. of the total population.

Recent Blue Books estimate that of a total population of 250,000 92,495 are male adults, 85,708 female adults, and 71,797 children.[5]

[1] See *Dominions Office and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 536. For recent years the numbers of male and of female Europeans have been put at 134 and 112 respectively; see *Blue Book 1940*, p. 88, *1941*, p. 88, *1942*, p. 16, *1943*, p. 15, *1944*, p. 15.

[2] I have assumed again that of the 37 'other Asiatics' 19 were males and 18 females.

[3] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 8.

[4] The number of adult males had increased since 1910 from 71,876 to 87,677 while the number of adult females had decreased from 81,149 to 80,822. The figures of the two counts, to be sure, are not strictly comparable because the lower age limit seems to have been 12 years in 1910 while it was 15 in 1931. But there cannot be any doubt that there was a large excess of women in 1910, while there was a notable excess of men in 1931. The change was brought about by a considerable immigration of both natives and non-natives.

[5] See *Blue Book 1940*, p. 88; *1941*, p. 88; *1942*, p. 16; *1943*, p. 15; *1944*, p. 15. Figures exclude European children.

IV. Birth and Death Registration

On 16 July 1894 Her Majesty's Consul-General made regulations for the registration of the deaths of British subjects and Protected persons in Zanzibar. These regulations were made applicable only to that district of Zanzibar which is situate within 4 miles of the Consulate, but the Consul-General was empowered by public notice to extend their operation to any district of the Protectorate of Zanzibar, and to appoint any person on his behalf to receive the prescribed particulars. Six years later, on 18 July 1900, he issued such a Notice[1] by which he extended the Regulations to all the districts of Zanzibar and Pemba.

The particulars specified in the Schedule to the Regulations of July 16th 1894 shall be furnished to the following officer (or to any person for the time being acting for them) any one of whom is hereby empowered to receive them namely:—in the island of Zanzibar either (*a*) to any Consular Officer attached to Her Majesty's Agency and Consulate General at Zanzibar (*b*) to His Highness the Sultan's Commissioner for the island of Zanzibar (*c*) to the Wali of the district in which the death occurred and in the island of Pemba (*a*) to Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Chaki-Chaki (*b*) to His Highness's Commissioner for the island of Pemba (*c*) to the Wali of the district in which the death occurred.

On 3 February 1904, the Regent and First Minister issued the following Notice[2] which made compulsory the registration of both births and deaths among the subjects of the Sultan of Zanzibar.

Notice is hereby given that on and after the above date a Registration must be made of all Births and Deaths occurring among the subjects of H.H. the Sultan of Zanzibar who reside in the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba.

For the purposes of this Registration the following Regulations are issued:—

In the Town of Zanzibar and its suburbs, the notification of Births and Deaths shall be made to the Registrar of the Zanzibar Government, at his office, between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m.

In the Country Districts, notice of Births and Deaths shall be given to the Local Sheha, and he shall report the same to the Wali of the District and the Wali shall enter the same in books kept for that purpose.

The persons responsible for these Registrations are:—

In the case of Births

1. One or other of the parents.
2. The occupier of the house where the Birth took place.
3. The person having charge of the child.

This registration must be made within 5 days of the Birth. If the information is not given to the proper Authorities within 5 days of the Birth any one of the above mentioned persons may be called upon to register the Birth in which case a charge of one rupee will be made and the same person will be liable to a penalty of 15 rupees if convicted of neglect of the above Regulations.

In the case of Deaths

The persons responsible for the Registration of Deaths are:—

1. Relatives present at Death or at Burial.
2. The person causing the body to be buried.
3. The occupier of the house where the Death took place.

[1] Notice No. 37, Queen's Regulations, *Zanzibar Legislation 1891–1911*, p. 41.
[2] Notice No. 52, Zanzibar Government Regulations, ibid., p. 56.

Information of a Death shall be given within 24 hours of the event, by one of the above mentioned persons, in which case Registration is made free. If the required information is not given within 24 hours of the event, one or other of the above mentioned persons may be called upon to supply it, in which case a charge of one rupee will be made for the Registration and the same person will be liable to a penalty of 15 rupees if convicted of neglect of the above Regulations.

In the case of Births the parents are primarily responsible for giving the necessary information, and for the Registration of Deaths, the nearest relative who is known to have been present at the Death or Burial or to have had knowledge of the same.

'The Consolidation of Laws Decree' of 28 February 1909[1] contained a Chapter 'Registration of Deaths' which implicitly replaced the Regulations for persons subject to British jurisdiction of 1894 and 1900, and also the Regulations for persons subject to Zanzibar jurisdiction of 1904 in so far as the latter concerned death registration.[2] The new provisions read as follows:

68. Information of the several particulars required in the Schedule hereto concerning the death of every person dying in our dominions shall be given by one of the following persons:—

(*a*) The nearest male relative over the age of 18 years of the deceased resident in Zanzibar or Pemba;

(*b*) Some person present during the last illness of the deceased; or

(*c*) The person or persons conducting the burial or funeral rites of the deceased;

to the person appointed under section 70 to receive such information.

69. The information of death and the particulars required in the said Schedule shall be given to the person appointed under section 70 to receive such notice and the particulars, before the burial of the deceased.

70. The persons appointed to receive the notice and particulars set out in the said Schedule are the following:—

In the town of Zanzibar, the Medical Officer of Health.

In the town of Chake Chake, the Assistant District Commissioner.

In the town of Weti, the Assistant District Commissioner.

In the country districts, the local Sheha, who shall report it to the Assistant District Commissioner of the district, who shall enter the same in a book kept for that purpose.

71. Any person who shall neglect or refuse to give any information which it is his duty to give under the provisions of this part shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding 150 shillings,[3] or to imprisonment of either description not exceeding one month, or to both.

72. No fees shall be paid on the registration of a death.

Schedule. Date of death; Abode of deceased; Duration of residence in district (or 'town') where death occurred; Name; Sex; Race or caste; Age; Occupation or trade of deceased, or his or her family; Place of birth; Cause of death; Duration of disease.

[1] No. 7 of 1909, ibid., reprinted in *Index, &c., and Text of Enactments in Force 1911*, pp. 131–48, and in *Laws of Zanzibar in Force 1922*, vol. i, pp. 73–91 (cap. 12).

[2] It probably replaced also a Decree and Regulations of 4 and 5 Sept. 1905 concerning which the Consul-General at Zanzibar wrote in 1908: 'In 1905 . . ., during the outbreak of bubonic plague, it was decreed that no dead body should be disposed of without the written authority of a qualified medical officer; . . . this enactment . . . is applied to British subjects and is still in force . . .' (*Report on the Administration of the Zanzibar Protectorate* dated 26 Oct. 1908, p. 13). The Consul-General apparently referred here to 'Decree by the Sultan authorising the First Minister to issue Plague Regulations', 'Regulations under the Plague Decree of September 4, 1905', and 'King's Regulations enforcing the Regulations under the Plague Decree of September 4, 1905', which were all repealed by 'The Repeal of Obsolete Enactments Decree, 1911' (No. 7 of 1911, 7 May, reprinted in *Index, &c., and Text of Enactments in Force 1911*, pp. 198–203).

[3] As amended by Currency Decree, 1935.

'The Registration of Births Decree' of 9 July 1909[1] formally repealed the Regulations of 1894, 1900, and 1904,[2] and made new provisions for the registration of births. It was amended in 1939.[3] Its main provisions as they stand to-day are as follows:

2. The birth of every child born alive, and the birth of every child born at full term, but still-born, in our dominions shall be registered at the offices of the officers appointed under section 8 of this Decree, within seven days of its birth.

3. It shall be the duty of the father and the mother, or persons having charge of the child, and in default of these persons, of the occupier of the house in which to his or her knowledge such child is born, to register the birth within the period prescribed by section 2.

4. Every person registering the birth of a child shall, to the best of his or her knowledge and ability, give particulars as to sex, date and place of birth, the names, residence, occupation, and nationality of the parents, and such other particulars as may by rules be prescribed.

5. No person shall be bound as father to register the birth of an illegitimate child, and no person shall be entered in the register as the father of such child except at his own request and upon his acknowledging himself to be the father of the child, and signing or affixing his mark to the register as such.

6. Any person who shall neglect or refuse to register or to give particulars required by this Decree, or any person who wilfully gives any false information or particulars for the purpose of registration, or any person failing to carry out the provisions of this Decree, shall be guilty of an offence against this Decree, and shall be liable to a fine not exceeding 150 shillings,[4] or to a month's imprisonment, or to both.

8. The officers appointed under this Decree to register births are—

In the town of Zanzibar, the Medical Officer of Health;

In the town of Chake Chake, the Assistant District Commissioner;

In the town of Weti, the Assistant District Commissioner;

In country districts, the Wali or local Sheha, who shall report it to the District Commissioner or Assistant District Commissioner of the district, who shall enter it in the register;

or such other officers as the British Resident shall appoint.

9. The officers appointed under section 8 of this Decree, to register births shall every quarter forward a return of the births in their respective districts to the Medical Officer of Health.

10. The British Resident shall have power from time to time to make rules for the carrying out of this Decree, and any offence against such rules and regulations shall be deemed to be an offence against this Decree.

Neither of the two decrees of 1909 provided a penalty for forgery or false statements, but 'The Penal Decree' of 31 December 1934[5] contained the following sections:

347. Any person who, having the actual custody of any register or record kept by lawful authority, knowingly permits any entry which in any material particular

[1] No. 13 of 1909, 'A Decree to Make Provision for the Registration of Births', *Zanzibar Legislation 1891–1911*, reprinted in *Index, &c., and Text of Enactments in Force 1911*, p. 155, and in *Laws of Zanzibar in Force 1922*, vol. i, pp. 94–5 (cap. 14).

[2] The Decree said: 'Registration of Deaths and Births Regulations by H.B.M. Consul General July 16, 1894, and Regulations extending the above Regulations signed by H.B.M. Consul General July 18, 1900, and the Regulations signed by Our Regent and First Minister February 4, 1904, are hereby repealed.' But the Regulations of 1894 and 1900 actually dealt only with registration of deaths.

[3] No. 1 of 1939 (16 June), 'Registration of Births (Rectification) (Amendment) Decree, 1939', Legal Supplement (Part I) to *Official Gazette of the Zanzibar Government*, 17 June 1939.

[4] As amended by Currency Decree, 1935.

[5] Reprinted in *Laws of the Zanzibar Protectorate in Force 1934*, vol. i, pp. 229–352 (cap. 9).

is to his knowledge false, to be made in the register or record, is guilty of a felony, and is liable to imprisonment for seven years.

349. Any person who knowingly and with intent to procure the same to be inserted in a register of births, deaths, or marriages, makes any false statement touching any matter required by law to be registered in any such register, is guilty of a felony, and is liable to imprisonment for three years.

'The Public Health Decree, 1929'[1] provided that 'no burial of any person who has died in any town shall take place until a permit has been obtained from the health officer'. The penalty for contravention is a fine not exceeding four hundred and fifty shillings or imprisonment for three months.

It will be noted that birth and death registration in the Protectorate is effected in a less formal manner than in most other British Dependencies. According to the decrees of 1909 the organization was as follows:

(1) In the towns births and deaths shall be notified by the relatives to the district registrar (in the town of Zanzibar, the Medical Officer; in the towns of Chake Chake and Weti, the Assistant District Commissioner).

(2) In country districts births and deaths have to be notified by the relatives to the local Sheha[2] who shall report them to the district registrar (Assistant District Commissioner or District Commissioner).

(3) The Medical Officer of Health has the functions of Registrar-General, to whom the district registrars shall forward every quarter a return of the births registered by them.[3]

Since the reorganization of the District Administration in 1934 the Assistant District Commissioners (and District Commissioners) no longer function as district registrars. The two islands (Districts) were divided into Mudirias, seven in the case of Zanzibar (excluding the Town), and nine in the case of Pemba. The 16 Mudirias were further subdivided into 138 Shehias,[4] 'consisting of a number of scattered villages, or in many cases, merely of scattered groups of houses'.[5] In control of these units are officials designated Mudirs (Arabs) and Shehas (Africans) respectively. Births and deaths have to be notified by the relatives to the Sheha who reports them to the Mudir. The Mudir registers the births and deaths; he is now the district registrar.[6]

Since Zanzibar is the only British Dependency in Africa preponderantly inhabited by natives where compulsory birth and death registration for

[1] No. 3 of 1929 (15 Mar. 1929), 'A Decree to Consolidate the Law relating to Public Health', reprinted in *Zanzibar Legislation 1929*, Part I, pp. 59–105, and in *Laws of the Zanzibar Protectorate in Force 1934*, vol. ii, pp. 862–905 (cap. 60).

[2] It would be interesting to know how these births and deaths are recorded by the Masheha. The Pim Commission relates (*Report Zanzibar*, 1932, p. 23) that many Masheha 'are illiterate, including some of the most capable among them'. *Report on the Provincial Administration 1941*, p. 1, states that 'out of 54 Masheha in Pemba, 18 are entirely illiterate'. But the number of births and deaths to be recorded by one Sheha is, of course, very small.

[3] The Decree concerning death registration does not explicitly provide for such returns.

[4] See 'Directions for the Division of the Zanzibar Protectorate', reprinted in *Laws of Zanzibar Protectorate in Force 1934*, vol. iv, pp. 479–81. According to *Report on the Provincial Administration 1941*, p. 1, Zanzibar has six Mudirias, including Zanzibar Town, and Pemba five Mudirias.

[5] Ibid. *1938*, p. 1.

[6] In Zanzibar Town registration is done in the Health Office (see *Report on the District of Zanzibar 1935*, p. 10).

TABLE 2. *Registered Births and Deaths, Zanzibar Island, 1907–33*[1]

Year	Zanzibar Town								Country Districts				Island	
	Live-born[2]				Deaths				Live-born[2]		Deaths			
	Swahilis[3]	Others	Total	Still-born	Swahilis[3]	Others	Total	Deaths under 1 year	Northern District[4]	Southern District[5]	Northern District[4]	Southern District[5]	Live-born[2]	Deaths
1907	..	..	..	..	709	495	1,204	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1908	..	..	..	..	719	530	1,249	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1909[6]	16	232	248	2	592	562	1,154	99	341	546	765	1,010	1,135	2,929
1910	24	354	378	..	..	..	1,363	..	529	660	1,029	1,142	1,567	3,534
1911	207	373	580	..	..	..	1,373	..	640	594	1,258	1,199	1,814	3,830
1912	151	367	518	22	796	488	1,284	101	580	437	1,118	1,853	1,535	4,255
1913	91	485	576	39	558[7]	464[7]	1,128	81	634	540	889	1,094	1,750	3,111
1914	24	377	401	42	589[7]	650[7]	1,317	123	511	435	801	1,020	1,347	3,138
1915	28	304	332	29	519	489	1,008	82	1,023	884	1,005	1,207	2,239	3,220
1916	19	277	296	20	598	570	1,168	93	1,099	959	881	1,208	2,354	3,257
1917	..	..	305	..	..	..	1,255	104	1,559	822	947	1,288	2,686	3,490
1918	27	391	418	31	716	643	1,359	..	930	863	1,109	1,406	2,211	3,874
1919	22	319	341	23	608	572	1,180	..	720	715	859	1,120	1,776	3,159
1920	41	432	473	37	553	530	1,083	..	1,573	913	800	1,158	2,959	3,041
1921	18	461	479	26	549	527	1,076	..	986	1,126	893	1,292	2,591	3,261
1922	23	458	481	47	677	585	1,262	101	1,090	1,087	888	1,307	2,658	3,457
1923	30	383	413	48	715	543	1,258	..	785	837	1,009	1,187	2,035	3,454
1924	32	469	501	50	518	525	1,043	..	1,064	1,069	749	1,040	2,634	2,832
1925	26	398	424	42	725	654	1,379	..	1,073	849	854	1,146	2,346	3,379
1926	89	348	437	58	1,276	284	1,560	..	846	915	799	1,473	2,198	3,832
1927	62	409	471	56	755	342	1,097	..	1,102	1,033	658	1,170	2,606	2,925
1928	97	427	526	56	700	393	1,093	..	916	1,088	788	1,240	2,530	3,121
1929	138	453	591	12	619	301	920	..	900	975	707	1,083	2,526	2,710
1930	144	459	603	54	778	339	1,117	..	820	742	680	1,191	2,165	2,968
1931	137	473	610	38	828	351	1,179	..	1,656	993	844	1,369	3,259	3,392
1932	160	472	632	32	793	314	1,107	..	910	802	947	1,318	2,344	3,372
1933	130	522	652	43	618	348	966	..	1,105	849	571	1,042	2,606	2,579

[1] See *Health Report 1909*, pp. 1–5; *1912*, pp. 3–5; *Medical Report 1913*, pp. 8–9, 28, 32; *Health Report 1914*, pp. 7–8, 10–12; *1915*, pp. 20, 24; *1916*, pp. 2–3, 5; *1917*, pp. 36–7; *Medical Report 1918*, pp. 34–6; *1919*, pp. 31–2; *1920*, pp. 31–3; *1921*, pp. 38–40; *1922*, pp. 48–9, 53; *1923*, p. 47; *1924*, pp. 52–3, 57; *1925*, p. 38; *1926*, pp. 62–3; *1927*, p. 91; *1928*, pp. 17, 91; *1929*, p. 65; *1930*, p. 68; *1931*, p. 59; *1932*, pp. 58–9; *1933*, pp. 63–5.

[2] Figures for 1909–12 apparently include still-born.
[3] 1926–33 'Africans'.
[4] Formerly Mkokotoni District.
[5] Formerly Mwera and Chwaka Districts.
[6] Birth figures for Zanzibar Town cover only the period from 1 July to 31 Dec.
[7] Excluding deaths at the Leper and Poor Asylums.

the whole population has been on the statutes for several decades the success, or rather the failure, of the pertinent decrees deserves particular interest. I have summarized in Tables 2, 3, and 4 the main results of registration as published in the Medical Reports for 1909, 1912–39, and 1945, and in the annual Blue Books for 1915–44.[1]

TABLE 3. *Registered Births and Deaths, Pemba Island, 1910–33*[1]

	Births				*Deaths*			
Year	*Chake-chake*	*Wete*	*Mkoani*	*Total*	*Chake-chake*	*Wete*	*Mkoani*	*Total*
1910	267	121	214	602	411	447	219	1,077
1911	306	100	126	532	398	459	198	1,055
1912	351	895[2]	146	1,392	495	357	161	1,013
1913	544	373	291	1,208	567	435	219	1,221
1914	305	384	133	822	414	418	210	1,042
1915	407	261	187	855	568	399	236	1,203
1916	631	553	348	1,532	493	407	263	1,163
1917	678	329	445	1,452	548	385	241	1,174
1918	1,000	388	348	1,736	1,001	615	397	2,013
1919	722	612	533	1,867	619	497	310	1,426
1920	..	..	..	1,920	..	..	..	1,416
1921	640	689	342	1,671	533	554	271	1,358
1922	625	467	575	1,667	328	491	397	1,216
1923	485	350	319	1,154	366	621	302	1,289
1924	565	376	340	1,281	476	461	342	1,279
1925	860	419	749	2,028	446	441	307	1,194
1926	689	517	426	1,632	377	491	317	1,185
1927	1,047	699	406	2,152	422	530	251	1,203
1928	693	628	385	1,706	437	454	290	1,181
1929	648	459	571	1,678	420	462	301	1,183
1930	690	381	405	1,476	444	399	320	1,163
1931	592	474	340	1,406	418	526	288	1,232
1932	942	575	648	2,165	383	481	394	1,258
1933	708	651	611	1,970	365	399	332	1,096

[1] See *Health Report 1912*, p. 28; *Medical Report 1913*, p. 61; *Health Report 1914*, p. 27; *Medical Report 1923*, p. 46; *1924*, p. 53; *1933*, p. 64; *Blue Book 1915*, Section N, p. 2, to *1919*, Section N, p. 2; *1920*, Section 15, p. 1.

[2] 'Registration suddenly enforced.'

For many years death registration was thought to be fairly complete, but birth registration has always been considered inadequate.[2] In his

[1] The available information is very defective for many years, and particularly since 1933. Moreover, some figures have been published in a haphazard fashion. Thus the 1913–17 birth figures which in the Reports up to 1917 are given for the Mwera District are given from 1918 on for the Chwaka District and vice versa! I, therefore, show the results only for both Districts combined. Finally, the figures for Zanzibar Island in the Blue Books differ for some years from those in the Medical Reports. The totals shown in Tables 2 and 4, therefore, differ somewhat.

The publication of separate birth and death figures for Zanzibar Town was stopped in 1934. But in a Reply to a Question in the Legislative Council (*Debates*, 15 Nov. 1943, p. 63) it was stated that the deaths registered in 1939–42 numbered 1,005, 858, 818, and 943 respectively (as compared with 1,648, 1,591, 1,484, and 1,326 in the rural districts of Zanzibar Island).

[2] I am dealing here only with the period starting in 1909. Regarding the earlier enactments the Consul-General at Zanzibar, Mr. Basil S. Cave, in his 1908 'Report on the administration, finances, and general condition of Zanzibar, and on the reforms which have been introduced into the government of the country since it was placed under the protection of His Majesty's Government in the year 1890', said that the Regulation of 1894/1900 'has never been properly enforced,

TABLE 4. *Registered Births and Deaths, Zanzibar Protectorate, 1919–45*[1]

Year	*Live-born*			*Deaths*		
	Zanzibar	*Pemba*	*Total*	*Zanzibar*	*Pemba*	*Total*
1919	1,773	1,867	3,640	3,158	1,426	4,584
1920	3,083	1,920	5,003	3,105	1,416	4,521
1921	2,580	1,671	4,251	3,260	1,358	4,618
1922	2,658	1,667	4,325	3,457	1,216	4,673
1923	2,035	1,154	3,189	3,454	1,289	4,743
1924	2,626	1,281	3,907	2,832	1,279	4,111
1925	2,346	2,028	4,374	3,379	1,194	4,573
1926	2,198	1,632	3,830	3,832	1,185	5,017
1927	2,551	2,152	4,703	2,881	1,204	4,085
1928	2,530	1,706	4,236	3,121	1,181	4,302
1929	2,526	1,678	4,204	2,710	1,183	3,893
1930	2,165	1,476	3,641	2,988	1,163	4,151
1931	3,259	1,406	4,665	3,392	1,232	4,624
1932	2,344	2,165	4,509	3,372	1,258	4,630
1933	2,606	1,970	4,576	2,579	1,096	3,675
1934	2,737	1,729	4,466	3,206	1,081	4,287
1935	2,177	1,459	3,636	3,056	987	4,043
1936	2,535	1,426	3,961	2,937	1,155	4,092
1937	2,754	1,385	4,139	2,911	1,215	4,126
1938	2,262	1,179	3,441	3,554	1,486	5,040
1939	2,693	2,402	5,095	2,654	1,253	3,907
1940	2,279	2,391	4,670	2,449	1,146	3,595
1941	2,120	1,889	4,009	2,302	1,039	3,341
1942	2,140	1,833	3,973	2,269	1,358	3,627
1943	2,494	1,761	4,255	2,324	1,101	3,425
1944	2,345	2,002	4,347	2,244	1,363	3,607
1945	2,827	2,271	5,098	2,333	1,518	3,851

[1] See *Blue Book 1919*, Section N, p. 2; *1920*, Section 15, p. 1; *1921*, Section 15, p. 1; *1922*, p. 50; *1923*, p. 49; *1924*, p. 50; *1925*, p. 54; *1926*, p. 56; *1927*, p. 56; *1928*, p. 62; *1929*, p. 66; *1930*, p. 67; *1931*, p. 68; *1932*, p. 78; *1933*, p. 84; *1934*, p. 84; *1935*, p. 86; *1936*, p. 84; *1937*, p. 86; *1938*, p. 86; *1939*, p. 88; *1940*, p. 88; *1941*, p. 88; *1942*, p. 16; *1943*, p. 15; *1944*, p. 15; *Medical Report 1945*, p. 2.

Report of the Public Health Department's Work for the year 1909 Dr. Spurrier stated:

Registration of births only came in force on the 1st July, 1909.[1]

Improvement is very slow in receiving registration of births, the Government being suspected of some ulterior motive in its endeavour to find out when a birth has occurred. Constant enquiries are made as to whether there is not danger (*hatari*) in registering a birth. Witchcraft is feared, and all the Old Testament prejudice against numbering the people is brought to bear on the matter.

In Calcutta it has been found necessary to pay money for information to midwives, barbers, known gossips, and *pariawalas*.

Here the engaging of a town crier to cry the obligation of registration only brought ridicule on his head and no increase in births recorded. It was thought not unlikely

and it has proved of little use either for statistical purposes or with respect to the collection of probate duty'; that the Decree of 1904, 'although its observance is not as general as could be desired, . . . has, through the agency of the Collectorate officers, achieved some degree of success'; and that the enactment of 1905 (see p. 657 above) 'has proved fairly effectual in securing a record of the deaths occurring in the town of Zanzibar' (*Report on the Administration of the Zanzibar Protectorate* dated 26 Oct. 1908, p. 13).

[1] *Health Report 1909*, p. 5. Actually the Registration of Births Decree was signed on 9 July and published in *Zanzibar Gazette* on 20 July (see *Index of Enactments 1863–1911*, &c., p. 43).

that the police on beat in the native quarter would get to hear of births, but such is said not to be the case. In the country villages the Masheha is likely to know, and probably always does know.

It is even more difficult to get still-births registered . . . .[1]

The Consul-General made the following comment:

It is much to be regretted that both the town and country population should be so very averse from registering the births of their children. It may be hoped, however, that in time they will cease to be so.[2]

The Medical Officer of Health, in his report for 1912, stated:

Although the registration of births is compulsory by law, yet it is by no means always carried out.[3]

In Zanzibar Town I think the percentage of non-notification is comparatively small, say under 10%.

. . . I think that the Masheha could be made to understand, that if a birth is discovered in their districts, which has not been notified, that they, as well as the parents, will be dealt with. The local Sheha should be fined and the parent can be prosecuted at law.[4]

The Medical Report for 1913 said with regard to 'the plantation districts' of Zanzibar Island (i.e. the Island excluding Zanzibar Town):[5]

The number of deaths recorded is probably accurate, since relatives of the deceased may benefit to some extent in the division of property.[6]

The figures for births are certainly inaccurate, parents gain nothing by reporting births, the dread of a poll tax or some such imposition by Government seems to exist, and native superstitions regarding the 'evil eye' are prevalent.

Subsequent reports of the Medical Department contain the following comments:

1916. It may be presumed that records of deaths are fairly accurate since relations have something to gain in the division of property . . . the records of births are inaccurate and much below their true figure . . . .[7]

A more thorough and accurate method of registration of births both in town and out-districts is promised for next year . . . .[8]

1917. . . . more care was taken over the registration of births [in the country districts of Zanzibar Island] . . . .

That the existing methods of collecting information of births in the Town [of Zanzibar] are very defective, especially among the Swahili population in 'Ngambo, is proved by the rarity with which a birth is registered which is not also a death among this class. In round figures the proportion of deaths to births among Swahilis is 30 deaths to one birth.[9]

[1] *Health Report 1909*, p. 6. 'In April, 1907, before any real attempt was made to obtain registration of births and deaths', the Medical Department had 'urged the establishment of . . . dispensaries at different points through the island' and had expressed the hope that the dispensers would 'help in the registration of births and deaths' (*Medical Report 1913*, p. 9).

[2] *Health Report 1909*, p. 6.

[3] Ibid. *1912*, p. 3. See also *Report for 1911-12 on the Trade and Commerce of Zanzibar*, p. 8.

[4] *Health Report 1912*, p. 30.

[5] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 8.

[6] It is stated ibid., p. 33, that in 1910 in the Island of Zanzibar death 'registration was probably not so universally carried out as it is now'.

[7] *Health Report 1916*, p. 3.

[8] Ibid., p. 4. Such measures were also announced in *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1915*, p. 15; *1916*, p. 12; *1917*, p. 8; *1918*, p. 9.

[9] *Health Report 1917*, p. 33. See also *Medical Report 1918*, p. 35.

1919. Until . . . more exact registration of births is enforced any vital statistics must be unreliable. It is probable that the records of deaths are more accurate.[1]

1921. The registration of births is very unreliable. By law the nearest relatives are bound to report the birth of a child. A certain proportion is so reported in the town districts to the Health Office and in the country districts to the local Sheha, who sends his return to the District Office. It is probable that many fail to report. . . . It has been found that the appointment of Birth Inspector for the township, whether native or Indian,[2] is a failure, as these men find it easier to rely upon their imagination for their returns rather than to ascertain the true number of births. The registration of deaths is probably much more accurate, as permission to bury must be obtained before the body can be disposed of . . . .[3]

1923. The registration of births and deaths is compulsory, but cannot be considered reliable.[4]

As compared with the two previous years the deaths have increased by about 100 and the births decreased by more than 1,100. It is therefore obvious that the disparity must be due to either incomplete birth returns or to a serious diminution of the birth rate.

After full enquiry the conclusion arrived at is that the apparent diminution in Pemba can be accounted for by incomplete birth returns, but for Zanzibar Island the figures are considered approximately correct.[5]

1924. The registration of Births and Deaths is compulsory, but, although there is yearly improvement in this respect,[6] cannot yet be considered very reliable.[7]

1926. . . . the birth returns cannot be accepted as reliable. The death returns can, however, be taken as approximately correct, especially so for Zanzibar Township, where they can be checked by the burial permits issued.[8]

1927. Investigations carried out during the year by the Administration definitely proved that the native population were not registering births as they should do. In future years it is hoped that a fair degree of accuracy may be arrived at, and thus important facts as regard infantile mortality brought to light.[9]

1928. . . . there is reason to believe that many births in the districts are left unrecorded.[10]

1931. . . . the death returns may be taken as approximately correct. There is reason to believe however that the registration of births in the case of Arabs and Africans living in the districts is incomplete.[11]

1932. . . . the death returns may be taken as approximately correct.[12]

1934. The registration of Births and Deaths is enforced by Decree, but there are indications that many escape registration.[13]

1935. The importance of accurate registration in a country such as Zanzibar

[1] *Medical Report 1919*, p. 31. See also ibid. *1920*, p. 31.

[2] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 22, and *Health Report 1914*, p. 4, list '1 Indian reporter of births' as member of the Statistical Department of the Clerical Division of the Health Department.

[3] *Medical Report 1921*, p. 44. See also ibid. *1922*, p. 53.

[4] Ibid. *1923*, p. 11.

[5] Ibid., p. 12. The conclusion concerning Zanzibar Island was obviously wrong. The number of births registered here in 1923 was 2,035 as against 2,658 in 1922 and 2,634 in 1924.

[6] The statistics indicate on the contrary that registration had deteriorated in 1923–4.

[7] Ibid. *1924*, p. 10.

[8] Ibid. *1926*, p. 11.

[9] Ibid. *1927*, p. 13.

[10] Ibid. *1928*, p. 16.

[11] Ibid. *1931*, p. 14. See also ibid. *1929*, p. 15; *1930*, p. 19; *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 106, 109.

[12] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 11. Literally the same ibid. *1933*, p. 14.

[13] Ibid. *1934*, p. 4; see also ibid., pp. 10–11. *Report on the Provincial Administration 1934*, p. 15, states: 'Little reliance can . . . be placed on the figures for births, as it is certain that a number are never registered. It is true that neglect to register is an offence under the relevant legislation, but it is an offence the breach of which is not easy to detect, frequent house to house inspections of certificates being impracticable. In the case of deaths, on the other hand, greater weight can be attached to the figures in view of the fact that registration is a condition precedent to the administration of the estates of deceased persons.'

can hardly be overestimated, because without it the knowledge of vital trends is so scanty that the direction in which our energies can best be applied remains unknown.[1]

At the beginning of 1935 a new quarterly vital statistics return was introduced for submission by the mudirs who act as registrars, and considerable pressure was brought to bear upon them through administrative channels throughout the year in the hope that registration would thus be rendered more reliable. This hope had not been realized but the new form does however, allow vital trends to be calculated of which nothing was previously known, although the inaccuracy of registration detracts very considerably from their value. It is possible now to give a Birth Rate, a Still Birth Rate, an Infantile Mortality Rate, a Maternal Mortality Rate, and a Death Rate for each Mudiria of the two islands, but the variation between Mudirias is so great as to render their publication unjustified. As an example, the mudirial birth rates vary from 6·7 to 31·6 and the death rates from 6·4 to 44·8 per thousand.[2]

It would . . . appear that registration is more effective in Zanzibar than in Pemba but that it is by no means satisfactory in either.

. . . It is only too obvious that death registration is ineffective, particularly in Pemba.[3]

1936. The following table of births and deaths arranged by districts shows how little reliance can be placed on any of the figures:—

	Birth Rate		*Death Rate*			*Birth Rate*		*Death Rate*	
Zanzibar District	*1935*	*1936*	*1935*	*1936*	*Pemba District*	*1935*	*1936*	*1935*	*1936*
Mkokotoni .	24·2	34·8	18·3	17·5	Wete . .	7·6	7·8	10·3	11·5
Chaani . .	13·6	20·1	21·0	16·8	Matangatwani .	10·0	12·2	6·9	7·0
Mangapwani .	13·5	18·2	11·5	20·6	Piki . . .	6·1	4·3	7·4	9·0
Magharib . .	5·5	5·7	25·0	18·3	Chake Chake .	11·9	14·7	7·7	7·3
Koani . .	10·9	12·2	18·3	15·8	Kisiwani . .	12·0	17·6	6·8	10·8
Chwaka . .	10·8	4·2	6·8	3·4	Chonge . .	15·2	9·7	4·8	9·4
Makunduchi .	7·5	33·0	50·0	16·0	Mkoani . .	19·4	21·2	15·0	13·4
Zanzibar Town .	—	3·7	3·2	15·9	Jambangome .	3·0	4·9	6·0	8·4
					Kengeja . .	9·6	8·6	10·7	11·7

It is obvious that the discrepancies in the above table cannot be accounted for except by faulty registration. The books of the Mangapwani mudiria were observed during the year with some care by the Health Office Staff so that the birth rate of 18·2 and the death rate of 20·6 for that area may be approximately correct.[4] It is remarkable how divergent the remainder of the figures are from these rates. The Pemba birth and death rates carry little conviction.[5]

[1] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 17; see also ibid. *1936*, p. 7. *Report on the District of Zanzibar 1935* says (pp. 10–11): 'In place of monthly statements Mudirs have this year submitted quarterly returns on a new form prepared by the Director of Medical Services . . . . On his advice the particular failings or peculiarities of each Mudiria are pointed out and a gradual improvement in the records is made. In particular still-births are being reported for the first time and an explanation by the D.M.S. of the value to him of accurate figures in his determination of policy for preventive measures has stimulated a real interest in work which was formerly a mere drudgery.' It is interesting to note in this connexion that according to *Standing Orders for the Medical Department 1936*, p. 12, one of the 'main objects' of the visits of the Medical Officers in the districts under their care is to 'endeavour to encourage birth and death registration in all cases'.

[3] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 19. See also *Report on District of Pemba 1935*, p. 11: 'The figures are . . . unreliable though every effort was made to ensure that births and deaths were properly reported by the Shehas.'

[4] It is difficult to see how an observation of the books could permit the drawing of any conclusions as to the completeness of registration. The birth-rate certainly seems extraordinarily low.

[5] *Medical Report 1936*, p. 7.

Whether future years will see such a degree of accurate registration that reliable figures can be obtained remains to be seen. It has been practicable elsewhere in Africa to obtain relatively accurate statistics relating to births and deaths, and the achievement of the same standard should not be impossible in the Zanzibar Protectorate.[1]

1937. For the compilation of accurate Birth and Death Rates, more accurate registration is required and this can only be possible when the villagers and their headmen realize that every death and every birth must be recorded.[2]

1938. Birth and Death Rates.—In every past report it has been pointed out that all the returns on which these rates are based are unreliable and it is questionable if it is worth recording them.[3]

1939. The [birth and death] figures are so obviously inaccurate that it is useless working out rates.[4]

1940. As the registration is incomplete, rates would be quite inaccurate.[5]

The Blue Books for 1931–3 stated that 'it is probable that many births are unregistered';[6] the Blue Books for 1934–44 said that 'it is probable that many births and deaths are unregistered'.[7]

Birth and death registration has been incomplete in both islands and has hardly improved in the course of time.

For the Protectorate as a whole the number of births registered in 1919–45 oscillated between 3,189 (1923) and 5,098 (1945) and averaged 4,228. The birth-rate oscillated between 14 in 1938 and 24 in 1920. It is most likely that even in some recent years the majority of the births were not recorded. Birth registration, on the whole, has been more effective in Zanzibar Island than in Pemba Island,[8] but has been very incomplete even in Zanzibar Island. It seems in fact to have been particularly defective among the natives in Zanzibar Town. In 1928–33 the average birth-rate of the Africans in the Town was 5[9] as compared with 25 for the rest of the population. It was 27 in the Northern and 17 in the Southern District of the Island. Registration seems to have been relatively complete in the Northern District, but how haphazardly it was effected may be inferred from the fact that the births registered in 1930–3 numbered 820, 1,656, 910, and 1,105 respectively. The birth-rates published for

[1] *Medical Report 1936*, p. 8.
[2] Ibid. *1937*, p. 10. See also ibid., p. 9.
[3] Ibid. *1938*, p. 9.
[4] Ibid. *1939*, p. 8.
[5] Ibid. *1940*, p. 3. See also ibid. *1941*, p. 3; *1942*, p. 2; *1943*, p. 2.
[6] *Blue Book 1931*, p. 68; *1932*, p. 78; *1933*, p. 84.
[7] Ibid. *1934*, p. 84; *1935*, p. 86; *1936*, p. 84; *1937*, p. 86; *1938*, p. 86; *1939*, p. 88; *1940*, p. 88; *1941*, p. 88; *1942*, p. 16; *1943*, p. 15; *1944*, p. 15.
[8] It may be mentioned in this connexion that according to the 1931 census there were in Zanzibar Island 3,144 children under 1 and in Pemba Island 3,453, while the number of births registered in Zanzibar Island in the twelve months preceding the census was apparently in the neighbourhood of 2,400 and in Pemba Island 1,400 or 1,500.
[9] The Medical Reports state repeatedly that 'the persistence of the old-established custom of women going from the town into the districts for their confinements accounts to some extent for the small number of births in the township' (see, for example, *Medical Report 1931*, p. 14), but on the other hand 'the town birth rate is increased to some extent by the admission of a certain number of women from the districts into the Maternity Home' (ibid. *1930*, p. 21). In a Dispatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 10 June 1930, the British Resident gave another explanation: 'The low birth-rate is largely due no doubt to the numbers of unmarried men or men whose wives are absent on the mainland' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 106). The main cause of the 'low birth-rate' was, of course, that only a small fraction of the African births have been registered.

1935 and 1936 for some mudirias of Zanzibar Island also inspire little confidence.

For 1935–7 still-birth rates were published for the whole Protectorate. They show that the proportion of registered still-births constituted 2·5, 4·2, and 1·7 per cent. of all registered births.[1] When in 1936 the percentage was 4·2 the Medical Report said:

> It is quite certain, however, that the reported rate is below the true rate as still births are not registered by many people.

The 1937 report stated:

> The registered still births give a rate of 1·7% . . . . From observations made at the Welfare Clinic during 1937, 29 still births occurred out of a total of 418 full term births among Indian women—a rate of 6·9% whereas out of a total of 991 native full term births 86 still births occurred giving rate of 8·7%.

Thus we are confronted with the situation that in 1937 about 70 still-births were registered in the whole Protectorate while 'from observations made at the Welfare Clinic' which covered only one-third of all births 115 'still births occurred'. The co-operation of the Welfare Clinic with the Registrar was obviously not very effective.

Death registration, to be sure, was more complete than birth registration. For the Protectorate as a whole the number of deaths registered in 1919–45 oscillated between 3,341 (1941) and 5,040 (1938) and averaged 4,190. The death-rate oscillated between 13 in 1941 and 23 in 1926. Registration was obviously much more defective in Pemba Island where the average death-rate (up to 1938) was only half as high as in Zanzibar Island, but here again the death-rates, particularly for recent years, and the infant mortality rates shatter the confidence in the completeness of death registration even in Zanzibar Island.[2]

In order to obtain some better knowledge of fertility and mortality sample investigations were started in 1934.

> Investigation into the vital trends of small populations was commenced during the year, and gave the greatest promise of producing some and the only reliable knowledge of what is happening to the people. . . . It will probably be found that in so far as the general native population are concerned, both birth and death rates are considerably higher than those recorded.[3]

The investigations in 1934, it seems, consisted in asking 69 African and Arab women in Zanzibar and 85 women in Pemba how many children they had borne and how many of these had died in the first year of life. In 1935 investigations were made on a much larger scale.

[1] See *Medical Report 1935*, p. 19; *1936*, p. 8; *1937*, p. 10.

[2] The infant mortality rates for the whole Protectorate averaged 78 in 1931–7 and 71 in 1939–45. For 1935 the rates of Africans (including Arabs) are given separately for Zanzibar Island and Pemba Island—104 and 47 respectively (see ibid. *1935*, p. 19). As birth registration is incomplete, a ratio of 104 registered infant deaths to 1,000 registered births indicates that a considerable proportion of infant deaths, probably the majority, were not recorded as such. But it is possible, of course, that some deceased infants were recorded erroneously as over 1 year of age.

[3] Ibid. *1934*, p. 4. See also ibid., p. 11: '. . . unless registration can be made effective in a short time which is very unlikely . . . a knowledge of the native populations of Zanzibar and their trends must await detailed investigations in the field of small selected communities.'

During the year vital surveys were made of selected rural populations . . . . The most extensive of these surveys were undertaken in Pemba, by Dr. W. A. Young, who with his staff interrogated 1,931[1] women representing a population of 5,318 and Mr. W. Addis, District Commissioner, Pemba, who enquired into the histories of 3,685 women. . . . Similar surveys are being undertaken in Zanzibar island on an even larger scale and as a routine duty of the rural sanitary personnel. The results are not yet far enough advanced to merit publication except in a comparatively few instances. These surveys are of undoubted value but they do not give the same information as reliable registration. It is almost impossible to arrive at even an approximate birth or death rate from them, but they do yield figures of the greatest value in assessing fertility and infantile mortality rates, although the figures obtained are not true annual rates, but average rates covering a period represented by the average length of adult life of the women interrogated.[2]

The results may be summarized as follows:[3]

	Women	*Live-births*	*Still-births*	*Deaths under one*	*Live-births per woman*	*Still-births per cent.*	*Infant mortality rate*
Pemba, Young's Survey	1,319[1]	3,188	224	605	2·4	6·6	190
Pemba, Addis's Survey	3,685	14,235	2,444	3,301	3·9	14·7	232
Zanzibar, 3 Fishing Villages	115	404	224	111	3·5	35·7	275
Total	5,119	17,827	2,892	4,017	3·5	14·0	225

[1] Of these women 260 were 'barren'; the number of abortions was 281 or 7·6 per cent. of all pregnancies.

No explanation is given for the enormous differences in the number of pregnancies or still-births ascertained at the two surveys in Pemba.

The hope to obtain birth- and death-rates, as envisaged when these special investigations were started, was not fulfilled, and a new effort made in 1936 again failed.

In the course of vital surveys an endeavour was made to ascertain actual birth and death rates amongst groups of villagers. The results obtained were inconclusive and the only prospect of obtaining returns that are approximately correct would appear to be the more careful registration of births and deaths by the authorities concerned.[4]

The only data published for 1936 show the total population of five mudirias in Zanzibar and the infant mortality rate for one area in Zanzibar. In 1937 and 1938 the investigations were confined again to the questioning of several hundreds of women.[5] The reports for 1937 and 1938 say:

1937. Over a period of 1 year, a series of women were interrogated in detail as to their pregnancies, and the following figures obtained, for Zanzibar City, in Swahilis and Indians, and at the shamba dispensaries Selem and Mkokotoni, in Swahilis only.[6]

1938. Selecting 100 families at random in the town of Zanzibar, and 100 of

[1] Should read 1,319.
[2] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 17.
[3] See ibid., pp. 19–20.
[4] Ibid. *1936*, p. 7.
[5] No investigations seem to have been made after 1938.
[6] Ibid. *1937*, p. 38.

mixed race at each of three rural dispensaries the following figures have been compiled: . . .[1]

	1937				
	Zanzibar			Dispensaries	
	City	*Swahilis*	*Indians*	*Selem Swahilis*	*Mkokotoni Swahilis*
Women questioned[1] .	100	75	100	100	100
Pregnancies . .	293	171	564	304	425
Miscarriages . .	66	26	146	65	45
Still-births . .	21	21	29	17	27
Live-births . .	206	124	389	222	353
Deaths under 4 weeks	21	7	2	14	6
Deaths under 1 year .	37	9	62	27	55
Deaths over 2 years .	32	17	41	29	80

	1938					
	Zanzibar			Dispensaries		
	Arabs	*Africans*	*Indians*	*Selem Mixed races*	*Mkokotoni Mixed races*	*Mwera Mixed races*
Women questioned[1] .	100	100	100	100	100	100
Pregnancies . .	208	193	341	263	172	241
Miscarriages . .	36	31	47	66	22	46
Still-births . .	16	19	23	14	20	19
Live-births . .	156	143	271	183	130	176
Deaths Neo Natal .	15	16	7	6	11	7
Deaths under 1 year .	14	14	13	38	27	33
Deaths over 2 years .	9	27	15	34	19	20

[1] Excluding sterile women. In 1937, 25 of 100 Swahili women questioned in Zanzibar, 36 of 136 women questioned in Selem, and 14 of 114 women questioned in Mkokotoni had never been pregnant.

The samples chosen are evidently too small to permit the drawing of any conclusions. The Indian women questioned in 1937 had had 564 pregnancies of which 146 ended in miscarriages, while the Indian women questioned in 1938 had had 341 pregnancies of which 47 ended in miscarriages; in Mkokotoni the women interrogated in 1937 had had 425 pregnancies, while those interrogated in 1938 had had 172 pregnancies. Some of the returns were, moreover, evidently wrong. It is out of the question that of the 389 children born to the Indian women questioned in 1937 only 2 should have died under 4 weeks of age. How deaths over 1 year but under 2 years were listed is anybody's guess. But even if the samples and the presentation of the results had been adequate these and all former investigations would be of little value, as no distinction is made between young women and women past child-bearing age.[2]

[1] Ibid. *1938*, p. 29.

[2] The women questioned in 1937 in Selem had had 222 live-born children, of whom 29 died over 2 years of age, while those questioned in Mkokotoni had had 353 live-born children of whom 80 died over 2 years. The difference may be entirely due to a larger proportion of young women being interrogated in Selem, and the fact that in Selem 26 per cent. of all women questioned had never been pregnant as against 12 per cent. in Mkokotoni seems to support this suspicion.

V. Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

Fertility. Long before there were any birth records to support this view there seems to have been a consensus of opinion that fertility among the Swahilis was extremely low. In his Dispatch of 26 February 1895 to the Earl of Kimberley, the Consul-General, Arthur H. Hardinge, gave as one of the reasons for the apparent enormous decrease in the slave population 'that, as your Lordship is aware, they have few children'.[1] In 1908, the Consul-General, Mr. Basil S. Cave, in his comprehensive report on the administration of Zanzibar, dealt very fully with fertility:

The Wahadimu and Wapemba are permanently settled in the agricultural districts, they are moral in their habits, and it is generally agreed that they are rather increasing than decreasing in their numbers. With the Swahilis it is different. Imported into Zanzibar as slaves or born in slavery, the birth-rate amongst them is always low, and emancipation has tended to still further reduce the number of children born to them. If they could be induced to settle down in the plantations larger families would probably follow in the natural course, but the invariable tendency of a freed slave is to migrate into the town, where native dances are numerous and immorality rampant. Amongst these people the birth-rate is extremely low, and the reasons for it are not far to seek. Firstly, there are the circumstances in which slaves are called upon to live and the absence amongst them of anything equivalent to family life, and the effect of these conditions will be seen for many years after slavery has ceased to exist. Secondly, there are the epidemics, which, in African countries, are usually attended by a heavy mortality; there was, for instance, a severe outbreak of small-pox in 1889, and the great loss of life which it occasioned is still marked by the scarcity of children of between 8 and 18 years of age; for some years consumption has been extremely prevalent amongst the natives, and a large percentage of deaths is undoubtedly due to this disease. Thirdly, and perhaps most important of all, there is immorality, and in that term I include promiscuous intercourse and the venereal diseases proceeding therefrom, prostitution of very young girls, and unnatural offences. In the fourth place, I should put the disinclination of young married women to have children arising either from the wish to avoid the trouble of raising them or from the interruption which would take place in their life of gaiety. Fifthly, there is the practice of procuring abortion, either for the reasons stated in the preceding paragraph or to escape the consequences of illicit connection, or brought about without the mother's connivance from motives of jealousy or revenge. And, lastly, certain native customs, such as the continuation of suckling for two years, the suspension of marital intercourse during that period, early marriage, and so on, all tend to reduce the birth-rate.[2]

Two years later, the 1910 census report referring to the figures of men, women, and children said:

Besides being of interest in themselves these figures enable us to arrive at an approximate estimate of the birth rate. Taking the limit of the age of the children at twelve years and making an allowance of thirty per cent. for their mortality up to that age we arrive at the following results:—

Zanzibar town	. .	19·5 per 1000.
„ Island	. .	22·5 „ „
Pemba Island	. .	32 „ „
Both Islands	. .	26·5 „ „

No statistics are available here relating to other countries from which it would be possible to draw comparisons nor have we yet sufficient data in respect of deaths to

[1] *Correspondence respecting Slavery in Zanzibar* (1895), p. 32.
[2] *Report on the Administration of Zanzibar* dated 26 Oct. 1908, pp. 5–6.

be able to say whether the population as a whole is increasing or decreasing but, if the basis from which the above calculations are made is approximately correct, these results confirm the opinions held by the medical and administrative officers as to the low birth rate in the town and also show that the Wahadimu and Wapemba are increasing at a healthy rate.

There is, of course, not the least justification for assuming that the birth-rate can be estimated approximately by dividing the number of children under 12 by $0{\cdot}7 \times 12$ and relating the result to the census population.

In his report for the year 1912 the Medical Officer of Health states:

. . . I find the childless village as well as the childless Town. If one goes into the shambas, and if one can find a collection of huts such as at Chaani or at Marseilles sufficient to justify the name of village and then asks for the children to be produced for inspection, there are not any to produce in any number. Here and there a mother can show one. During the cholera epidemic I had occasion to quarantine large collections of people, and having gained their confidence, have asked those women who have got children to put up their hands. Only a few did so. In fact Zanzibar seems to be becoming a childless Island.

Remedies.—I have none to suggest. . . .

If in this state of affairs, there is any curious psychological factor dependent on a slave race suddenly becoming free this will right itself in time, but we should have seen some sign of it by now, and I think it has not been a factor operating among freed slaves in America, the West Indies or on the West Coast of Africa. If, on the other hand, the Swahili, as a Swahili race, is a dying one, like the Australian aborigine, the Maori and the Red Indian,[1] then nothing can stop it. It would appear that the race has got to go.[2]

He attributes the low fertility in the Protectorate mainly to venereal disease in early youth and to early marriage, and, contrary to Cave, does not think that 'the native practices of procuring abortion and long continued suckling' or tuberculosis, malaria, and epidemics play a part.[3]

One year later he said:

I am by no means sure that the time will not soon arrive when it will be necessary for the Government to offer something in the shape of a 'baby bonus' for Swahilis in very much the same way as is done in Australia. Whatever happens to this country its economic future does depend on the maintenance of its indigenous labour supply.[4]

There is [in Pemba Island] an almost total lack of children among the Swahilis. The Arabs are more prolific and the Indians most of all.[5]

The Colonial Report for 1915 expressed doubts as to whether fertility was actually so low in Zanzibar Town:

In previous reports it has always been shown that a marked decline has taken place from year to year in the birth-rate among Swahilis, a decline which has been attributed to a variety of reasons.

During the latter part of 1915, however, steps were taken to insure a more accurate record of births being kept, and although sufficient time has not yet elapsed for the correct ratio of births to deaths to be disclosed, it has become apparent that when the proper enforcement of the registration of births has been made general, it will

[1] The Maori and the Red Indian have in the meantime recuperated their vitality.
[2] *Health Report 1912*, p. 30.
[3] See ibid., pp. 28–30. See also *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1913*, p. 22; *1914*, p. 24.
[4] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 29.
[5] Ibid., p. 62.

be found that, contrary to the previously accepted theories, there is actually a preponderance of births over deaths.[1]

But the Medical Department did not share this opinion. After having shown the number of Swahili and of Indian births registered in Zanzibar Town in 1911–16 it stated:

It will be noted that births amongst bazaar Indians remain fairly stationary, those of Swahilis have fallen from 207 to 19 in 5 years.

It is persistently urged that there is no cause for alarm, that the native birth rate is satisfactory, and that only the records of births are at fault. The above figures, for what they are worth, are not due to diminishing town population, do not suggest that pregnant native mothers are increasingly seeking out-districts for their confinements, and cannot solely be due to increasing inefficiency of system of birth registration.[2]

The Medical Report for 1917 again emphasized that 'with regard to the Town defective registration alone cannot account for the most unsatisfactory figures relating to births'.[3]

. . . the actual number of births is small among the Swahili population. There can be no other explanation for the extraordinary dearth of children which must immediately attract the attention of the most casual observer walking through the 'Ngambo district and which is in the most marked contrast to the conditions found in the shamba villages, such for example as Donge in the Mkokotoni district, where as in most native villages and towns, children are such a prominent feature, unless it is assumed that almost all children born here die off within a few months of their birth.

The causes of the small actual birth rate in the 'Ngambo district are probably venereal disease and promiscuous sexual intercourse and the use of abortifacients. These are factors which are more likely to prevail in the Town districts than in the shambas and there is little doubt that all are playing an active part in 'Ngambo.[4]

When the number of births decreased enormously in 1923, the Medical Department, as shown above, stated that the decrease in Pemba was due to faulty registration, while in Zanzibar Island it was genuine.

This decrease the natives themselves ascribe to a drought and scarcity of food.[5]

Though the birth-rate was only 10·9 for Zanzibar Town as compared with 18·4 for the rest of the Island, the Department then did not think that the fertility of women in the town was lower than in the country.

The smaller Birth Rate in the Town Area is thought to be due to the fact that many women leave the town for the district prior to confinement.[6]

As to fertility in the Protectorate in general the report said:

Most of the births recorded occur among the recent immigrants and the remnants of the old native population, while those occurring among the large mass of the population consisting of Swahilis and the descendants of slaves are almost negligible. The cause of this infertility among the last named has not so far been determined.

Venereal disease does not appear to be a factor of such great importance as in Central Africa. Tuberculosis, undoubtedly much more common than indicated by the hospital statistics, must tell to some extent on the birth rate, especially in the town of Zanzibar. The lowered vitality of the inhabitants, due to the prevalence of Ankylostomiasis and Malaria throughout the Protectorate is also an important factor,

[1] *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1915*, p. 15; see also ibid. *1916*, p. 12, *1917*, p. 8, *1918*, p. 9, and *A Handbook of Kenya Colony &c.* (I.D. 1216), p. 511. [2] *Health Report 1916*, p. 3.
[3] Ibid. *1917*, p. 33. [4] Ibid., p. 34. [5] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 12. [6] Ibid.

but does not account for the inequality in the number of births among the different sections of the population.

Every endeavour will be made to discover and remove the cause or causes, and the establishment of numerous district dispensaries ought to be of great assistance towards this end.[1]

When in 1927–9 the number of registered births was somewhat higher the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services said that in so far as the increase in the birth-rate was genuine it 'must be ascribed to the births which occur in greater number among the more recent immigrants than among the older inhabitants'.[2] He thought that the low birth-rate was to some extent the result of loss of vitality due to ankylostomiasis[3] and that gonorrhoea was 'a common cause of sterility'.[4]

Initiation rites of such a nature as to affect the general health or birth-rate are not practised in the Protectorate. With regard to other customs, it is said not to be unusual for some of the younger women to induce abortion, but little reliable information on the subject is obtainable, and there is no doubt that the most important factors injuriously affecting both the birth and death rates are ignorance and superstition together with the ill-health and lowered vitality due to endemic diseases and lack of sanitary arrangements and ventilation in native dwellings.[5]

In 1930 the number of births dropped again conspicuously.

The number of births registered is the lowest since 1923, and the decrease of 563 as compared with the previous year cannot to any great extent be attributed to the incomplete registration . . . .[6] It has been suggested that the recent period of poverty with resulting malnutrition may be the primary cause, but the recent excess of emigration due to the improved conditions obtaining on the mainland must also be taken into consideration. Women of mainland origin show much greater fertility than those born of old Protectorate stock, and the departure of many of these who have been residing in the Protectorate for some time, without replacement by new arrivals, cannot but adversely affect the birth rate to a considerable extent.[7]

The Medical Report for 1935 stated that 'there is a general belief that the African women of the Protectorate are reluctant to bear children, a relic no doubt of the old slave days'.[8]

Neither the birth records nor the results of the special investigations permit the drawing of any final conclusions concerning fertility. On the other hand, there is no evidence to contradict the general belief that the native women of the Protectorate have a low fertility.

Still-births. For a long time figures of still-births were available only for Zanzibar Town. They averaged 41 in 1919–33 and constituted 7·5 per cent. of all births. According to the special investigations made in 1935 the percentage of still-births for all women interrogated was 14·0 per cent.[9]

[1] Ibid., p. 13.

[2] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 109. [3] See ibid., p. 112.

[4] Ibid., p. 113. See also in this connexion *Medical Report 1941*, p. 6: 'Venereal Disease is common in Zanzibar and Pemba—especially gonorrhoea . . . .'

[5] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 110.

[6] When a similar drop occurred in 1935, the Medical Department said (*Medical Report 1935*, p. 17): '. . . it must be presumed that the drop in the birth rate is more likely to be due to faulty registration than to an actual decrease in the number of babies born.'

[7] Ibid. *1930*, p. 20. [8] Ibid. *1935*, p. 19.

[9] See ibid., p. 3: 'A very disquieting state of affairs that emerged from these enquiries was the apparently appallingly high still-birth rate. No cause could be definitely ascribed for this,

The corresponding percentages ascertained at the special investigations of 1937 and 1938 were 8·2 and 9·5 respectively. The 1938 Medical Report stated that for the whole Protectorate the still-birth rate was 'probably more than 5% and less than 9%'.[1] For 1941–5 the registered still-births numbered 54, 69, 73, 77, and 18 respectively.[2] The proportion of still-births among all registered births was 1·3, 1·7, 1·7, 1·7, and 0·4 per cent. Registration of still-births was evidently very incomplete.

General Mortality. The death records of Zanzibar Island for 1909–45 indicate that mortality was excessive for a very long time but has decreased in the last twenty years. In 1909–26, when the population averaged about 120,000, the number of registered deaths[3] oscillated between 2,832 (1924) and 4,255 (1912), and averaged 3,392. In 1927–39, when the population averaged about 140,000, the number of registered deaths[4] oscillated between 2,579 (1933) and 3,554 (1938), and averaged 3,028. In 1940–5, when the population probably averaged about 150,000, the number of registered deaths[5] oscillated between 2,244 (1944) and 2,449 (1940), and averaged 2,320. Assuming that all deaths have been registered, which is not the case, the average death-rate would have been about 28 in 1909–26, about 22 in 1927–39, and about 15 in 1940–5. The age composition—owing to immigration and probably also to a low fertility—has been apparently a favourable one all the time. For Pemba Island death registration has been so incomplete that the death records are useless for an appraisal of mortality.

It seems, however, that prior to the 1930s the Administration did not realize that mortality was very high. In his Report for the year 1909, when 1,154 deaths were registered in Zanzibar Town, the Medical Officer of Health said that this gives 'a mortality of 15·4 per 1,000 if calculated on a town and suburban population of 75,000'.

This estimate of the total population is adhered to for comparative purposes, it being that adopted for the past five years. A recent attempt to make a census shows the population of this area to be only 40,000. This would make the death rate abnormally high, and there seems nothing to indicate that.[6]

But the count of 1910 showed the population of the Town to be 35,264, so that the death-rate in 1909 would appear to have been 33 per 1,000.[7]

The Health Report for 1912 showed that the registered deaths in Zanzibar Island, with a population in 1910 of 114,071, numbered 4,255.

though the possibility of syphilis being more widespread than is generally believed must be borne in mind.' A quarter of a century earlier the Medical Officer had stated: '. . . still-births . . . often indicate the presence of syphilis and the outset of some zymotic disease' (*Health Report 1909*, p. 6).

[1] *Medical Report 1938*, p. 9.

[2] See ibid. *1941*, p. 3; *1942*, p. 2; *1943*, p. 2; *1944*, p. 2; *1945*, p. 2.

[3] According to Medical Reports. [4] According to Blue Books.

[5] For 1940–4 according to ibid., for 1945 according to Medical Report.

[6] *Health Report 1909*, p. 1.

[7] The death-rate of the Town was, as a rule, somewhat higher than in the rest of the Island, but this was probably due to the high mortality of strangers. In 1917, when the official death-rates of Zanzibar Town and Mwera District were 36·0 and 29·0 respectively, the Health Report corrected the deaths 'for the Locality where they occurred' and thereby obtained corrected death-rates of 31·4 and 34·0 respectively (see ibid. *1917*, p. 39).

The crude death rate for whole Island is therefore 26·7 per 1,000. Had the Island not been visited by the disastrous epidemic of cholera, which accounted for some 900 deaths the year would have been a normal one.[1]

Actually the death-rate was 37[2] as against 34 in 1911 and 31 in 1910. Discussing mortality in the whole Protectorate in 1910–12 the Medical Officer of Health said:

Now 14,687 deaths in 3 years is 4,895 per annum. Assuming the population of both Islands to be about 200,000, that gives an average crude annual death rate of about 24 per 1,000. This is a very fair death rate; it is about 10 per 1,000 higher than the death rate for England and Wales, and it compares favourably with the death rates of other British Tropical Dependencies.[3]

He evidently was not aware of the fact that registration in Pemba Island was so defective that the ratio of recorded deaths to population there was only 12 per 1,000. The reduction of the official death-rate of the Protectorate through inadequate death registration in Pemba Island seems also to have been one of the reasons why for many years thereafter the appallingly high mortality was not recognized. When in 1926 the death-rate in Zanzibar Island rose to about 30 (while that of Pemba Island appeared to be 13) the Medical Officer of Health stated:

From Table III it will be seen that the deaths throughout the Protectorate for all races numbered 5,017 as compared with 4,573 in 1925 and 4,111 in 1924.

Based upon these figures and the estimated total population, the crude death rate per 1,000 for each of the three years was as follows:—

	1924	*1925*	*1926*
Death Rates	18·7	20·6	23·1 per 1,000

From Table III it will also be seen that the increase in the number of deaths occurred solely in Zanzibar Island, whereas in Pemba there was not only no increase but a slight decrease as compared with 1925 and a considerable decrease as compared with the previous four years.

In Zanzibar Town the deaths of Arabs and Africans numbered 1,276 in an estimated population of 28,500, representing the high death rate of 44·3 as compared with 36·7 in 1925 and 30 in 1924.[4]

The fact that the death-rate of the natives in Zanzibar Town was 44 did not prevent the British Resident from stating in his Address to the Legislative Council on 28 October 1927:

As regards the Medical and Sanitary Department, we have to thank the Director and his staff for two things which strike all visitors on arrival in Zanzibar, viz., the healthy condition of the natives and the clean and well-kept appearance of the town. Notwithstanding its natural disadvantages, the prejudices of many of its inhabitants, its endemic diseases, and its former bad name, Zanzibar, except in the most congested areas, may now claim to be regarded as one of the healthiest towns in tropical Africa. This has been brought about by the unremitting care bestowed upon it by a devoted staff.[5]

[1] Ibid. *1912*, p. 4.

[2] This was the death-rate according to the registered deaths, but see *Medical Report 1936*, p. 67: 'It was thought that the 900 known deaths [from cholera] represented only a small proportion of the deaths which actually occurred.'

[3] *Health Report 1912*, p. 29. [4] *Medical Report 1926*, p. 12. [5] *Debates 1927–8*, p. 9.

But his successor took another view. When the death-rate of the natives in Zanzibar Town had fallen to 25·8 in 1929, he said in a Dispatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies:

> The death-rate is very high. It compares very unfavourably with that in large towns on the mainland, especially with that of Dar es Salaam where, owing to health measures, the death-rate among Africans has fallen to 16·2 per thousand.[1]

As regards the Protectorate as a whole he stated:

> There is no doubt in my mind that the health of the community is being rapidly undermined by the general incidence of ankylostomiasis[2] and that the debility caused by this disease renders them especially susceptible to other diseases by lowering their powers of resistance. It is not surprising that the natives of Zanzibar are lethargic and incapable of sustained labour. The spread of tuberculosis is in the circumstances all the more alarming.[3]

But he shared the opinion of the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services that mortality had decreased considerably. The official death-rate for the Protectorate in 1929 had in fact dropped to 18 and the Director who thought that 'the death returns can be accepted as approximately accurate'[4] said:

> The decreased number of deaths in recent years indicates . . . a true fall in the death-rate and can to a great extent be ascribed to improved sanitation, the absence of any serious epidemic, and the greater readiness on the part of the native to take advantage of the improved medical facilities now offered.[5]

It was apparently only several years later, when serious doubts concerning the completeness of death registration arose, that the Medical Department fully realized that mortality was very high. After having shown that the official death-rate of 'the combined population of Arabs and Africans' in the Protectorate was 17·2 (22·6 in Zanzibar and 10·2 in Pemba) the Medical Report for 1935 said that this rate appears 'to be far too low when the type of population is taken into account'.[6] The Report for 1936 was more explicit.

> The health of the rural population of both islands is undermined from birth by infestations with ankylostome worms, malnutrition, malaria, venereal diseases, ulcers, etc. It is clearly impossible to breed a healthy and energetic people who have so much ill health to contend with.[7]

The *Nutritional Review of the Natives of Zanzibar* published at the same time said among other things:

> The routine medical examination of the rural school boys displays the fact that a very large number of the children are undernourished and that in many the

[1] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 106. The apparently low death-rate in Dar es Salaam was actually due to defective registration; see p. 368 above.

[2] See also the Memorandum of the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services, ibid., pp. 111–12: 'Investigations have shewn that practically the whole native population is infected to a greater or less extent, and since infection occurs as soon as a child begins to walk, development is retarded and the sapping of energy through many years results in premature old age and inability to continue work. . . . The loss to the Protectorate due to disability, depreciation in the standard of work, and curtailment of the working years of life must be very considerable, and there is little doubt that the low birth and high infantile mortality rates are to some extent the result of loss of vitality due to this disease.'

[3] Ibid., p. 107.

[4] Ibid., p. 109. [5] Ibid., p. 108. [6] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 19. [7] Ibid. *1936*, p. 68.

grosser physical signs of avitaminosis are evident. On questioning the children, it is usual to find that only comparatively few have had a satisfactory meal and some have had no food at all before coming to school. In many places it is not uncommon that the majority will have no regular food until the evening meal is cooked at dusk; one meal a day is the rule and not the exception.[1]

The Acting British Resident, in a Dispatch of 15 September 1937 to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, confirmed the above statement.

I have visited Rural Schools along with Dr. Webb and have seen for myself the pitiable condition of undernourishment from which a large number of the children obviously suffer.[2]

The conditions under which children grow up in the Protectorate go far to explain the chronic unfitness and lack of energy of the adults; and these conditions must be radically improved, specially in regard to nutrition, before any marked advance in the welfare of the people and the development of their latent potentialities can be expected.[3]

Malnutrition seems to be particularly conspicuous in Zanzibar Town.

Evidence of a low nutritional standard in Zanzibar Town came to light in connection with the enlistment of army recruits, and the examination of labour required for permanent employment with a trading company. Rejects were in the vicinity of 40%, and, in the case of smaller batches examined, even higher.

This state of affairs is only to be expected with a large town resident population living on the agricultural production of a small rural population and not industrialized. Continuously lowering standards naturally result from such a state of affairs and forms one of the big problems to be met after the war—particularly the large families of the Indian artisan group resident in the Town.[4]

In Zanzibar Town overcrowding also impairs the health of the population.

There has been no long term planning in Zanzibar and no special areas have been set aside for special trades, offensive trades, or for godowns. The stone town is densely overbuilt. In many cases the houses are insanitary, dark and ill-ventilated, numerous families occupy one room only and ground floors are frequently used as stores for foodstuffs in bulk, or other merchandise. To the east of the town there is a maze of buildings mostly of native type built on privately owned land, arranged according to no plan, which, in places, reach a density of 26 or more to the acre. There are no surveyed plots and the only restriction of the area of the plot which may be built over is the legal requirement that the latrine must be five feet from the nearest building.[5]

Infant Mortality. In his report for 1909 the Medical Officer of Health deplored the 'lamentable loss' of infant life.

Once the Zanzibar baby is born its troubles begin. Midwives tampering with the mother derange the mother's milk supply. This gives the opportunity for the introduction into the child's mouth of everything the baby should not have, from adult's food to opium, and when, as in a tropical place as Zanzibar, cow's milk in all stages of decomposition and condensed milk kept open for days together is given to a baby, convulsions and bowel complaints form the purgatory the infant has to pass through before reaching the comparative heaven of a native child's life.[6]

In his report for 1912 he states that the infant mortality rates in Zanzibar Town in 1909–12 had been 399, 288, 162, and 193.

[1] *Nutritional Review*, pp. 19–20.
[2] Ibid., p. 3.
[3] *Medical Report 1943*, pp. 2-3.
[4] *Nutritional Problems of Zanzibar*, p. 2.
[5] *Report of the Provincial Administration 1943*, p. 7.
[6] *Health Report 1909*, p. 6. See also ibid., pp. 3–4.

As to the Zanzibar figures the years, 1909 and 1910, are not I am afraid of any great value for statistical purposes. The high ratio of these years is due probably to non-notification of births, which of course raises the infantile mortality figure.[1]

Still I am afraid that the average annual loss of infant life is somewhere between 150 and 190 per 1,000 births.

The chief causes of a high infantile mortality in the tropics are, premature birth, congenital defects, inexperience and neglect of mothers, and malaria, of which I am inclined to believe the last mentioned is the most important and next to it comes the ignorance of the mother.[2]

Comments on infant mortality in subsequent Medical Reports are very scanty and quite irrelevant. The Report for 1922, for example, stated with regard to Zanzibar Town:

Large families are rarely seen and the death-rate among children is high, the total number of deaths under one year being 101, and under five years 63.[3]

For 1923–30 hardly any data on infant mortality seem to have been compiled.[4] But for 1931 to 1937 infant mortality rates were published for the whole Protectorate. They amounted to 78, 78, 61, 91, 84, 90, and 64 respectively.[5] The Blue Books for 1931–3 contained the following comment:

This figure is to be regarded with considerable reserve, as it is probable that many births are unregistered.

The author was apparently not aware that incomplete birth registration tends to raise and not to reduce the infant mortality rate.

The Medical Report for 1934 said:

405 deaths of infants under one year of age were recorded amongst the 4,466 registered births, giving an Infantile Mortality Rate of 90·7 for the total population. The rate recorded last year was 61·2, but there is no doubt that these figures do not represent the truth. During the year 69 African and Arab women in Zanzibar, were interrogated, and stated that between them they had had 176 babies of whom 60 had died in their first year, representing a rate of 341 per 1,000, which is no more than would be expected.

In Pemba 85 women were questioned and it was found that of 336 live children born a total of 120 had died: this represents an infantile mortality rate of 357 which approximates to that which it is thought obtains in Zanzibar.[6]

It is difficult to see how infant mortality among 512 children born in the course of the 40 years preceding the investigation can throw any light

[1] Actually the high rate for 1909 was obtained by relating the number of infant deaths registered during the whole year (99; see *Health Report 1909*, p. 3) to the number of births registered in the last six months of the year (248)!

[2] Ibid. *1912*, p. 6. See also *Report for 1911–12 on the Trade and Commerce of Zanzibar*, p. 8.

[3] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 53. These figures afford no proof of a high infant mortality. The number of live-births registered in 1922, it is true, was only 481, but registration was incomplete; moreover, many native women had their confinements in the country and afterwards returned with their infants to the town. On the other hand, registration of infant deaths was probably also very incomplete. The total number of deaths registered was 1,262, and it seems most unlikely that actually only 8 per cent. of all deaths should have been deaths of infants (and 13 per cent. deaths of children under five).

[4] *Medical Report 1923*, p. 12, and *1924*, p. 11, say that no statistics are obtainable with regard to infant mortality. *Report on the Pemba District Administration 1926*, p. 11, shows that 55 infant deaths were recorded in the Island, a figure which doubtless lagged enormously behind the truth.

[5] See *Blue Book 1931*, p. 68; *1932*, p. 78; *1933*, p. 84; *1934*, p. 84; *1935*, p. 86; *1936*, p. 84; *1937*, p. 86.

[6] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 11.

on the actual infant mortality rate in the Protectorate in the year of the investigation.

The 1934 Report states furthermore:

> The figures are at present too small to be of very much value, but there are indications that the infantile mortality rate is nearer 400 per thousand than the recorded rate of 91.[1]

According to the answers given by the much larger number of women questioned in 1935 they had lost 225 per 1,000 of their live-born children in the first year of life. The Medical Department thereupon stated: 'it appears to be established that the Infantile Mortality Rate is over 200 per 1,000 live births'.[2] The 1936 Medical Report said:

> The rate calculated from the official returns is 90 for all communities, but there is no reason to believe that this rate approximates to the truth.
>
> The rates obtained from investigations carried out in 1935 varied from 190 to 275 per 1,000 live births. One of the same areas, in Zanzibar, was kept under observation during 1936 and the infantile mortality rate was 161.
>
> It seems probable that the true infantile mortality rate is in the neighbourhood of 200 per 1,000 live births. This rate is high, of course, by European standards but may be regarded as more or less normal for African communities living under such conditions as prevail in Zanzibar.[3]

On the other hand, the Colonial Reports for both 1936 and 1937 said that 'it is believed that the correct rate may be a hundred per thousand births'.[4]

According to the Medical Report for 1937 the investigations made in that year 'gave rates of 141 for natives and 159 for Indians per 1,000 live births'.[5] The investigations for 1938 showed a rate of 190. The Medical Report did not mention this rate but said that the infant mortality rate is 'probably more than 275 per 1,000 live births'.[6]

Thus, the official guesses concerning the infant mortality rate varied in 1934–8 between 100 and nearly 400.

No rates have been published for recent years. The infant deaths registered in 1939–45 numbered 382, 410, 317, 358, 281, 295, and 172 respectively. But registration is considered to be incomplete.[7] The infant mortality rates computed by relating the registered infant deaths to the registered live-births are in fact only 75, 88, 79, 90, 66, 68, and 34 respectively.

Adult Mortality. In early years great stress was laid upon the high mortality of people between 20 and 50, and particularly between 20 and 30 years, in Zanzibar Town.

> The leading disease which cuts off the people in early adult life is Tuberculosis.[8] Tuberculosis must certainly be made a notifiable disease here, and precautionary

[1] Ibid., p. 4. See also *Colonial Report 1934*, p. 6: 'It is believed that the correct rate is between three and four hundred per thousand births.'

[2] *Medical Report 1935*, p. 3. See also *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1935*, p. 6: 'It is believed that the correct rate is over two hundred per thousand births.' [3] *Medical Report 1936*, pp. 7–8.

[4] *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1936*, p. 6; *1937*, p. 6. [5] *Medical Report 1937*, p. 10.

[6] Ibid. *1938*, p. 9. See also *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1938*, p. 6: 'The infant mortality-rate is not known but it is believed that the correct rate may be 275 per thousand births.'

[7] See *Blue Book 1939*, p. 88, *1940*, p. 88, *1941*, p. 88, *1942*, p. 16, *1943*, p. 15, *1944*, p. 15; *Medical Report 1940*, p. 3, *1941*, p. 3, *1942*, p. 2, *1943*, p. 2. [8] *Health Report 1909*, pp. 3–4.

and disinfecting measures adopted. Otherwise the day will come when in the capital of the Swahilis [Zanzibar Town] there will be no Swahilis left.[1]

. . . it will be seen on examination of the number of deaths that between 1905 and 31st December, 1913, the deaths from plague amounted to 147 only, and from tuberculosis between 1907 and 1913, 1,357. Everything that can possibly be done to stamp out plague is done, but no one pays much attention to tubercle.[2]

One of the unsatisfactory returns as causes of deaths is Malaria; this is often diagnosed after deaths are reported, of which rather more than half, in age period 21–50.

Again when we examine the death return for Tuberculosis we find that out of 235 deaths, 183 occurred between the ages of 21–50. In both instances the death rate during this age period is much higher among males than females.

The Swahili seems to suffer more than any other race from these two diseases. He can scarcely be more prone to succumb to Malaria, but his mode of living would undoubtedly favour the spread of the tubercle bacillus.[3]

A very satisfactory feature of this year's [1915] report is the fact that the death rate is the lowest ever recorded in Zanzibar town. . . .

What is still the disturbing factor of the vital statistics, is the mortality between the ages of 21 and 50.[4]

. . . the incidence of pulmonary tuberculosis is very serious.

Undoubtedly introduced by Indians . . . and fostered by over crowding, lack of ventilation and fresh air, purdah incarceration of womenfolk and ignorant disregard of instructions on the occurrence of a case in a household, the disease is finding a receptive soil amongst Arabs and Africans who exhibit very low powers of resistance.[5]

But as only a small proportion of sick people were attended by doctors, as very little is known about the age composition of the population, and as for many years no data whatsoever have been published about the ages of the deceased, it is impossible to draw any final conclusions concerning the mortality of adults.

Population Growth. There is no doubt that the population of the Protectorate has increased in the course of the last thirty-five years.[6] In

[1] *Health Report 1909*, p. 5. 'In July 1912 Tuberculosis Pulmonalis became a notifiable disease' (ibid. *1912*, p. 14).

[2] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 25.

[3] *Health Report 1914*, p. 7.

[4] *Medical Report 1915*, p. 19; see also ibid. *1916*, p. 4.

[5] Ibid. *1918*, p. 27. In 1930 the British Resident pointed out that 'one of the most disturbing features is the undoubted spread of tuberculosis, which is becoming a serious menace', while the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services said that 'there is no doubt that the disease is spreading both in the town and district' (*Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, pp. 107, 112–113).

[6] I do not dare express an opinion regarding the changes in the population of the Protectorate prior to 1910. It has been said that the population, in the two decades following the Treaty of 1873 by which the Sultan pledged himself to suppress the sea-borne traffic of slaves and to close all public markets for imported slaves, decreased from 400,000 or 450,000 to 150,000 or 200,000. But the high estimates of Burton (1858) and Seyyid-Barghash (1873) were most likely overestimates and the estimate of Consul C. S. Smith (1894, 150,000) was, no doubt, an underestimate. The only estimate of the last century which inspires confidence is the one made in 1895 by the First Minister of the Sultan, Sir Lloyd Mathews, which ran as follows:

Europeans (including Americans) and Eurasians (excluding Goanese)	200
Indians and other non-Arab Asiatics	7,500
Arabs (pure)	4,000
Africans	197,000
Total	208,700

If this estimate is correct the population would have decreased between 1895 and 1910, but this is not surprising, as 20,000 people are said to have died from smallpox in Pemba Island in 1897–8.

See *Correspondence respecting Slavery in Zanzibar 1895*, pp. 21, 32; *1896*, pp. 7–9; *1901*, pp. 37–8; *Report on the Administration of the Zanzibar Protectorate* dated 26 Oct. 1908, p. 5.

submitting the results of the 1910 count which showed a total of 197,199 inhabitants (including 8,987 Non-Africans) the Consul-General stated:

> It will be seen that the total population falls short considerably of the estimates previously made which generally placed it at a quarter of a million[1] and although it is probable that owing to the disinclination of the people to be numbered and to the difficulty of getting hold of a certain number of natives with no fixed abode some have escaped the census yet it may I think be regarded as certain that the total population of both Islands does not exceed two hundred thousand.[2]

The count of 1931 revealed a population of 235,428 (including 15,561 non-natives). By adding to this figure the excess of registered births over registered deaths, and the excess of recorded arrivals over recorded departures, the population appears to have been 238,922 at the end of 1944. Since registration of births is particularly defective, it may well be that the increase since 1910 has amounted to 50,000. But it is impossible to tell to what extent the increase was due to excess of immigration and to what extent to natural increase.

The Consul-General, in 1910, as stated above, said he was not able to say whether the population as a whole is increasing or decreasing. But in his report for 1913 the Medical Officer of Health expressed the opinion that

[1] In *Statistical Tables, British Colonies* (*1901*, p. 743; *1902*, p. 817; *1903*, p. 811; *1904*, p. 883) the population was estimated for 1901 at 250,000, for 1902, 1903, and 1904 at 200,000. For the following years more detailed estimates were published which showed wide variations, particularly as regards the Arabs and Indians.

Report for the Year 1905 on the Trade and Commerce of Zanzibar (pp. 11–12): '. . . it is roughly estimated that the total population of the two islands is from 200,000 to 250,000, of which perhaps 50,000 inhabit the Island of Pemba. The Arabs . . . probably number about 15,000 . . . British Indians . . . probably now number from 10,000 to 12,000. The European population numbers about 220, half of whom are British.'

Ibid. *1907* (p. 9): 'A rough census of the population of the town of Zanzibar taken in 1907 gave a total of 55,750 and an official estimate of the rest of this island at 120,500, reaching a total of 176,250. Estimates of the population of the Island of Pemba place it at between 50,000 and 60,000. The officer in charge of the census-taking of the town admits that his figures are probably below rather than over the mark, and the health office places the population within the town limits at 75,000.

'Probably the total population of the islands falls but little short of 250,000, of whom about 10 per cent. are British subjects or persons under British protection.

'The Europeans do not number more than 250, of whom about half are British.

'The British Indians . . . probably number about 20,000 . . . .

'The Arabs . . ., it is now estimated, do not number more than from 8,000 to 10,000 . . . .'

Report on the Administration of the Zanzibar Protectorate dated 26 Oct. 1908 (p. 5): 'The first census of Zanzibar Island was taken in 1907, but the results obtained were very unsatisfactory; this was due partly to the inexperience of the staff employed, partly to the aversion entertained by all Eastern nations to a "numbering of the people", and partly to the idea that the measure was introduced with a view to taxation, which led to the numbers being understated. Sufficient data were obtained, however, to enable a fairly reliable estimate to be formed, and it is probable that the population of Zanzibar town consists of about 55,000 persons, and that of the country districts of 120,000, or 175,000 altogether, including some 200 Europeans, 7,000 Arabs, and 20,000 Asiatics, mostly British Indians. There are probably some 50,000 to 75,000 persons in Pemba, or from 225,000 to 250,000 persons of all nationalities in both islands. A census is to be taken more carefully next year.'

The count made in 1910 yielded for Zanzibar Island a very much lower population (114,069), and for Pemba Island a much larger population (83,130). The number of Asiatics, excluding Arabs, was not more than 8,757, and the number of Europeans 230.

[2] *Census Report 1910.*

as even in 'normal' years deaths exceeded births in Zanzibar Town, while births hardly exceeded deaths in the country districts of Zanzibar Island, the population of the Protectorate was decreasing.

If the true figure for births during those four normal years [1909–11, and 1913] was twice the recorded number, then in those four years the births exceeded the deaths by only 489 throughout these districts, an average increase of only 122 per annum for the island population outside the town precincts.

When other factors which deplete population are considered, such as the high infant mortality between the ages 0–5 years, emigration of adults, the occurrence of epidemics, etc., a very much larger figure than this 122 would be quite insufficient to maintain even a stationary population.

Considering the absolute dependence of these islands upon agricultural produce and hence upon native labour, this apparent gradual depletion in population would appear to be most serious.[1]

In the following year he said that, owing to an excess of deaths over births, the population was 'undoubtedly decreasing'.

In course of time the population, if not augmented by immigration, will become one of children and old people as the heavy death rate during what must be the most viable period of life is excessive, 68% of the total deaths occur between 21–50 years.[2]

The Colonial Reports for 1915–18, as shown above, suggested that the apparent excess of births over deaths may be due to defective registration.[3] The Medical Officer did not share this view[4] and thought that the population of Zanzibar Town was decreasing:

Under the Registration of Male Persons Decree, 1917, an approximate estimate of the population of the town of Zanzibar was obtained. This estimate places the population of Zanzibar town at 32,192 in 1917, a decrease of 2,630 on the figure at the time of the census in 1910, whereas an estimate based on the excess or otherwise of births over deaths since the last census places the population in 1917 at 29,441, a decrease of 5,381.[5]

In discussing the results of the 1921 census of non-natives the Colonial Report for that year stated:

The only noteworthy feature of the census returns was the increase which was shown to have taken place during the last ten years in the number of British Indian inhabitants. That increase is primarily attributable to the absence of any form of restriction on Indian immigration into the Protectorate, and to the opportunities Zanzibar offers to the small Indian trader.[6]

[1] *Medical Report 1913*, p. 9. The Medical Officer evidently assumed that emigration exceeded immigration and that conditions in Pemba Island were the same as in Zanzibar Island.

[2] *Health Report 1914*, p. 7. In fact age data of the deceased were published only for Zanzibar Town and they showed that 52 per cent. of the deaths occurred between 21 and 50 years.

[3] See also Handbook *Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar*, issued by the Foreign Office in 1920 (p. 28): 'It was supposed till recently that the population of the Protectorate was dwindling, but it is now believed that, if complete records were obtainable, they would show that in recent years births have outnumbered deaths.'

[4] See p. 672 above.

[5] *Health Report 1917*, p. 33. The latter estimate does not take account of migrations and of the incompleteness of birth registration.

[6] *Colonial Reports, Zanzibar 1921*, p. 6. The number of British Indians had increased between 1910 and 1921 from 8,233 to 12,841, and the number of other non-natives from 754 to 1,284. See *Census Report 1921*, p. 3.

From 1922 onwards the Medical Reports paid again more attention to the question of population growth.

1922. . . . for the last ten years the deaths in the [Zanzibar] Town area have greatly exceeded the births, whereas in the country districts the births nearly equal the deaths. Taken as a whole the death-rate is far higher than the birth-rate.[1]

1923. Although the [birth and death] figures recorded can be taken as only approximately correct, there appears to be no doubt that a serious diminution in population would be obvious but for the constant immigration of mainland natives. . . .[2]

1924. The Emigration and Immigration returns show a large excess of Immigrants over Emigrants. During the last four years alone, the returns show an Immigrant excess of more than 10,000, and although the figures cannot be accepted as very reliable there is no doubt that but for the excess of Immigrants over Emigrants the 1924 census returns would have shown a considerable diminution in population since 1910.[3]

1926. In the past, the population of the Protectorate has been not only maintained but increased year by year owing to an excess of immigrants over emigrants. In the six years from 1920–1925 inclusive, the excess of immigrants returned was 19,256, but last year . . . an excess of 3,330 emigrants was recorded. This remarkable change, it is thought, has been brought about by the attraction, more especially to natives of mainland origin, of the improved conditions and prospects now obtaining in Tanganyika Territory. If this is correct and an excess of emigration is maintained, the question of conserving the health and lives of the indigenous population of the Protectorate becomes one of increased economic importance.[4]

1928. Since the census was taken, the returns to the end of last year show an excess of immigrants over emigrants of 2,038 and of deaths over births of 1,018, representing an increase of 1,020 in total population. . . . Taking all factors into consideration, it is probable that any increase in population is chiefly non-native and that the native population remains much the same as in 1924, any loss due to an excess of deaths over births having been made good by immigration.[5]

1929. Immigration and emigration statistics are not reliable[6] and do not specify the different races, but there is no doubt that up to the year 1926 there was a considerable excess of immigrants over emigrants and that since then the position has been reversed owing to the improved conditions prevailing on the mainland. As far as can be judged taking all the various factors into consideration, it would appear that the total population of the Protectorate has decreased to some extent since the 1924 census; there has probably been some increase of Asiatics (excluding Arabs) due to both excess of births and immigration, but of Arabs and Africans a greater decrease owing to excess of deaths and emigration.[7]

The documents submitted to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in 1930 dealt very fully with the question of population growth. The Director of Medical and Sanitary Services, in a Memorandum dated 5 May 1930, said:

From 1913, the earliest year for which birth and death returns are available, to 1926 inclusive, the average number of deaths among Arabs and Africans each year was 4,321 and of births 3,295, showing an excess of deaths over births averaging 1,026.

For the three years 1927–1929 there has on the other hand been an excess averaging 140 in the number of births, the deaths averaging 3,794 and the births 3,934.

[1] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 53. [2] Ibid. *1923*, p. 13.

[3] Ibid. *1924*, p. 11. The native population of the Protectorate had increased from 188,212 in 1910 to 202,665 in 1924. [4] Ibid. *1926*, pp. 13–14. [5] Ibid. *1928*, p. 16.

[6] *Medical Report 1927*, p. 12, says that as they 'do not include Tanganyika natives, who come and go freely, and are probably made up chiefly of Asiatics, they afford no guide'.

[7] Ibid. *1929*, p. 16.

Exact figures for the Arab and African population are not known, but there is no doubt that the large excess of deaths over births from 1913–1926 was more than counterbalanced by immigration during the same years and that a considerable increase in population actually occurred.[1]

In spite of the decrease of more than 500 yearly in the number of deaths the position cannot as yet be considered by any means satisfactory; an excess of births averaging only 140, in years free from epidemics, being an insufficient safeguard against a serious decrease in population.

Formerly, as already stated, any decrease in population due to excess of deaths was more than made good by excess of immigrants. No exact immigration and emigration statistics are available, but an approximate estimate is that for many years prior to 1926 there was an annual excess of immigrants of more than 3,000. In 1926, however, the position was reversed, and since then there has been an excess of emigrants.[2]

The British Resident, in his Dispatch of 10 June, stated:

Since 1926 the non-native population has increased by 700 represented by excess of births over deaths. The native population during the same time has decreased by one thousand, due partly to excess of deaths over births and partly to numbers of natives having returned to the mainland. It is impossible to ascertain the respective numbers. In 1929, births (4,204) exceeded deaths (3,893) by 311 in the Protectorate as a whole. . . . Non-native births were 399 and deaths 197. . . .

Unfortunately no reliable statistics of births and deaths, especially of births, are available. Without such statistics, for which I hope it may be possible to arrange before long, it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain whether the population, apart from immigrants and emigrants, is increasing or decreasing. But the Director of Medical and Sanitary Services is of the opinion that, as a result of medical work in recent years, there is reason to believe that a fairly large decrease in the resident population has now been turned into a slight increase. There can be not the slightest doubt, however, that very much remains to be done if the general health of the community is to reach a reasonable standard and if there is to be a satisfactory increase in the population.[3]

The statements are somewhat contradictory. The Director of Medical and Sanitary Services says that there has been an excess of births over deaths amongst Arabs and Africans in 1927–9, but the Resident says that there has been an excess of deaths over births since 1926. It should be noted, moreover, that 'except in the case of Zanzibar town, the returns do not differentiate between the different races',[4] and that in the above statements births and deaths among non-natives outside Zanzibar Town were treated as native births and deaths. But what is much more important is that registration was so defective that the recorded figures of births and deaths do not permit the drawing of any conclusions concerning the natural increase of either the native or the non-native population.

The Medical Report for 1930 stated:

Since the census was taken, the returns have shown a considerable excess of deaths over births, but it is thought that any decrease in population due to this cause has been more than counterbalanced by the large excess of immigration over emigration that occurred especially during the years 1923–1926.[5]

The Medical Department apparently thought that the total population had increased since 1924. But it stated at the same time that the estimated

[1] *Papers relating to the Health of Native Populations*, p. 108. [2] Ibid., p. 109.
[3] Ibid., p. 106. [4] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 15. [5] Ibid. *1930*, p. 19.

population at the end of 1930 was 216,801 as against 217,965 in 1924.[1] Actually the 1931 count showed that the native population had increased since 1924 from 202,665 to 219,867 (and the non-native population since 1921 from 14,132 to 15,561). Even in Zanzibar Town the native population had increased since 1924 from 26,499 to 33,219. But the Medical Department, attributing the increase probably to immigration, did not change its views about the actual ratio of deaths to births among the natives.

1932. Zanzibar Township. As noted in previous years the death rate greatly exceeds the birth rate among these races [Africans and Arabs], and unless this state of affairs is altered and the rates reversed, before no long time these people will be replaced by other more vigorous races.[2]

1934. The recorded excess of births over deaths in the last four years is 996, and if this figure is accepted the natural rate of increase of the population is less than one per 1,000 per annum, which is an extremely low figure for any population, particularly a native one.[3]

There appears to be little doubt in the minds of those Africans and Arabs who have so far been interrogated that their people are decreasing in numbers.

. . . In the past, the number of immigrants has been in excess of the number of emigrants, but in the year under review, the reverse has been the case.

If this tendency continues, the population of Zanzibar may become a decreasing one, as the recorded number of births in excess of deaths is so small.[4]

1935. The evidence available suggests that the native population of Zanzibar Protectorate may be a diminishing one.[5]

1937. These [birth and death] figures tend to bear out the suggestion made in previous years, that the population of Zanzibar if not reinforced periodically by an excess of immigrants over emigrants, may be diminishing. Though the above figures do not warrant the drawing of a definite conclusion it would appear that the margin of natural increase—if any—is smaller than the limits of safety would prescribe.[6]

Births and deaths of Europeans were usually shown separately in former years but no data seem to have been published since 1933. Mortality of European officials has been low for a long time.

TABLE 5. *Deaths of European Officials, Zanzibar, 1923–39*[1]

Number				Number				Number			
Year	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Total*	*Average*	*Deaths*
1923	112	76	3	1929	125	85	1	1935	97	70	—
1924	116	74	1	1930	116	78	—	1936	102	70	2
1925	128	85		1931	117	87	—	1937	110	70	1
1926	128	100	..	1932	111	84	—	1938	103	80	—
1927	112	99	.	1933	106	78	1	1939	107	78	—
1928	127	90	1	1934	105	69	—				

[1] See *Medical Report 1925*, p. 10; *1927*, p. 14; *1930*, p. 23; *1933*, p. 15; *1936*, p. 8; *1939*, p. 8.

[1] See ibid., pp. 19-20, 66. This estimate was apparently based on the records of births, deaths, immigration, and emigration.

[2] Ibid. *1932*, p. 11; literally the same ibid. *1933*, p. 14. See also ibid. *1931*, p. 14.

[3] Ibid. *1934*, p. 10.

[4] Ibid., p. 11.

[5] Ibid. *1935*, p. 3; see also ibid. *1936*, p. 7.

[6] Ibid. *1937*, p. 10.

SOURCES QUOTED

GENERAL[1]

Report on Mombasa Victoria Lake Railway Survey. C. 7025 (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1893–4, vol. lxii, pp. 1–138).

Memorandum showing Position of the Four African Protectorates Administered by the Foreign Office in June 1903, Africa No. 9 (1903). Cd. 1635 (*P.P.* 1903, vol. xlv, pp. 569–78).

Memorandum on the State of the African Protectorates administered under the Foreign Office, Africa No. 10 (1904). Cd. 2163 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. lxii, pp. 225–36).

Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, Part XXV, *1900*; Part XXVI, *1901*. Cd. 1324; 1728 (*P.P.* 1902, vol. cxiv; 1903, vol. lxxxi).

Statistical Tables relating to British Colonies, Possessions and Protectorates, Part XXVII, *1902* to Part XXXII, *1907*. Cd. 2184; 2629; 3107; 3706; 4385; 4881 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. civ; 1905, vol. xcv; 1906, vol. cxxxi; 1907, vol. xcv; 1908, vol. cxix; 1909, vol. ci).

Statistical Tables relating to British Self-Governing Dominions, Crown Colonies, Possessions and Protectorates, Part XXXIII, *1908* to Part XXXVII, *1912*. Cd. 5295; 5906; 6400; 7024; 7667 (*P.P.* 1910, vol. cvii; 1911, vol. xcix; 1912–13, vol. civ; 1913, vol. lxxv; 1914–16, vol. lxxviii.

Statistical Abstract for the British Empire in each Year from 1889 to 1903 to *1928 to 1937*. London, 1905–38.

Statistical Abstract for the Several British Self-Governing Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, and Protectorates in each Year from 1899 to 1913; from 1900 to 1914. London, 1915, 1916.

Annual Colonial Reports, British Central Africa Protectorate 1904–5 to *1906–7; Nyasaland 1907–8* to *1919–20, 1920* to *1938; East Africa Protectorate 1904–5* to *1919–20; Kenya 1920–1, 1921* (1 Apr. to 31 Dec.), *1922* to *1938; Northern Rhodesia 1924–5, 1925–6, 1926* to *1938; Somaliland 1904–5* to *1919–20, 1920* to *1938; Uganda 1904–5* to *1919–20, 1920* (1 Apr. to 31 Dec.), *1921* to *1938; Zanzibar 1913* to *1938*. London, 1905–39.

The Colonial Office List for 1894 to *1925*. London.

The Dominions Office and Colonial Office List for 1926 to *1940*. London.

Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, Naval Staff, Admiralty, I. D. 1216, *A Handbook of Kenya Colony (British East Africa) and the Kenya Protectorate (Protectorate of Zanzibar)*. London.

Report of the East Africa Commission. Cmd. 2387. London, 1925.

Rhodesia-Nyasaland Royal Commission Report (Bledisloe Commission). Cmd. 5949. London, 1939.

Report on the Statistical Department of the Conference of East African Governors, 1930, under the Direction of A. Walter; same *1931*.

Joint East African Board, *Memorandum on Post-War Problems in East Africa*. London, 1943.

[1] Sources quoted only in the Introduction or in more than one Chapter.

Colonial Office, *East Africa, Vital Statistics of European Officials, Returns for 1930 to 1941.* London, (1932)–1945.

Papers relating to the Health and Progress of Native Populations in Certain Parts of the Empire. Colonial No. 65. London, 1931.

Report of the Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Financial Position and Further Development of Nyasaland (Commissioner: R. D. Bell). Colonial No. 152. London, 1938.

Labour Conditions in East Africa, Report by Major G. St. J. Orde Browne. Colonial No. 193. London, 1946.

Northern Rhodesia, Mines Department, *Annual Report 1927; 1930; 1931; 1932.* (Typescripts.)

Northern Rhodesia, Department of Lands, Mines and Local Government, *Annual Report for the Year 1933; 1934.* Livingstone, 1934.

Northern Rhodesia, *Land and Mines, Annual Report for the year 1935; 1936.* Lusaka, 1936, 1937.

Northern Rhodesia, Department of Lands, Mines and Surveys, *Annual Report for the Year ended 31st December, 1937; 1938.* Lusaka, 1938.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of the Committee appointed by His Excellency the Governor to enquire into Emigrant Labour, 1935.* Zomba, 1936.

Report on Nyasaland Natives in the Union of South Africa and in Southern Rhodesia, by J. C. Abraham, The Senior Provincial Commissioner, Nyasaland. London, 1937.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Labour Branch of the Provincial Administration for the Year ending 31st December, 1938.* Zomba, 1939.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Labour Department of the Provincial Administration for the Year ending 31st December, 1939; 1940.*

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Labour Department for the Year ending 31st December, 1941; 1944.* Zomba, 1942, 1945.

Tanganyika Territory, *Report on a Visit to Uganda and Kenya, Made at the Request of the Standing Committee on Tsetse and Trypanosomiasis Research,* by S. Napier Bax, Acting Director of Tsetse Research, Tanganyika Territory. 1943.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Census, regarding the Census taken on 7th May, 1911.* Salisbury, 1912.

Southern Rhodesia, *Second and Final Report of the Director of Census regarding the Census taken on 3rd May, 1921.* Salisbury, 1922.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Census regarding the Census taken on the 4th May, 1926,* Part III and Final. Salisbury, 1927.

'Southern Rhodesia, Census of Population, 1936, Natives in Employment', *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia,* issued by the Department of Statistics, 21 Oct., 7 Nov., and 7 Dec. 1937.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Census on the Census of Population, 1936.* 1943.

'Southern Rhodesia: Census of Population, 1941, Natives in Employment', *Economic and Statistical Bulletin of Southern Rhodesia,* 7 Jan., 7 Feb., 21 Feb., 21 Mar., 7 Apr. 1942.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Secretary, Department of Mines and Public Works on Mines for the year 1939.* Salisbury, 1940.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner for the Year 1920 to 1940*. Salisbury, 1921–41.

Southern Rhodesia, *Supervisor of Native Labour Immigration, Annual Report 1943*.

The Rhodesia Chamber of Mines (Incorporated) Bulawayo, *Twenty-third Annual Report for the Year 1917* to *Forty-fourth Annual Report for the Year 1938*. Bulawayo, 1918–39.

The Chamber of Mines of Rhodesia (Incorporated), *First Annual Report for the Year 1939* to *Sixth Annual Report for the Year 1944*. Bulawayo, 1940–5.

Union of South Africa, *Report of the Witwatersrand Mine Natives' Wages Commission on the Remuneration and Conditions of Employment of Natives on Witwatersrand Gold Mines, &c., 1943*. Pretoria, 1944.

Société des Nations, *Rapport sur l'Administration belge du Ruanda et de l'Urundi pendant l'année 1921, présenté aux Chambres par M. le Ministre des Colonies*. Geneva, 1922.

Rapport présenté par le Gouvernement belge au Conseil de la Société des Nations au sujet de l'Administration du Ruanda–Urundi pendant l'année 1924 to *1938*. Geneva, 1925; Brussels, 1926–39.

Statistical Year-Book of the League of Nations 1942/44. Geneva, 1945.

RAYMOND LESLIE BUELL, *The Native Problem in Africa*. 2 vols. New York, 1928.

MAJOR ARCHIBALD CHURCH, *East Africa, A New Dominion*. London, 1927.

DR. A. R. COOK, *Still-birth and Infant Mortality from the Pathological Point of View* (International Conference on African Children, Question I, East Africa). Geneva, 1931.

H. L. DUFF, *Nyasaland under the Foreign Office*. London, 1903.

CHARLES DUNDAS, 'Native Laws of Some Bantu Tribes of East Africa', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. li, 1921, pp. 217–78.

R. W. FELKIN, 'Notes on the Waganda Tribe of Central Africa', *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. xiii, pp. 699–770. Edinburgh, 1886.

LORD HAILEY, *An African Survey, A Study of Problems arising in Africa South of the Sahara*. Oxford, 1938.

SIR HARRY JOHNSTON, *The Uganda Protectorate*. 2 vols. London, 1902.

CAPTAIN F. D. LUGARD, *The Rise of our East African Empire, Early Efforts in Nyasaland and Uganda*. 2 vols. Edinburgh and London, 1893.

MAJOR J. R. L. MACDONALD, *Soldiering and Surveying in British East Africa 1891–1894*. London and New York, 1897.

A. M. Mackay, By his Sister. London, 1890.

ARTHUR SILVA WHITE, *The Development of Africa*. London, 1890.

KENYA

The Official Gazette of the Colony and Protectorate of Kenya.

East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations up to March 31, 1899*. Mombasa, 1899.

East Africa Protectorate, *Orders in Council, King's (Queen's) Regulations, Ordinances, Rules, Proclamations, and other Official Orders in Force in the East Africa Protectorate on the 1st of January, 1903. (1876–1902.)* Printed by Authority.

East Africa Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations January 1st to December 31st, 1903* to *1919*. Mombasa, 1904–6; Nairobi, 1906–19.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Ordinances and Regulations 1st January to 31st December, 1920; 1921.* Nairobi, 1921, 1922.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Ordinances Enacted during the Year 1924* to *1944.* Nairobi, 1925–45.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Proclamations, Rules and Regulations January 1st to December 31st, 1922; 1930; 1938* to *1944.* Nairobi, 1923, 1931, 1939–45.

The Laws of Kenya, containing the Ordinances of Kenya in Force on the 1st Day of January, 1924. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, 1921, by Sir J. W. Barth, R. W. Lyall Grant, and Herbert Bown. 3 vols. Nairobi, 1926.

The Laws of Kenya containing Orders, Proclamations, Rules, Regulations and By-Laws of Kenya, in Force on the 1st Day of January, 1927. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, as Amended by the Revised Edition of the Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1928, by Sir J. W. Barth and B. A. Crean. 2 vols. London, 1928.

East Africa Protectorate, *Census Return, 1911.* Nairobi, 1911.

Kenya Colony and Protectorate, *Report on the Census of Non-Natives 24th April, 1921,* by C. E. Spencer, Superintendent of Census. Nairobi.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report on the Non-Native Census Enumeration made in the Colony and Protectorate of Kenya on the Night of the 21st February, 1926,* by A. G. Baker, Director of Land Surveys, Kenya, edited by A. Walter, Statistician, Conference of East African Governors. Nairobi, 1927.

Kenya Colony and Protectorate, *Report on the Non-Native Census Enumeration made in the Colony and Protectorate of Kenya on the Night of the 6th March, 1931,* under the direction of A. Walter, Statistician, Conference of East African Governors. Nairobi, 1932.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Agricultural Census 1928* to *1938.* Nairobi, 1929–39.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Special Labour Census 1944.*

Kenya Colony and Protectorate, *Financial Report and Statement for the Year 1931.* Nairobi, 1932.

(Colony and Protectorate of Kenya) Labour Section, *Abridged Annual Report 1939.* (Typescript.)

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Labour Department Annual Report 1941* to *1944.* Nairobi, (1942)–1945.

Labour Department, Statistical & Migration Section, *Migration Summary for 1940.*

(Colony and Protectorate of Kenya) *Report of the Commissioner for Local Government for the Year 1938.* (Typescript.)

East Africa Protectorate, *Annual Medical Report for the Year Ending 31st December, 1912* to *1919.*

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Annual Medical Report for the Year Ending 31st December, 1920* to *1928.* Nairobi, (1921)–1929.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, Medical Department, *Annual Report 1929* to *1937; 1938 and 1939; 1940 (Abbreviated); 1942 (Abbr.)* to *1944 (Abbr.).* Nairobi, 1931–45 (1938–9 typescript).

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, Medical Department, *Medical Survey Masai Province, 5th November, 1930 until 28th April, 1931.*

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, Medical Department, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report, Digo District 1932.*

Kenya Colony and Protectorate, Native Affairs Department, *Annual Report 1927* to *1934.* London, (1928)–1931; Nairobi, 1932–4; London, 1936.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Annual Report on Native Affairs 1935* to *1938.* Nairobi, 1936; London, 1938; Nairobi, 1938, 1939.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Registrar General's Annual Report 1927* to *1938.* Nairobi, (1928)–1939.

Kenya Colony and Protectorate, *Blue Book for the Year ended 31st December 1929* to *1944.* Nairobi (1930)–1939. (*B.B.* 1939–44 typescripts.)

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Legislative Council Debates, 1925; 1927; 1928; 1929; 1931; 1937; 1944; 1944–5; 1945; 1945–6.* Nairobi.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Legislative Council, Interim Report on Development* (*Sessional Paper No. 2 of 1945*).

East Africa Protectorate, *Native Labour Commission, 1912–13, Evidence and Report.* Nairobi.

East Africa Protectorate, *Economic Commission, Final Report,* Part I, *1919.* Nairobi.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report of the Committee on Statistical Services in Kenya* (Aug. 1925). Nairobi, 1925.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report of the Local Government Commission 1927.* 2 vols. London.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report on Native Taxation,* by G. Walsh, Treasurer, and H. R. Montgomery, Chief Native Commissioner. Nairobi, 1936.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report of the Commission of Inquiry appointed to Examine the Labour Conditions in Mombasa.* Nairobi, 1939.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report on a Malaria Survey of Mombasa.* Nairobi, 1939.

Memorandum for the Native Affairs Committee of the Nairobi Municipal Council by the Senior Medical Officer of Health and Municipal Native Affairs Officer on Housing Problem. Nairobi, 1941.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report of the Committee Appointed to Inquire into the Question of the Introduction of Conscription of African Labour for Essential Services.* Nairobi, 1942.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Post-War Employment Committee Report and Report of the Sub-Committee on Post-War Employment of Africans.* Nairobi, 1943.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Food Shortage Commission of Inquiry Report, 1943.* Nairobi, 1943.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Interim Report on Development.* Nairobi, 1945.

Colony and Protectorate of Kenya, *Report of the Development Committee.* 2 vols. Nairobi, 1946.

Quarterly Bulletin of Statistical Research for British East Africa, vol. i, Part 1, January to March, 1927. Prepared under the Direction of A. Walter (Statistician to the East African Governors' Conference). Nairobi, 1927.

Report by Sir A. Hardinge on the Condition and Progress of the East Africa Protectorate from its Establishment to the 20th July, 1897, Africa No. 7 (1897). C. 8683 (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1898, vol. lx, pp. 199–272).

Report by Sir A. Hardinge on the British East Africa Protectorate for the Year 1897–98, Africa No. 3 (1899). C. 9125 (*P.P.* 1899, vol. lxiii, pp. 269–302).

Report for the Year ending March 31, 1900, on the Trade and Customs Revenue of the East Africa Protectorate (Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2536—*P.P.* 1900, vol. xcii, pp. 41–57).

Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1900–1, Africa No. 8 (1901). Cd. 674 (*P.P.* 1901, vol. xlviii, pp. 677–94).

Report by His Majesty's Commissioner [Sir C. Eliot] *on the East Africa Protectorate*, dated 10 June 1901, Africa No. 9 (1901). Cd. 769 (*P.P.* 1901, vol. xlviii, pp. 369–94).

Report by the Mombasa-Victoria (Uganda) Railway Committee on the Progress of the Works, 1901–2, Africa No. 4 (1902). Cd. 1080 (*P.P.* 1902, vol. lxix, pp. 813–40).

Report by His Majesty's Commissioner [Sir C. Eliot] *on the East Africa Protectorate*, dated 18 Apr. 1903, Africa No. 6 (1903). Cd. 1626 (*P.P.* 1903, vol. xlv, pp. 697–744).

Final Report of the Uganda Railway Committee, Africa No. 11 (1904). Cd. 2164 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. lxii, pp. 763–98).

Report on the East Africa Protectorate for the Year 1903–4, Africa No. 15 (1904). Cd. 2331 (*P.P.* 1905, vol. lvi, pp. 179–232).

Reports from the Director of Agriculture on the Government Farms at Nairobi and Naivasha in the East Africa Protectorate for the Year 1904, and on the Prospects of Settlers, Africa No. 4 (1905). Cd. 2410 (*P.P.* 1905, vol. lvi, pp. 107–58).

Reports relating to the Administration of the East Africa Protectorate, Africa No. 6 (1905). Cd. 2740 (*P.P.* 1906, vol. lxxx, pp. 139–94).

Tours in the Native Reserves and Native Development in Kenya. Cmd. 2573. London, 1926.

Report by the Financial Commissioner (Lord Moyne) on certain Questions in Kenya, May, 1932. Cmd. 4093. London.

Kenya Land Commission, *Evidence and Memoranda*. 3 vols. Colonial No. 91. London, 1934.

Report of the Kenya Land Commission, September, 1933. London, 1934.

Colonial Office, *Indians in Kenya, Memorandum*. Cmd. 1922. London, 1923 (Reprinted 1927).

Colonial Office, *Report of the Commission Appointed to Enquire into and Report on the Financial Position and System of Taxation of Kenya* (Sir Alan Pim). Colonial No. 116. London, 1936.

Medical Research Council, *The Physique and Health of Two African Tribes*, by J. B. Orr and J. L. Gilks. London, 1931.

Joint Select Committee on Closer Union in East Africa, *Minutes of Evidence*. London, 1931.

Handbook for East Africa, Uganda and Zanzibar 1905 to *1907*. Mombasa.

MARJORIE RUTH DILLEY, *British Policy in Kenya Colony*. New York, 1937.

SIR CHARLES ELIOT, *The East Africa Protectorate*. London, 1905.

SIR CHARLES ELIOT, 'The Progress and Problems of the East Africa Protectorate', *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*, vol. xxxvii, pp. 81–100. London, 1906.

SIDNEY LANGFORD HINDE and HILDEGARDE HINDE, *The Last of the Masai*. London, 1901.

C. W. HOBLEY, 'The Romance of the Foundation of Uganda and Kenya Colony', *Supplement to The African World*, 7 Feb. 1925, p. xi.

——, *Kenya, From Chartered Company to Crown Colony*. London, 1929.

ELSPETH HUXLEY, *White Man's Country, Lord Delamere and the Making of Kenya*. 2 vols. London, 1935.

—— and MARGERY PERHAM, *Race and Politics in Kenya*. London, 1944.

JOMO KENYATTA, *Facing Mount Kenya, The Tribal Life of the Gikuyu*. London, 1938.

——, *My People of Kikuyu and the Life of Chief Wangombe, Africa's Own Library, No. 1*. London.

NORMAN LEYS, *Kenya*. London, 1924.

M. MERKER, *Die Masai*. Berlin, 1904.

P. L. M°DERMOTT, *British East Africa or Ibea*. New edition. London, 1895.

SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME, *The Elements of Vital Statistics*. New edition. London, 1923.

W. MCGREGOR ROSS, Director of Public Works East Africa Protectorate (1905–23), *Kenya from within, A Short Political History*. London, 1927.

W. SCORESBY ROUTLEDGE and KATHERINE ROUTLEDGE, *With a Prehistoric People, The Akikúyu of British East Africa*. London, 1910.

MAX SALVADORI, *La Colonisation européenne au Kenya*. Paris, 1938.

H. R. TATE, 'Notes on the Kikuyu and Kamba Tribes of British East Africa', *Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. xxxiv, 1904, pp. 130–48.

——, 'Further Notes on the Kikuyu Tribe of British East Africa', ibid., pp. 255–65.

GÜNTER WAGNER, *The Changing Family among the Bantu Kavirondo* (Supplement to *Africa*, vol. xii, No. 1). Oxford, 1939.

DR. CHRISTOPHER J. WILSON, *One African Colony, The Native Races of Kenya*. London, 1945.

UGANDA

The Official Gazette of the Uganda Protectorate.

Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances under the Africa Order in Council, 1902, issued during the year 1904. With Rules and Notices thereunder.*

Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances under the Africa Order in Council, 1905, issued during the year 1906. With Rules and Notices thereunder*. Uganda.

Chronological Table (Revised to 31st December, 1908) and Index (Revised to 15th July, 1909) of the Laws of the Uganda Protectorate. Uganda, 1909.

Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force on the 31st December, 1909, compiled by G. F. M. Ennis and W. Morris Carter. London, 1910.

Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances under the Uganda Order in Council, 1902, issued during the Year 1915, with Appendices containing Proclamations, Rules, Orders and Notices, Orders in Council, Native Law and Appointments; same 1919*. Uganda.

Uganda Protectorate Ordinances 1922–3 (Colonial Office Library).

Laws of the Uganda Protectorate in Force on the 30th April, 1923, Revised and

Consolidated under the Authority of 'The Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, 1923', by Sir Charles Griffin. 3 vols. Entebbe, 1924.

1927 Supplement to the Laws of Uganda, containing Ordinances of Uganda Enacted between the 1st May, 1923, and the 31st December, 1926, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of Laws (Annual Supplements) Ordinance, 1926. Entebbe, 1927.

Uganda Protectorate, *Ordinances 1930 and Subsidiary Legislation, containing Orders in Council, Rules, Regulations, Proclamations, Orders, Notices, Native Laws, etc.*; same *1931, 1934, 1935*. Entebbe.

Laws of the Uganda Protectorate, Revised and Consolidated under the Authority of The Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, by Neville Turton, John Bowes Griffin, and Arthur W. Lewey (Revised Edition, 1935). 6 vols. Entebbe, 1936 (vols. i–iii); London, 1936 (vols. iv–vi).

Laws of the Uganda Protectorate, Revised and Consolidated under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, 1936, containing the Ordinances and Subsidiary Legislation enacted since the 31st December 1935, and in force on the 31st December, 1936, by Arthur W. Lewey and Charles Mathew. Entebbe, 1937.

Uganda Protectorate, *Census Returns 1911*, Published by command of His Excellency the Governor. Entebbe.

Uganda Protectorate, *Census Returns 1921*, Published by command of His Excellency the Governor. Entebbe, 1921.

Uganda Protectorate, *Census Returns 1931*, Published by Command of His Excellency the Governor. Entebbe, 1933.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Kampala Township Authority for the Year ended 31st December, 1938*. Entebbe, 1939.

Labour Department, Annual Report for 1925. (Typescript.)

Annual Report of the Labour Department for the Year Ending 31st December 1930. (Typescript.)

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Inspectorate of Labour for the Year ended 31st December, 1938* to *1942*. Entebbe, 1939–43.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Labour Department for the Year ended 31st December, 1944: 1945*. Entebbe, 1945, 1946.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year ended 31st December, 1912* to *1933*. London, 1913–16; Entebbe, 1917–34.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Medical Department for the Year ended 31st December, 1934* to *1944*. Entebbe, 1935–45.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Reports of the Provincial Commissioners, Eastern, Northern and Western Provinces, on Native Administration for the Year ended 31st December, 1935* to *1938*. Entebbe, 1936–9.

Uganda Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Provincial Commissioners, Eastern and Western Provinces, on Native Administration for the Year ended 31st December, 1939*. Entebbe, 1940.

Uganda Protectorate, *Proceedings Legislative Council, Twenty-First Session, First, Second and Third Meetings*, Dec. 1941; *Twenty-Second Session, First and Second Meetings*, Dec. 1942, *Fourth Meeting*, Sept. 1943; *Twenty-Third Session, First and Second Meetings*, Dec. 1943; *Twenty-Fourth Session, First and Second Meetings*, Dec. 1944. Entebbe, 1942–5.

Uganda Protectorate, *Enquiry into Land Tenure and the Kibanja System in Bunyoro, 1931, Report of the Committee.* Entebbe, 1932.

Uganda Protectorate, Agricultural Survey Committee, *An Investigation into Health and Agriculture in Teso, Uganda,* by M. G. de Courcy-Ireland, H. R. Hosking, and L. J. A. Loewenthal. Entebbe, 1937.

Uganda Protectorate, Agricultural Survey Committee, *Report of the Nutrition Sub-Committee.* Entebbe, 1937.

Uganda Protectorate, *Report on an Investigation into Conditions affecting Unskilled Labour, and the Supply thereof, within the Protectorate,* by J. R. McD. Elliot, District Officer. Entebbe, 1937.

Uganda Protectorate, *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Labour Situation in the Uganda Protectorate, 1938.* Uganda, 1938.

Uganda Protectorate, *Second Report of the Labour Advisory Committee, Organization of the South-Western Labour Migration Routes.* Entebbe, 1943.

Uganda Protectorate, *Third Report of the Labour Advisory Committee, Supervision of Labour and other matters relating to Conditions of Employment in Uganda.* Entebbe, 1944.

Uganda Protectorate, *Report on Livestock Production in Uganda,* by J. B. Randall, Veterinary Officer, Uganda Protectorate. Entebbe, 1944.

Uganda Protectorate, *Report and Recommendations on the Post-War Development of the Medical Services in Uganda,* by Dr. H. S. de Boer, Director of Medical Services. Entebbe, 1944.

Uganda Protectorate, Nutrition Committee, *Review of Nutrition in Uganda, A Summary of Previous Work and An Appreciation of the Present Position.* Entebbe, 1945.

Uganda Protectorate, *Joint Report of the Standing Finance Committee and the Development and Welfare Committee on Post-War Development* (2nd ed.). Entebbe (1945).

Uganda Protectorate, *Administrative Instructions,* Published by Authority. Entebbe, 1940.

Uganda Protectorate, *Blue Book for the Year ended December 31st, 1928 to 1944.* Entebbe.

Reports relating to Uganda by Sir Gerald Portal, Africa No. 2 (1894). C. 7303 (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1894, vol. lvii, pp. 641–98).

Papers relating to Uganda, Africa No. 7 (1895). C. 7708 (*P.P.* 1895, vol. lxxi, pp. 219–369).

Report on Military Operations against Kabarega, King of Unyoro, Africa No. 1 (1896). C. 7924 (*P.P.* 1896, vol. lix, pp. 887–94).

Papers relating to Recent Events in the Uganda Protectorate, Africa No. 1 (1899). C. 9123 (*P.P.* 1899, vol. lxiii, pp. 477–530).

Papers relating to Events in the Uganda Protectorate and Lieut.-Colonel Macdonald's Expedition, Africa No. 4 (1899). C. 9232 (*P.P.* 1899, vol. lxiii, pp. 531–66).

Preliminary Report by Her Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda, Africa No. 6 (1900). Cd. 256 (*P.P.* 1900, vol. lvi, pp. 865–80).

Report by His Majesty's Special Commissioner on the Protectorate of Uganda, Africa No. 7 (1901). Cd. 671 (*P.P.* 1901, vol. xlviii, pp. 569–98).

General Report on the Uganda Protectorate for the Year ending March 31, 1903, Africa No. 15 (1903). Cd. 1839 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. lxii, pp. 799–836).

General Report on the Uganda Protectorate for the Year ending March 31, 1904, Africa No. 12 (1904). Cd. 2250 (*P.P.* 1905, vol. lvi, pp. 275–316).

Correspondence relating to Famine in the Busoga District of Uganda. Cd. 4358 (*P.P.* 1908, vol. lxxiii, pp. 923–37).

Colonial Office, *Colonial Reports Miscellaneous, No. 65, Uganda, Report on the Measures Adopted for the Suppression of Sleeping Sickness in Uganda*, by Sir H. Hesketh Bell. London, 1909.

Handbook of British East Africa including Zanzibar, Uganda, and the Territory of the Imperial British East Africa Company, prepared in the Intelligence Division, War Office, 1893. London, 1893.

Intelligence Division, War Office, *Précis of Information concerning the Uganda Protectorate*, compiled by Brevet Major E. M. Woodward, Staff Captain, September, 1902. London, 1902.

ROBERT P. ASHE, *Two Kings of Uganda or Life by the Shores of Victoria Nyanza, being an Account of a Residence of Six Years in Eastern Equatorial Africa*. London, 1889.

WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL, *My African Journey*. London, 1908.

COLONEL SIR HENRY COLVILE, *The Land of the Nile Springs, being chiefly an Account of how we fought Kabarega*. London and New York, 1895.

SIR ALBERT R. COOK, *Uganda Memories (1897–1940)*. Kampala, 1945.

GENERAL F. D. LUGARD, *The Story of the Uganda Protectorate*. London (1901).

L. P. MAIR, *An African People in the Twentieth Century*. London, 1934.

SIR GERALD PORTAL, *The British Mission to Uganda in 1893*, ed. by Rennell Rodd. London, 1894.

JOHN ROSCOE, *The Baganda, An Account of their Native Customs and Beliefs*. London, 1911.

——, *Twenty-Five Years in East Africa*. Cambridge, 1921.

——, 'Uganda and some of its Problems', *Journal of the African Society*, vol. xxii, 1922–3, pp. 96–108, 218–25.

HENRY M. STANLEY, *Through the Dark Continent or The Sources of the Nile around the Great Lakes of Equatorial Africa and down the Livingstone River to the Atlantic Ocean*. 2 vols. London, 1878.

H. B. THOMAS and ROBERT SCOTT, *Uganda*. Oxford, 1935.

H. C. TROWELL and E. M. K. MUWAZI, 'A Contribution to the Study of Malnutrition in Central Africa, A Syndrome of Malignant Malnutrition', *Transactions of the Royal Society of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene*, vol. xxxix, No. 3, Dec. 1945, pp. 229–43.

C. T. WILSON and R. W. FELKIN, *Uganda and the Egyptian Soudan*. 2 vols. London, 1882.

TANGANYIKA TERRITORY

Kaiserliches Gouvernement von Deutsch-Ostafrika, *Die Landes-Gesetzgebung des Deutsch-Ostafrikanischen Schutzgebietes*. Berlin, 1902.

Kaiserliches Gouvernement von Deutsch-Ostafrika, *Amtlicher Anzeiger für Deutsch-Ostafrika* 1907–14. Daressalam, 1907–14.

Reichs-Kolonialamt, *Die deutschen Schutzgebiete in Afrika und der Südsee 1909/10; 1912/13*. Berlin, 1911, 1914.

German East Africa Proclamations, &c. 1916–20 (Colonial Office Library).

The Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances, Proclamations, etc., being a Collection of those Ordinances, Proclamations, etc., which were in Force on the 31st December, 1920, with an Appendix containing the Regulations, Rules and Notices thereunder*. London, 1921.

The Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances under the Tanganyika Order-in-Council, 1920, Enacted during the Year 1921, with an Appendix containing Orders-in-Council, Proclamations, Rules, Notices, etc.* London, 1923.

Tanganyika Territory, *Ordinances Enacted during the Year 1922, with an Appendix containing Proclamations, Orders, Rules and Notices;* same *1923* to *1929*. Dar es Salaam, (1923)–1930.

Tanganyika Territory Ordinances Enacted during the Year 1931 and Subsidiary Legislation. Dar es Salaam.

Tanganyika Territory Ordinances Enacted during the Year 1939, with an Appendix containing Proclamations, Rules, Regulations, Orders and Notices; same *1942* to *1944*. Dar es Salaam, 1940, 1943–5.

The Laws of the Tanganyika Territory in Force on the 31st Day of December, 1928, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of Laws Ordinance, 1928, by Sir Alison Russell. 3 vols. London, 1929.

Tanganyika Territory, *Report on the Native Census, 1921*. Dar es Salaam.

Tanganyika Territory, *Census of the Native Population 1931*. Dar es Salaam, 1932.

Tanganyika Territory, *Report on the Non-Native Census taken in the Territory on the night of the 26th April, 1931*. Dar es Salaam, 1932.

Tanganyika Territory Blue Book for the year ended 31st December 1925 to *1944*. Dar es Salaam (*B.B.* 1940–44, MS. or typescript).

Report of the Labour Inspectorate, Tanganyika Territory, for the Year 1939.

Tanganyika Territory, Labour Department, *Annual Report 1940* to *1943*. Dar es Salaam, 1941–4.

Tanganyika Territory, Department of Lands and Mines, *Annual Report 1938*. Dar es Salaam, 1939.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Reports of the Principal Medical Officer and the Senior Sanitary Officer, Period, November 1918 to November 1920*.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Medical Report, Annual Report of the Sanitation Branch of the Medical Department, Report of the Dar-es-Salaam Laboratory, for the Year 1921; 1922*.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Medical Report for the Year Ending December 31st, 1923* to *1925*. (Report 1924, London; 1925, Dar es Salaam.)

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year Ending 31st December, 1926* to *1936*. London, 1927–30; Dar es Salaam, 1932–7.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Report of the Medical Department for the year ended 31st December 1937* to *1943*. Dar es Salaam, 1938–44.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Report on the Administration of the Police 1939*. Dar es Salaam (1940).

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Reports of the Provincial Commissioners for the year 1930* to *1944*. Dar es Salaam, 1931–45.

Tanganyika Territory, *Annual Report by the Treasurer for the Financial Year 1931–2*. Dar es Salaam (1932).

Tanganyika Territory, *Native Administration Memoranda*, No. VIII, *Collection of Hut and Poll Tax*. Dar es Salaam, 1929.

Tanganyika Territory, *Proceedings of the Legislative Council, First Session, 1926–7; Second Session, 1928; Fourth Session, 1929/30; Fifth Session, 1931; Fifteenth Session, 1940/1* to *Nineteenth Session, 1944/5*, Parts I and II. Dar es Salaam, (1927)–1945.

Tanganyika Territory, *Preliminary Survey of the Position in regard to Nutrition amongst the Natives of Tanganyika Territory*. Dar es Salaam, 1937.

Tanganyika Territory, *Report of the Committee Appointed to Consider and Advise on Questions Relating to the Supply and Welfare of Native Labour in the Tanganyika Territory*. Dar es Salaam, 1938.

Tanganyika Territory, Medical Department, *Memorandum on Medical Policy* (*Sessional Paper No. 3 of 1938*). Dar es Salaam (1938).

Tanganyika Territory, *Report of the Central Development Committee* (1940).

Tanganyika Territory, *An Outline of Post-War Development Proposals*. Dar es Salaam, 1944.

Report on Tanganyika Territory, Covering the period from the conclusion of the Armistice to the end of 1920. London, 1921.

Report on Tanganyika Territory for the Year 1921; 1922. London, 1922–3.

Report by His Britannic Majesty's Government on the Mandated Territory of Tanganyika for the Year 1923. London, 1924.

Report by His Britannic Majesty's Government on the Administration under Mandate of Tanganyika Territory for the Year 1924. London, 1925.

Report by His Britannic Majesty's Government to the Council of the League of Nations on the Administration of Tanganyika Territory for the Year 1925 to *1938; 1940*. London.

Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, Naval Staff, Admiralty, *A Handbook of German East Africa*. London.

Geographical Section of the Naval Intelligence Division, Naval Staff, Admiralty, *A Manual of Portuguese East Africa*. London, 1920.

League of Nations, Permanent Mandates Commission, *Minutes of the Third Session; Thirteenth Session; Eighteenth Session; Twenty-Second Session; Twenty-Fifth Session; Thirty-First Session; Thirty-Seventh Session*. Geneva, 1923, 1928, 1930, 1932, 1934, 1937, 1940.

The Handbook of Tanganyika. First Issue 1930, issued by the Chief Secretary's Office, General editor, Gerald F. Sayers. London, 1930.

The South and East African Year Book and Guide, 1939 Edition. London (1939).

Wilhelm Arning, *Deutsch-Ostafrika gestern und heute* (*Schriftenreihe der Deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft*). Berlin, 1936.

K. C. Charron, Medical Specialist, Labour Department, *The Welfare of the African Labourer in Tanganyika*, with an Introductory Note by R. R. Scott, Director of Medical Services. Dar es Salaam, 1944.

A. T. Culwick and G. M. Culwick, 'A Study of Population in Ulanga, Tanganyika', *The Sociological Review*, Oct. 1938, pp. 365–79, Jan. 1939, pp. 25–43.

Charlotte Leubuscher, *Tanganyika Territory, A Study of Economic Policy under Mandate*. London, 1944.

NORTHERN RHODESIA

The British South Africa Company, *North-Eastern Rhodesia Government Gazette.*

Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette.

The Statute Law of North-Western Rhodesia, 1899–1909. Livingstone, 1910.

The Statute Law of North-Eastern Rhodesia, 1908–11, North-Western Rhodesia, 1910–11, Northern Rhodesia, 1911–16. Livingstone, 1917.

Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia for Year ended 31st December 1929; 1930; 1933; 1936; 1938. Published by Authority. Livingstone, 1930, 1931, 1934; Lusaka, 1937, 1939.

Government Notices of Northern Rhodesia for Year ended 31st December 1930. Published by Authority. Livingstone, 1931.

The Laws of Northern Rhodesia in Force on the 30th Day of June, 1930. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, 1930, by Frederic Gordon Smith. 2 vols. London, 1931.

The Laws of Northern Rhodesia, vols. iii and iv, *containing the Rules, Regulations, Proclamations, Notices, Orders and Bye-Laws made under the Ordinances of Northern Rhodesia in Force on or Enacted by the Legislature prior to the 1st Day of January, 1934.* Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws (Supplemental) Ordinance, 1931, by Audley McKisack. London, 1935.

1939 Supplement to the Laws of Northern Rhodesia, containing Ordinances Enacted between the 1st July, 1930 and the 31st December, 1938, and Subsidiary Legislation Published since the 31st December, 1933, and in Force on the 31st December, 1938, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws (Annual Supplements) Ordinance, 1936, by the Attorney-General of Northern Rhodesia. Lusaka, 1939.

Northern Rhodesia, *Government Notices for the Year 1939; 1940.* Lusaka, 1940, 1941.

The British South Africa Company, *Report on the Company's proceedings and the condition of the Territories within the sphere of its operations 1889–92; 1896–7.* London.

The British South Africa Company, *Reports on the Administration of Rhodesia, 1897–8; 1898–1900; 1900–2.* London.

The British South Africa Company, *Directors' Report and Accounts 1897–8: 31st March, 1899, and 31st March, 1900; 31st March, 1901, and 31st March, 1902; for the Year ending 31st March, 1903* to *31st March, 1912; for the Years ended 31st March, 1913, and 31st March, 1914.* London.

The British South Africa Company, *Report of the Seventh Ordinary General Meeting Held at London on 4th December, 1901.*

The British South Africa Company, *Report upon the Present Condition of Rhodesia*, presented to the Directors by J. F. Jones, Joint Manager and Secretary, 5 Feb. 1903. London.

The British South Africa Company, *Official Handbook of North-Eastern Rhodesia, April, 1903.* Fort Jameson.

The British South Africa Company, *Report of an Extraordinary General Meeting Held at London on 23rd January, 1908.* London.

Northern Rhodesia, *Report of the Director of Census Regarding the Census Taken on the 5th May, 1931.* London, 1931.

Northern Rhodesia, Department of Agriculture, *Annual Report for the year 1943.* Lusaka, 1944.

Northern Rhodesia, *Annual Report on African Education for the year 1944.* Lusaka, 1945.

Northern Rhodesia, Labour Department, *Annual Report for the Year, 1940* to *1943.* Lusaka, 1941–4.

Northern Rhodesia, *Medical Report on Health and Sanitary Conditions for the years 1925 and 1926; 1927* to *1939.* London, 1928, 1930–2; Livingstone, 1928, 1933–4; Lusaka, 1935–40.

Northern Rhodesia, *Abbreviated (War-time) Medical Report on Health and Sanitary Conditions for the Year 1940* to *1943.*

Northern Rhodesia, Game and Tsetse Control Department, *Report for the Year 1944.*

Northern Rhodesia, *Report upon Native Affairs for the Year Ended 31st March, 1925; for the Year 1925–6; for the Year 1926; for the Year 1928.*

Northern Rhodesia, *Annual Report upon Native Affairs 1929* to *1934.* Livingstone, 1930–5.

Northern Rhodesia, *Native Affairs, Annual Report for the year 1935* to *1938.* Lusaka, 1936–9.

Northern Rhodesia, *Police, Annual Report 1928.* (Typescript.)

Government of Northern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia Police, *Annual Report 1931* to *1939.* Livingstone, (1932)–1934, (1936): Lusaka, 1935, 1937–40.

Northern Rhodesia, Court Registrar, *Annual Report 1923–4.* (Typescript.)

Northern Rhodesia, Registrar, *Annual Report for Year 1930.* (Typescript.)

Northern Rhodesia, Judicial Department, *Annual Report for Year Ending 31st December, 1935; 1936; 1938; 1939.*

Northern Rhodesia, *Report of the Commissioner for Unemployment 1934.* Lusaka, 1935.

Northern Rhodesia, *Report of Chairman of the Native Industrial Labour Advisory Board, Ndola, November 7th and 8th, December 16th and 17th, 1935.* Lusaka, 1936.

A Report by the Committee appointed to make a Survey and present a Review of the present Position of Nutrition in Northern Rhodesia. Lusaka, 1938.

Report of the Commission Appointed to Inquire into the Disturbances in the Copperbelt, Northern Rhodesia, July 1940.

Northern Rhodesia, *Blue Book for the Year Ended 31st December 1924* to *1943.* Livingstone (1925–34); Lusaka (1935–45).

Northern Rhodesia, *Report of the Proceedings of the Second Advisory Council, First Meeting, 21st to 29th June, 1920; Third Advisory Council, First Meeting, 15th to 21st July, 1922.* (*Supplement to the 'Northern Rhodesia Government Gazette'*, 14 Aug. 1920; 15 Aug. 1922.) Livingstone (1920, 1922).

Northern Rhodesia, *Legislative Council Debates* (vol. i), May 1924, to vol. li, Aug. 1945. Livingstone, 1924–35; Lusaka 1935–45.

Report of the Commission Appointed to Enquire into the Financial and Economic Position of Northern Rhodesia (Sir Alan Pim and Mr. S. Milligan). Colonial No. 145. London, 1938.

Labour Conditions in Northern Rhodesia, Report by Major G. St. J. Orde Browne. Colonial No. 150. London, 1938.

Northern Rhodesia, *Health Services Development Plans 1945–55*, by Dr. J. F. C. Haslam, Director of Medical Services. Lusaka, 1945.

Northern Rhodesia, *Memorandum on Post War Development Planning in Northern Rhodesia*, by G. F. Clay, Joint Adviser on Development to the Governments of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland. Lusaka, 1945.

Southern Rhodesia, *Report on the Public Health for the Year 1912 to 1929*. Salisbury, 1913–30.

Rhodesian Native Labour Bureau, *Report of the Management and Finance Committee for the Twelve Months Ended December 31st, 1908*, &c.

Department of Overseas Trade, *Report on the Economic Situation in the Belgian Congo, Dated July, 1924*, by C. K. Ledger. London, 1924.

Chambre des Représentants, *Session de 1922–3, Rapport Annuel sur l'activité de la colonie du Congo Belge pendant l'année 1921 présenté aux Chambres Législatives;* same *1922*. Brussels, 1923–4.

Le Problème de la Main-d'Œuvre au Congo Belge; Rapports (1) de la Commission pour l'Étude du problème de la main-d'œuvre au Congo Belge (1924–5), (2) du Comité Consultatif de la main-d'œuvre (1928). Brussels, 1928.

Le Problème de la Main d'Œuvre au Congo Belge, Rapport de la Commission de la main d'œuvre indigène 1930–1, Province du Katanga. Brussels, 1931.

François Coillard, *On the Threshold of Central Africa, A Record of Twenty Years' Pioneering among the Barotsi of the Upper Zambesi*, translated from the French and edited by his Niece, Catherine Winkworth Mackintosh. London, 1897.

J. Merle Davis, *Modern Industry and the African*. London, 1933.

Max Gluckman, *Economy of the Central Barotse Plain (The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers, Number Seven)*. Livingstone, 1941.

Rita Hinden, *Plan for Africa*. London, 1941.

Hugh Marshall Hole, *The Making of Rhodesia*. London, 1926.

Audrey I. Richards, *Land, Labour and Diet in Northern Rhodesia, An Economic Study of the Bemba Tribe*. London, 1939.

——, *Bemba Marriage and Present Economic Conditions (The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers, Number Four)*. Livingstone, 1940.

Sir Malcolm Watson, 'A Conquest of Disease, Hygiene in North Rhodesia', *The Times*, 10 Feb. 1940.

Godfrey Wilson, *An Essay on the Economics of Detribalization in Northern Rhodesia*, Parts I, II (*The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers, Numbers Five, Six*). Livingstone, 1941, 1942.

NYASALAND PROTECTORATE

The Nyasaland Government Gazette.

Ordinances, Rules, Proclamations and Notices, Promulgated in the British Central Africa Protectorate, 1904. Zomba, 1905.

Orders in Council, Ordinances, Regulations, Proclamations, Orders and Rules, Promulgated in the British Central Africa Protectorate, 1905. Zomba, 1906.

Orders in Council, Ordinances, Proclamations, Rules and Orders, &c., Promulgated in the Nyasaland Protectorate, 1911. Zomba.

Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate in Force on the 31st March, 1913, Revised and Consolidated under the Authority of 'The New Edition of the Ordinances Ordinance, 1911', by Charles J. Griffin. London, 1913.

Proclamations, Rules and Notices relating to the Nyasaland Protectorate in Force on the 31st December, 1914, compiled by Charles J. Griffin and Walter E. Demuth. Zomba, 1915.

Ordinances of the Nyasaland Protectorate for the year ended 31st December, 1921; 1924; 1931 to *1935.* Zomba, 1922, 1925, 1932–6.

Orders in Council, Proclamations, Rules and Orders, &c., Promulgated in the Nyasaland Protectorate during the Year 1921; 1926; 1929. Zomba.

The Laws of Nyasaland in Force on the 31st Day of December, 1933. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance, 1933, by Haythorne Reed. 3 vols. London, 1934.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Census of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1911,* compiled in the Registrar-General's Office, Blantyre, June, 1911.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Census of the Nyasaland Protectorate 1921.* Zomba.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Census of 1926,* by S. S. Murray, Superintendent of Census. Zomba, Dec. 1926.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Census of 1931.* Zomba, 1932.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Census of 1945.* Zomba, 1946.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Native Labour Census taken on 15th January, 1930.* Zomba (1930).

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on the Native Labour Census taken on 15th August, 1930.* Zomba, 1930.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture 1926* to *1944.* Zomba, 1927–(1945).

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Medical Department for the Year Ended 31st March 1911; 1912.* Zomba.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Medical Report on the Health and Sanitary Condition of the Nyasaland Protectorate for the Year Ended 31st March 1913; 31st December, 1913* to *1932.* London, 1913; Zomba, 1914–33.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Medical & Sanitary Report for the year ending 31st December, 1933* to *1942.* Zomba, 1934–43.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Abridged Annual Report of the Medical Department for the Year ending 31st December 1943; 1944.* Zomba.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report upon Native Affairs 1931.* London, 1932.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report on Native Affairs for the Year ended 31st December, 1932; 1933.* Zomba, 1933, 1934.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Reports of the Provincial Commissioners for the Year ended 31st December, 1934* to *1939.* Zomba, 1935–40.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Administration of the Police Department for the year ended 31st December, 1930* to *1939.* Zomba, 1931–40.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Public Works Department 1931* to *1938.* Zomba, 1932–9.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of the Native Welfare Committee for the Year Ending 31st December, 1936* to *1940.* Zomba, 1937–41.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Blue Book for the Year ended December 1920 to 1939*. Zomba, (1921)–1939. (*B. B.* 1939, typescript.)

Annual Report on the Social and Economic Progress of the People of Nyasaland for the year 1939. (Typescript.)

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of a Commission Appointed by His Excellency the Governor to Enquire into and Report upon certain Matters connected with the Occupation of Land in the Nyasaland Protectorate*. Zomba (1921).

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of a Commission Appointed by His Excellency the Governor on the 21st day of October, 1922, to Enquire into certain Matters affecting the Public Revenue and Expenditure in the Nyasaland Protectorate*. Zomba (1924).

Nyasaland Protectorate, Native Reserves Commission (North Nyasa District), *1929 Report*. (Typescript.)

Native Welfare Committee, *Memorandum on Native Policy in Nyasaland, January 1939*. Zomba, 1939.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *A Report by Mr. Eric Smith, Administrative Officer, on the Direct Taxation of Natives in the Nyasaland Protectorate and other cognate Matters*. London, 1937.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of the Agricultural Survey of the five most Northerly Districts of Nyasaland*. Zomba, 1938.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Nyasaland Native Labour in Southern Rhodesia*, by Capt. G. N. Burden, Nyasaland Labour Officer. Salisbury (1938).

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Report of the Post-War Development Committee*. Zomba, 1945.

Nyasaland Protectorate, *Summary of the Proceedings of the Legislative Council of Nyasaland*, Feb. 1926 to May 1945. Zomba (1926)–1945.

Report by Commissioner Johnston of the First Three Years' Administration of the Eastern Portion of British Central Africa, dated March 31, 1894, Africa No. 6 (1894). C. 7504 (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1894, vol. lvii, pp. 741–93).

Report by Commissioner Sir Harry Johnston, K.C.B., on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate, April 1, 1895, to March 31, 1896, Africa No. 5 (1896). C. 8254 (*P.P.* 1896, vol. lviii, pp. 423–54).

Report by Consul and Acting Commissioner Sharpe on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate, from April 1, 1896, to March 31, 1897, Africa No. 5 (1897). C. 8438 (*P.P.* 1897, vol. lxii, pp. 15–30).

Annual Report on the British Central Africa Protectorate for the Year 1897–8, Africa No. 9 (1898). C. 9048 (*P.P.* 1899, vol. lxiii, pp. 237–68).

Report for the Year 1898 on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate from April 1, 1898, to March 31, 1899 (Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2327—*P.P.* 1899, vol. xcviii, pp. 11–50).

Report for the Year ending March 31, 1900, on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate; same *March 31, 1901* (Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 2497, 2722—*P.P.* 1900, vol. xcii, pp. 1–40; 1902, vol. cv, pp. 1–45).

Report for the Year 1901–2 on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate (Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, No. 2872—*P.P.* 1902, vol. cv, pp. 65–106).

Report on the Trade and General Conditions of the British Central Africa Protectorate for the Year 1902–3, by Major F. B. Pearce, Acting Commissioner, Africa No. 13 (1903). Cd. 1772 (*P.P.* 1904, vol. lxii, pp. 237–316).

Report on the Trade and General Condition of the British Central Africa Protectorate for 1903–4. Cd. 2242 (*P.P.* 1905, vol. lvi, pp. 49–106).

Colonial Office, *Report on the Nyasaland Railways and Proposed Zambesi Bridge 1927*. London, 1929.

Census of the British Empire 1901, Report with Summary and Detailed Tables for the Several Colonies, &c. Cd. 2660. London, 1906.

Statistics and Intelligence Branch of the Empire Marketing Board, *Production and Trade of Nyasaland. January, 1931*. London, 1931.

A Handbook of Nyasaland, compiled by S. S. Murray. London, 1932.

Lionel Decle, 'The Development of our British African Empire', *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*, vol. xxxvii, pp. 311–36. London, 1906.

Sir Harry H. Johnston, *British Central Africa*. London, 1897.

Dr. Margaret Read, 'Migrant Labour in Africa and its Effects on Tribal Life', *International Labour Review*, June 1942, pp. 605–31.

SOMALILAND

Somaliland Protectorate, *Ordinances and Regulations from 1900 to 1905; 1906–1907*. London, 1906, 1908.

Somaliland Ordinances 1910–1922 (Colonial Office Library).

The Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate. Revised Edition, containing the Orders in Council, Ordinances, Rules, Proclamations, etc. in Force on the 31st Day of December, 1922. London, 1923.

The Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate, containing the Ordinances of Somaliland in Force on the 30th Day of June, 1930. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance by A. S. Lawrance. London, 1931.

Somaliland Protectorate, *Notices, Proclamations, Regulations and Rules in Force on the 30th Day of June, 1930*, Revised and prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Ordinance by A. S. Lawrance. London, 1931.

Somaliland Protectorate, *A Supplement to The Laws of the Somaliland Protectorate, containing the Ordinances of Somaliland Enacted between the 1st July, 1930, and the 31st December, 1932, and Subsidiary Legislation Published between the aforesaid Dates*. London, 1933.

Somaliland Protectorate, *Returns of the Census of the Alien Population of the Coast Towns of the Protectorate 1911*. (Typescript.)

Somaliland Protectorate, *Non-Somali Census, April 26th 1931*.

Somaliland Protectorate, *Annual Medical Report for the year ended on the 31st December 1916* to *1924*.

Somaliland Protectorate, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year ending 31st December, 1925* to *1930; 1932* to *1938* (1930–7 typescript).

Somaliland Protectorate, *Blue Book 1928* to *1938*. (Typescript.)

ZANZIBAR

Zanzibar Legislation 1891–1911 (Colonial Office Library).

Zanzibar, *Chronological Index of Enactments Issued 1863–1911, and Text of Enactments in Force December 31, 1911*, compiled by John H. Sinclair. 1912.

Zanzibar, Decrees, Regulations and Notices, 1921.

The Laws of Zanzibar in Force on the 28th Day of February, 1922. Revised Edition. 4 vols. London, 1922.

The Laws of Zanzibar, Revised Edition, Supplementary Volume containing the Orders in Council, Rules, Proclamations, Notices, etc., in Force on the 28th Day of February, 1922. London, 1922.

Zanzibar Legislation 1929; 1931; 1935. Zanzibar, 1930, 1932, 1936.

The Laws of the Zanzibar Protectorate in Force on the 31st Day of December, 1934. Revised Edition, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws Decree, 1934, by John Henry Vaughan. 4 vols. London, 1935.

1935–1938 Supplement to the Laws of Zanzibar, containing the Decrees Enacted between the 1st January, 1935, and the 31st December, 1938, and Subsidiary Legislation Published since the 31st December, 1934, and in Force on the 1st January, 1939, prepared under the Authority of the Revised Edition of the Laws (Annual Supplements) Decree, 1936, by the Attorney General of the Zanzibar Protectorate. Zanzibar, 1939.

Legal Supplement (Part I) to the Official Gazette of the Zanzibar Government, 17 June 1939.

Statements showing the Result of the Census taken in 1910. (Typescript.)

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Non-Native Census, 1921.* Zanzibar, 1921.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Native Census, 1924.* Zanzibar, 1924.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Census Enumeration of the Whole Population on the Night of the 28th–29th March, 1931.* Zanzibar, 1931.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Pemba District Administration for the Year 1926.*

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Administration of the Province of Pemba for the Year 1929 to 1931.*

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Provincial Administration for the year 1934.* (Typescript.)

Annual Report on the District of Zanzibar for the year 1935.

Annual Report on District of Pemba for the year 1935. (Typescript.)

Annual Reports on the Districts of Zanzibar and Pemba for the Year 1936.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report of the Provincial Administration for 1937; 1938; 1941 to 1943.* Zanzibar, 1938, 1939. (1941–3 typescript.)

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Department of Agriculture for the year ended 31st December, 1942 to 1945.*

Report of the Public Health Department's Work for the Year 1909 (Enclosure in Mr. Clarke's No. 154 of June 7, 1910), with *Observations of H.M. Agent & Consul General.*

Zanzibar Government, *Public Health Department, Annual Report for the Year 1912.*

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year 1913.*

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Medical Department for the Year 1914.* Zanzibar, 1915.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Public Health Department for the Year 1914.* Zanzibar, 1915.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Medical and Public Health Reports for the Year 1915.* Zanzibar, 1916.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Public Health Department for the Year 1916*. Zanzibar, 1917.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Public Health Division for the Year 1917*. Zanzibar, 1919.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Medical Division for the Year 1918; 1919*. Zanzibar, 1920, 1921.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Reports on the Medical and Public Health Departments for the Year 1920* to *1922*. Zanzibar, 1922–3.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Medical Department for the Year 1923; 1924*. Zanzibar, 1924, 1925.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Medical, Sanitary and Biological Divisions for the Year 1925* to *1929*. Zanzibar, 1926–30.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Report on the Medical and Sanitary Divisions for the Year 1930* to *1933*. Zanzibar, 1931–4.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Annual Medical and Sanitary Report for the Year ended 31st December, 1934* to *1945*. Zanzibar, 1935–46.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Report on the Zanzibar Police for the Year 1931; 1933* to *1939*.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Blue Book for the Year ended 31st December, 1914* to *1944*. Zanzibar, 1915–45.

Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure of the Zanzibar Protectorate for the Year 1932. Zanzibar, 1932.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Standing Orders for the Medical Department 1936*.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Debates of the Legislative Council, Official Report, First Session, 1926–1927* to *Nineteenth Session, 1944–1945*. Zanzibar (1927)–46.

Zanzibar Protectorate, *Nutritional Review of the Natives of Zanzibar*. Zanzibar, 1937.

Zanzibar Protectorate, Legislative Council, *Nutritional Problems of Zanzibar Protectorate* (*Sessional Paper No. 10 of 1937*). Zanzibar, 1937.

Correspondence respecting Slavery in Zanzibar, Africa No. 6 (1895). C. 7707 (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1895, vol. lxxi, pp. 143–88).

Correspondence respecting Slavery in the Zanzibar Dominions, Africa No. 7 (1896). C. 8275 (*P.P.* 1896, vol. lix, pp. 395–444).

Correspondence respecting Slavery and the Slave Trade in East Africa and the Islands of Zanzibar and Pemba, Africa No. 4 (1901). Cd. 593 (*P.P.* 1901, vol. xlviii, pp. 173–214).

Despatch from His Majesty's Agent and Consul-General at Zanzibar, furnishing a Report on the Administration, Finance, and General Condition of the Zanzibar Protectorate [26 Oct. 1908], Africa No. 4 (1909). Cd. 4816 (*P.P.* 1909, vol. lix, pp. 581–634).

Report for the Year 1905 on the Trade and Commerce of Zanzibar; same *1907, 1908, 1911–12* (Diplomatic and Consular Reports, Annual Series, Nos. 3677, 4058, 4312, 5176—*P.P.* 1906, vol. cxxix, pp. 985–1002; 1908, vol. cxvii, pp. 941–68; 1909, vol. xcix, pp. 695–721; 1913, vol. lxxiii, pp. 727–55).

Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar, Handbooks Prepared under the Direction of the Historical Section of the Foreign Office, No. 96. London, 1920.

Report of the Commission appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies to consider and report on the Financial Position and Policy of the Zanzibar Government in Relation to its Economic Resources (Commissioner: Sir Alan Pim). London, 1932.

F. B. WILSON, District Agricultural Officer, 'Emergency Food Production in Zanzibar', *The East African Agricultural Journal*, Oct. 1944, pp. 93–100.

FOURTH PART

MAURITIUS AND SEYCHELLES

CHAPTER XV

MAURITIUS AND DEPENDENCIES

A. MAURITIUS[1]

I. CENSUS-TAKING

1. *1753–1810*

IN the early period census-taking was so interwoven with registration of the inhabitants, particularly the slaves, that I shall start by listing the various relevant Acts.

A. *Registration of Slaves*

(1) 9 April 1753. Act establishing a corporation of inhabitants. I have not found the text of this Act made under the régime of the French India Company by Acting Governor Bouvet. Pitot relates:[2]

> One of the first actions of M. Bouvet was the establishment of a corporation (*commune*) of inhabitants (9 April 1753) . . . which was altogether merely a kind of mutual assurance against the running away of slaves. Up till then the rigorous provisions of the law on this subject[3] tended only to repress the delicts and did not grant any compensation to the inhabitants when their runaway slaves were killed by the detachments sent in their pursuit. Agriculture, in particular, suffered from this state of affairs which the corporation remedied in the following manner: all slave-owners, without distinction—and the India Company on the same account—formed this corporation and were obliged to make a true and accurate statement of all their blacks,[4] on pain of having those who had not been declared confiscated and sold, one moiety to accrue to the informer and the other to the account of the corporation. This general census of the working population served as basis for a light tax imposed on the owners according to the number of their slaves and constituting together with the confiscations the funds out of which they would be indemnified for every black runaway killed or captured and sentenced to work in irons for life . . . .[5] The runaway slaves were likewise to be listed as such with the least

[1] The island was discovered in the early part of the sixteenth century by the Portuguese, who named it *Ilha da Cirnos*, or Swan Island. The Dutch took possession in 1598 and called the island Mauritius; they abandoned it in 1710. The French annexed it in 1715 and called it *Isle de France*. They surrendered it in 1810 to the British, who renamed it Mauritius.

[2] Pitot, *L'Ile de France (1715–1810)*, pp. 62–3.

[3] See Royal Edict of Dec. 1723 (*Code noir*), Delaleu, *Code des Iles de France et de Bourbon*, 2nd ed., pp. 247–52, No. 224. An English translation is given in *Returns of the Number of Government Slaves in Mauritius*, July 1828, pp. 12–19.

[4] The statement required by the Act of 1753 was to be made every year and was to contain the names of all negro slaves. See Bonnefoy, *Table générale pour servir aux recherches à faire au greffe de la Cour Suprême de l'Ile Maurice*, p. 394: 'Tout habitant est tenu de fournir annuellement au Secrétaire du Conseil supérieur un recensement contenant le nom de chaque noir, négresse, négrillon et négrillonne lui appartenant.'

[5] See also Toussaint, *Port-Louis (1735–1935)*, p. 60: 'The object of this corporation seems to have been originally to provide for the cost of capturing black runaways. When, towards

possible delay; otherwise their masters would not, should occasion arise, be entitled to claim the indemnity.[1]

(2) 16 September 1772. Regulation concerning the corporation of inhabitants.[2] This Regulation by the Superior Council of the island, though dealing mainly with runaway negroes re-enacted the earlier provisions concerning the registration of slaves. Each slave-holder was to furnish every six months on prescribed forms a list (*recensement*) in duplicate, of all his slaves on pain of a fine of 50 *livres*, and a higher fine in case of repetition. One copy was to be sent to the accountant (*receveur*) of the corporation who was to prepare a general list of the negroes living in the island at the end of each half year and to fix the contribution to be paid by the owner to the corporation for each slave without distinction of age.

XXIV. Each negro and negress, of whatever age and caste, who will not have been included in the list delivered by his or her master will, by right, be confiscated and sold to the profit of the corporation.

(3) 23 November 1784. Decision by the Superior Council, amending the Regulation of 16 September 1772.[3]

I. Article XXIV of the said Regulation is hereby repealed.

II. The inhabitants shall be bound to date the list of all their slaves as of 1 January of each year and to send it to the prefects of the quarters between the first and the fifteenth of said month at the latest, on pain of a fine of 50 *livres* to the profit of the corporation.

IV. Every inhabitant whose list will not be truthful shall pay a fine of 100 *livres* to the profit of the corporation for every black whom he will not have listed . . . .

V. The prefects of the districts of the island shall duly send at the end of the month of January to the general accountant of the corporation the lists which will have been furnished to them during the first fifteen days of the said month . . . . He will furnish to the Attorney-General of the King a summary of the said lists which will be made public by means of posters and gazettes . . . .[4]

B. *Registration of all Inhabitants*

(1) 11 August 1762. Order dividing the island into eight Districts and providing for the appointment of a syndic for each District. It was con-

the end of the Royal [French] Government escapes had at last been checked, the revenues were devoted almost exclusively to the maintenance of roads, bridges, and canals.' See also ibid., p. 145. For details concerning the taxes imposed on the owners according to the number of their slaves see also, for example, Delaleu, pp. 279–80, 282, Nos. 263, 265 (Ordinances of 12 Dec. 1786 and 1 May 1787).

[1] Pitot gives as his source 'Registry of the Supreme Court, Reg. 8, Nos. 140, 154'. According to Bonnefoy, *Table*, pp. 106, 394, No. 140 is an Act of 9 Apr. 1753, and No. 154 an Act of 12 Apr. 1756 (containing 'other provisions on this subject'). It seems, therefore, that Pitot's description refers to both these Acts.

[2] Delaleu, pp. 229–31, No. 191.

[3] Ibid., p. 277, No. 260. Both Delaleu (2nd ed., p. 296) and Rouillard (*Collection of the Laws of Mauritius*, vol. i, p. 395) give as date 3 Nov. But this must be a mistake, since the Preamble mentions an indictment of 10 Nov. and an Order of the 12th inst. Delaleu, in the 2nd Supplement to the 1st ed. (p. 134; Appendix, p. 25), and Bonnefoy (p. 394) give as date 23 Nov.

[4] This Act was apparently the first to provide for the publication of the results of slave censuses. Bonnefoy, p. 394, lists two supplementary Orders of 3 May 1785 and 7 Aug. 1786. See furthermore, for example, Decree of 1 Pluviose Year XII (22 Jan. 1804), *Code Decaen* (*Recueil complet des Lois et Réglemens de l'Ile Maurice*, vol. i, Part IV), pp. 50–4, No. 47.

firmed by Orders of 19 July 1766 and 23 December 1767.[1] I have not found the text of these Orders, and the scanty reports about the statistical records the syndics had to keep are conflicting. Toussaint says that by the Order of 1762 'the syndic was entrusted with obtaining in January of each year from the inhabitants the lists of their slaves and their livestock'.[2] This would suggest that the statements regarding population were again confined to slaves. But Pitot, in his description of the tasks of the syndics, says:

> They were obliged to take every year a general census of the free and slave population; they had likewise to prepare after every harvest an account of the quantity and the kinds of grain harvested. They kept a special register for all the notifications of runaway slaves, and a second register for the notifications of deaths.[3]

A King's Ordinance of 1 August 1768[4] abolished the chamber of syndics and invested the commanders of Districts with the functions of the chamber of syndics. The statements concerning the negro slaves prescribed by the Act of 1753 remained obligatory. As regards the whites another King's Ordinance of 1 August 1768,[5] which established a militia and subdivided the island into 11 Districts[6] (promulgated in the Isle of France on 15 June 1769), provided:

> XXVIII. All the inhabitants[7] . . . shall send to the commander of the District at the time of the inspections[8] their declarations, showing their age, their names, and their rank . . . everything having to be forwarded to the Governor.

C. *Population Records leading to Censuses*

(1) 1 September 1772. Regulations by the General and the Intendant, concerning the owners or chief tenants of the houses in the town of Port Louis.[9]

It being necessary to afford to Police officers in the town of Port Louis the means of more easily preserving good order, and being desirous of preventing the disturbances which might hereafter arise therein, in virtue of the powers conferred upon us by the King, we have ruled and ordered, and we do rule and order as follows:

I.—Every house owner[10] or the chief tenant thereof, shall be bound to send, without delay, to the Police office a written statement mentioning his name and the names of the persons residing in his house, and the number of slaves belonging

[1] See Preamble to King's Ordinance of 1 Aug. 1768 (promulgated in the Isle of France 14 June 1769): 'His Majesty, having been informed that there has been created in the Isle of France, by an Order of the Superior Council of the said island of 11 August 1762, a chamber of syndics to which have been assigned all the municipal functions and numerous other functions relating to the general policing of the said Colony; that this chamber was confirmed by a second Order of 19 July 1766; finally, that the same Superior Council, in confirming it a third time by another Order of 23 December 1767 regulated its form anew . . . .' (Delaleu, pp. 5–6, No. 4.)

[2] Toussaint, p. 59.

[3] Pitot, *L'Ile de France (1715-1810)*, p. 80.

[4] Delaleu, pp. 5–6, No. 4.

[5] Ibid., pp. 32–6, No. 22.

[6] A King's Ordinance of 30 July 1773, promulgated in the Isle of France on 11 Oct. 1774 (ibid., p. 237, No. 203), subdivided the island again into 8 Districts.

[7] This apparently refers only to the males from 15 to 55 years.

[8] The inspections were to be made every year in January and July.

[9] Delaleu, p. 227, No. 188. (Toussaint, p. 71, says erroneously that this regulation is not reprinted in the second edition of Delaleu.) An English translation, from which I quote, is given in Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 252–5.

[10] Rouillard says erroneously 'house-holder'.

to him and to the persons residing in the same house; this written statement shall be stamped with the number of the said house.

II.—He shall be bound likewise to give within twenty four hours at the Police office, the names and ranks of the persons who may come to reside with him and to do the same with respect to persons leaving the lodgings occupied by them in his house.

We order Police officers to see that the present regulations be duly complied with; and the present regulations shall be read, published and posted up wherever it shall be necessary so to do, in order that no one may be ignorant of the same.

As Article II was not properly observed, an Ordinance of 1 November 1772[1] stipulated:

II.—Every house-owner or chief lessee of a house contravening the provisions of this article shall be condemned, for the first offence, to a fine of fifty 'livres'; and in cases of repetition of the same offence, to a fine of one hundred 'livres', to be applied to the use of the corporation (*commune*) established in this island . . . .

(2) 23 February 1775. An Ordinance re-enacting the Regulation of 1 September 1772.[2]

Upon the representations which have been made to us that the police inspectors charged with effecting the census of the persons resident in Port-Louis as well as that of the slaves belonging to them have not yet succeeded in giving to this work all the perfection it needs, either because in the course of the tours by the inspectors it sometimes happens that nobody is present, or because in the private houses, and where the workers are lodged, these are either absent or at their work, and because it also occurs that the greater part of the proprietors do not know the true names of their tenants, nor the places from which they come, or, finally, because the said inspectors, even in the exercise of their functions, have sometimes met with a flat refusal in trying to obtain the information for which they asked;

Whereas it is necessary to remedy these abuses which are the more dangerous as, if they became perpetual, they might occasion the greatest disorders through the facilities which the persons interested in not being known would have of evading the vigilance of the police; in virtue of the powers granted us by the King, we have ruled and ordered, and we do rule and order as follows:

Art. I. All persons, whatever their rank or condition, residing within the full extent of the town of Port-Louis, shall be bound to send to the Police office of this town, a fortnight after the publication of this Ordinance, a list which shall be stamped with the number of the house of the proprietor and which shall contain his names and ranks, and the date of his arrival in this Colony, the name of the ship which shall have brought him, whether he is married, and whether he has children; the said list shall also contain the names of the slaves both males and females, belonging to each of the said masters or proprietors.

II. All proprietors of houses or chief lessees shall also in future, within the first fortnight of January in each year, furnish a similar statement to the Police office notifying the changes which may have occurred in their families or regarding their servants; on pain of a fine, imposed on the contravening parties, of one hundred *livres*, of which one-third shall be applied to the repairs of the parish church of St. Louis in this island, another third to the corporation (*commune*) established on this island, and the remaining third shall accrue to the informer of the neglects which may be committed in the execution of this Ordinance and even the inaccuracies which may slip into the lists of the individuals.[3]

[1] Delaleu, p. 234, No. 195; Rouillard, vol. I, pp. 270-3. [2] Delaleu, p. 242, No. 216.

[3] Article III ordered that Art. II of the regulation of 1 Sept. 1772 be strictly observed. I found no evidence that this Ordinance applied to the whole Colony, but according to Bourde de la Rogerie, *Les Bretons aux Iles de France et de Bourbon* (1934), this seems to have been the case. He says (p. 329): 'The census of the Isle of France in 1776 . . . provides the most precise data on

(3) 24 December 1779. An Ordinance stipulating, among other things, that the lists of inhabitants be furnished henceforward every year.[1]

IX.—All owners of houses or chief lessees thereof, residing in this town, whatever may be their rank or condition, shall be bound to send to the Police office, within the first fifteen days of January in each year, a list which shall be stamped with the number of their houses, which said list shall also contain their names, surnames, ages, designations and residences, and those of their wives and children, if they have any, the date of their arrival in this island, the name of the ship which shall have brought them, and the number of slaves owned by them, together with their names, sexes, ages and qualifications, on pain as to contravening parties of a fine of one hundred 'livres', of which one third shall be applied to the use of the said parochial assembly,[2] another third to the corporation (*commune*), and the remaining third shall accrue to the informer.

D. *Censuses*

12 December 1786. An Ordinance providing for censuses to be taken every year on 1 January in the Colony.[3] This Ordinance which was chiefly issued in order to ensure more fair taxation does not differ essentially from the Ordinance of 1779 for Port Louis. Even so I consider it to be the first real census ordinance because it contains the following article:

I. Every year, beginning 1 January next, the accountant of the corporation in every District shall send, for distribution to each inhabitant, the census forms (*feuilles de recensement*), corresponding to the attached model, which they shall be bound to fill in.[4]

Numerous supplementary and amending Orders were issued prior to the end of the French régime.[5]

As regards the completeness of an early slave census, Bourde de la Rogerie relates:

The author of the census of the Isle of France in 1776 noted that the colonists

the state of the Colony; it gives for every head of household his age, his country of origin, his occupation and the date of his arrival in the Colony, the name and the native country of his wife, the names and age of his children; finally, it shows the number of his horses and mules, of his cattle, his poultry, and the area of his land, cultivated or uncultivated. There are no parishes in France for which we have such abundant information.'

[1] Delaleu, pp. 264–5, No. 242; Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 336–41.

[2] i.e. *la fabrique de l'église de la paroisse de Port-Louis.*

[3] Delaleu, pp. 278–9, No. 262.

[4] Delaleu does not reproduce the model.

[5] In many cases I found merely references but in some cases the full text. I shall list here the Orders chronologically:

28 Sept. 1787. 'The inhabitants who have not furnished their declarations shall be sentenced to the fine fixed for this purpose by the Regulations' (Bonnefoy, *Table*, p. 394).

1 Dec. 1788. 'Other Order containing the same provisions' (ibid.).

14 Jan. 1790. 'Same' (ibid.).

26 Apr. 1793. Order 'ordering all citizens in the Colony to make a declaration of their persons and property' (Rouillard, vol. i, p. 487).

1 Aug. 1793. Act concerning the municipal and correctional police (reprinted in *Code Decaen*, pp. 245–57, No. 217). This Act prescribed that both in the towns and the rural areas the municipalities shall take an annual census of the citizens; see also Toussaint, p. 150.

5 Floréal Year IV [24 Apr. 1796]. 'Regulations concerning declarations to be furnished by the citizens' (Bonnefoy, p. 394).

5 Messidor Year XI [24 June 1803]. Order 'enacting penalties against persons not inserting their names correctly in the lists intended for the census of the population' (Rouillard, vol. i, p. 831; see also Bonnefoy, p. 395).

made great efforts to conceal part of their property in slaves and that perhaps a thousand should be added to the number returned.[1]

Later censuses were much more defective.

It has been realized that several causes, particularly the carelessness of a number of owners and the desire to escape taxes and the provision of labour have at all times led to many inaccuracies in the slave censuses, particularly since 1790. The omissions were estimated at one-quarter by several administrators, but this was an exaggeration.[2]

The Collector of Internal Revenues reported on 7 March 1827:

The annual Census is an institution of long standing. In first establishing and since supporting it, the Colonial Government appears to have had several objects in view connected with the population, and with the general state of the Colony; but the chief of these objects has, no doubt, been the raising of the Public Revenue, of which the capitation taxes upon slaves have long formed a principal part.

But from the commencement, it cannot, I apprehend, be stated that this object has at any period been fulfilled in a perfect manner. The Returns of the slave proprietors have never been considered accurate.[3]

Finally, Governor Farquhar said in 1829:

. . . General Decain [*sic*] left a minute in his own hand-writing, in the archives, setting forth that, from his own private knowledge, the slave population at the time of his surrender of the island amounted to upwards of 80,000, although the returns to the collector of taxes stated them to amount to only 60,000; the difference consisting in the aged and the children incapable of work, for whom they were unwilling to pay.[4]

Whether the returns of the general censuses or of the slave censuses, taken under the French régime, were always statistically analysed it is impossible to tell. D'Unienville, the archivist of the Colony who spent many years in assembling all statistics available in the island, showed the results of the general censuses of 1767, 1777, 1787, 1797, and 1807 (distinguishing whites, free coloured, and slaves) and in addition the number of slaves for 1783, 1786, 1790, 1800, 1806, 1808, and 1809.[5] De Rauville published in detail the results of the general censuses of 1782, 1785, and 1788.[6] Prentout showed the results of the censuses taken in 1803–7, as reported by the *administrateurs généraux*.[7] Milbert published in detail the results of the general census of 1806 and of the slave census of 1808.[8] Governor Farquhar, in a dispatch to the Earl of Liverpool, dated 8 January 1811[9]), gave details of the slave census of 1809.[10]

[1] Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 297.

[2] D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice* (1825) MS., C.O. 172, vol. xlii, p. 25.

[3] *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), p. 4.

[4] Letter to Under-Secretary of State R. W. Hay, 3 Feb. 1829, *Correspondence between Farquhar and Colonial Department* (1829), pp. 4–5. See also *Mémoire pour les Habitans de l'Ile Maurice par un Colon* (1836), p. 7.

[5] See D'Unienville, C.O. 172, vol. xlii, pp. 33 5.

[6] See de Rauville, 'Population de l'Ile de France de 1782 à 1788' (1890), pp. 1–3. His figures for slaves in 1782, 1785, and 1788 are the same as those given by D'Unienville for the beginning of 1783, 1786, and 1790.

[7] See Prentout, *L'Ile de France sous Decaen*, p. 650.

[8] See Milbert, *Voyage pittoresque à l'Ile-de-France* (1812), vol. ii, p. 233 *Bis, Ter.*

[9] See *Papers and Communications relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 5.

[10] The Commissioner of the 1921 census was certainly mistaken when he said: 'Statistics of Population are not numerous previous to the British occupation . . .' (*Census Report 1921*, p. 1).

2. *1811–37*

The capitulation of 3 December 1810[1] stipulated: 'The inhabitants shall preserve their religion, laws and customs.'[2] The continuity, so far as slave censuses are concerned, appears from the following Order of 24 January 1811:[3]

All inhabitants and other slave owners who are in arrears are ordered to furnish their declarations (*recensements*) for the preceding years, including 1810, so as to comply with the law concerning direct taxes, and they are granted time until 15 March 1811 to deliver their census forms at the following places . . . .

All inhabitants and other slave owners are likewise ordered to pay their overdue taxes, up to and including 1810, within the aforesaid period, and to deliver their declarations for the year 1811 between now and 30 April next . . . .

The general annual censuses prescribed by the Ordinance of 12 December 1786 were also continued under the British régime. On 28 July 1812 Governor Farquhar transmitted to the Earl of Liverpool the returns of the census of 1811 (including the last slave census).

Appendix, N° 1, is the Official Report of the population, according to the last returns; these, however, appear to be very inaccurate. The annual recensements are so defective, that the administration has not derived from them the utility which might be expected.[4]

Slave censuses in the same manner as in 1811 were taken in 1812, 1813, and 1814.[5] But the Administration was not satisfied with the results,[6] and on 8 April 1814 Governor Farquhar wrote to Earl Bathurst:

In pursuing the most effectual means for the legal enforcement of the Abolition

[1] Rouillard, vol. iii, pp. 2–9.

[2] See also Proclamation of 5 Dec. 1810 (ibid., pp. 8–11) which began: 'The present Proclamation has for its object to inform all persons inhabiting the said Colony, whether Europeans, or Creoles, planters, traders, freemen, &c. &c., that the Regulations hitherto adopted for the Civil Administration of Justice and Police shall be maintained.'

[3] French text, *Code Farquhar* (*Recueil complet des Lois et Réglemens de l'Ile Maurice*, vol. i, Part V), p. 10, No. 21.

[4] C.O. 167, vol. x, Appendix No. 1, '*Etat Général de la population de l'Ile Maurice pour l'année 1811, Extrait de Recensemens fournis par les habitans de cette Ile*', shows the results for each District. The figures for the capital and for the whole island read as follows:

Population	*Districts*	*Men resident and taxable*	*Women and widows*	*Children*	*Total*
White . .	Port Louis	1,511	605	1,247	3,363
	Mauritius	3,024	1,501	3,118	7,643
Free . .	Faubourg de l'Est	277	433	923	1,633
	Faubourg de l'Ouest	141	743	1,482	2,366
	Mauritius	1,266	2,407	4,913	8,586
Slave . .	Port Louis	..	..	..	8,500
	Faubourg de l'Est	..	..	..	898
	Faubourg de l'Ouest	..	..	..	1,867
	Mauritius	..	..	..	59,734

The figures for Whites in Port Louis are identical with those given by Milbert for 1806 and undoubtedly refer to that year. No free [Coloured] are shown for Port Louis proper, but it is possible that they lived practically all in the suburbs; see p. 761 below.

[5] According to Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice* (*1810–1823*), p. 82, these censuses were taken in January.

[6] The Collector of Internal Revenues, after having pointed out that under the French Administration 'the Returns of the slave proprietors have never been considered accurate' (see p. 712 above),

Acts, I have issued a proclamation, subjoined, by which the tax rolls of the inhabitants being converted into exact registers of all the slaves and free blacks of the colonies, and their transition from hand to hand in the interchange and transfer of property, we shall insure the discovery and means of tracing any introduction of blacks, in contravention to the law, which may be effected.

This I have every reason to hope will be a most powerful check, if it do not entirely frustrate any attempt to practise such daring violations of the law; and its operation will not subject the planters to danger, or give cause for discontent.

It will also produce a direct increase of revenue in proportion to the improved accuracy of the tax-rolls, which will enable me, without injury to the finances of the colony, to hold out to the planters another inducement to the extensive practice of vaccination, by exempting children under a certain age from the payment of the capitation tax, on proof being administered of their having undergone the process of vaccination.

These tax-rolls are issued every year; and should your lordship deem it expedient to increase the weight of the penalties, or render the obligations more rigorous or extensive, I should gladly receive your lordship's specific directions on this important point.[1]

The main provisions of the Proclamation dated 11 April 1814[2] were as follows:

Considering that the annual census of the slave population has always been deemed an essential part of the administration of the colonies, not only for the purpose of securing the fiscal duties, but also as a measure of internal police; that under present circumstances it is still more important to require, in the census of slaves, that exactness which every inhabitant is bound to give to it.

We have ordered as follows:

Article First: From the first to the thirty-first of May next, each inhabitant, whether proprietor, farmer, or trustee, shall furnish a fresh census of all the slaves in their possession; consequently those that have already been furnished for the present year 1814, remain of non-effect.

This census, agreeably to the statements which will be distributed by the commissary of police in the different quarters, and for Port Louis, at the office of General Police, shall be furnished by triplicate, the one to be directed to the chief commissary of the general police at Port Louis, the second to be deposited with the civil commissary of each quarter, and the third to be handed to each inhabitant after having been attested and signed by the civil commissary, and for Port Louis by the chief commissary of the general police, after the verification hereafter enjoined.

An exact and precise mention shall be made in the said census of the negroes who may have died, and of those born since the date of the last census, as well as of the negroes included in the last census, who may have been sold, and the purchaser's name; those who have been bought since the same period, and the name of the vendor.

With respect to all slaves to be included in the census, mention must be made of any change that may have taken place in their names.

For each negroe whose death, birth or change of name will not have been mentioned in the census, a fine shall be imposed of five dollars or 50 livres.

For the negroes who may have been bought or sold without any mention being made of the same, either by the buyer or seller, a fine shall be imposed of ten dollars upon each party.

said: 'Since the Capture, they have certainly not been so. Subsequently to that event, during the first years, whilst every thing as yet remained in an unsettled state, it is not surprising that many persons should have failed to furnish their Returns, and also that many of the Returns furnished should have been inaccurate' (*Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, 1828, pp. 4–5). See also Toussaint, *Missions d'Adrien d'Epinay* (1946), p. 134.

[1] *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 84.

[2] Reproduced ibid., pp. 86–8.

Article 2: After the expiration of the above mentioned delay, and within eight days following, without further delay, the civil commissaries of the several quarters shall send to the chief commissary of general police at Port Louis, for the purpose of being delivered to the King's attorney-general, a statement of all the inhabitant proprietors of slaves, farmers, or trustees, who may not have furnished the census required by the first article. The chief commissary of general police will add a like statement respecting the census to be furnished by the inhabitants of Port Louis.

The fine incurred by those who may not have complied with the first article shall be twenty dollars.

It shall be fifty dollars for those who, after having been subsequently required, by the civil commissaries of the different quarters, and at Port Louis by the chief commissary of general police, to furnish the census, with not having complied within eight days with the requisition.

Lastly, those of the inhabitants proprietors, farmers or trustees, who, after having been again called upon, may have again allowed eight days to elapse, without rendering the said census, are to be considered in the same light as those inhabitants who may furnish an untrue census, and shall be subject, with respect to their negroe slaves not entered in the census, to the punishments and fines to be decreed by the 3d and 4th Articles hereafter.

Article 3: Every negroe slave not included in the census required by Article 1st, shall be confiscated to the state, to be employed upon the public roads, if the proprietor, farmer or trustee, does not afford proof that the said negroe was in his possession, or was in existence in either of the two islands [Mauritius and Bourbon] at the date of or previously to the 2d December 1810.

Article 4: With the exception of the case provided for in the said Article 3, the fine shall be twenty times the amount of the duty imposed upon each head of slave, for those that may have been left out of the census.

In case of relapse on the part of the same proprietor, farmer or trustee, they become subject to the confiscation of all the slaves not entered in the census.

Article 8: For the future, and commencing from the 1st of January in the year 1815, all that has been directed by Articles 1, 2 and 7, shall take place during the month of January in each year, and in the three first weeks of the month of February following.

The time limits fixed in this Proclamation proved to be too short, and they were extended by a Proclamation of 5 July 1814.[1] On 10 March 1815 Governor Farquhar issued a Proclamation[2] concerning the slave census of 1815, ordered 'until the gracious orders of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, on this subject, shall be known in an immediate and positive manner'.

The annual Census was commenced but not completed, and no Returns for this year exist in this office; and in the month of April a Proclamation was issued by the Colonial Government, rendering the Tax Rolls for 1814 applicable to the levy of the taxes for 1815.[3]

In the meantime the Prince Regent had made on 24 September 1814 an Order in Council for the Registration of Slaves in Mauritius.[4] It pro-

[1] French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 88–9, No. 144.

[2] French text ibid., pp. 104–5, No. 161.

[3] 'Return of the Slave Population of the Isle of France', dated Internal Revenues Office, Port Louis, 7 Mar. 1827, *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, pp. 4–5. The Proclamation referred to was issued on 25 Apr.; see Bonnefoy, p. 245.

[4] *The Original Order in Council for the Registration of Slaves*. This Order comprises about 15,000 words; to it is attached the model of a filled-up schedule. Governor Farquhar had himself planned the establishment of such a registry; see his Dispatch of 18 Nov. 1814 to Earl Bathurst (*Papers relative to the Slave Trade 1811–1817*, pp. 99–100).

vided for the *establishment of a public registry*;[1] the publication of the Order at the Isle of France;[2] the appointment of a registrar of slaves; the accommodation of the registry; *the books to be kept by the registrar*; *the return of schedules or lists by the possessors of slaves*; the entry of the particulars in the registry books; *the delivery of certified copies of the entries in the registry books*; *the inspection of the entries*; *delayed registration*; the closing and authenticating of the primary registration ('which shall thenceforth be called "The original Registry of the Slaves of the Isle of France and its Dependencies"'); an alphabetical index of all slaves registered and of the plantations and owners' names; duplicates of the books of original registry and the indexes; the *Annual Return of slaves*; the examination of these annual returns by the registrar and their registration in the registry books; the *fees of the registrar; special checks on returns of new imported slaves*; *the registration of delayed annual returns*; *the preparation of an abstract of the annual returns*; a duplicate of the abstract; the transmittal of the original abstract to His Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonial Department in England; the dealing with complaints of persons aggrieved by default or misconduct of the registrar; *the abandonment of other annual returns of slaves*; the penalties for offences by the registrar, his deputy, assistant, or clerk; *the penalties for offences by the possessors of slaves*; the liabilities of tenants, mortgagees, mortgagors, and trustees, &c., in possession of slaves; penalties for holding in slavery coloured persons illegally imported; the admission of slaves as witnesses; the receipt in court of certified extracts from registry books; *the fees of the registrar for certificates and searches*; the prohibition of the registrar to own slaves and to absent himself from the island without leave.

The main provisions of the Order in Council read as follows:

WHEREAS it is deemed expedient to provide more effectually for the prevention of the illegal and clandestine importation of Slaves into the Isle of France and its dependencies; it is therefore this day ordered by His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, in the name and on the behalf of His Majesty, and by and with the advice of His Majesty's Privy Council;--

That there shall be established within the Isle of France a public registry, for the registration and enrolment of the names and descriptions of all Negroes, Mulattoes and Mustees, who now are, or at any time hereafter shall be held in a state of slavery within the said island and its dependencies, and of the births and deaths of all such slaves.

And it is hereby further ordered, that the said registrar shall forthwith provide two large blank paper books, strongly and durably bound, for the purpose of the registry and enrolment hereinafter directed, one of which books shall be intituled 'Registry of Plantation Slaves,' and the other 'Registry of Personal Slaves;' in which said first-mentioned book shall be entered and registered, as hereinafter directed, the names and descriptions of all slaves which belong to, and are usually worked or employed upon any particular plantation or plantations within the said island; and in the other of which said books shall be entered and registered in like manner the names and descriptions of all slaves employed in domestic labour, or in any handicraft, art or trade within the said island, or in manning or navigating any

[1] The provisions in italics are shown below.

[2] For many years after the capitulation the island was called either the Mauritius or the Isle of France.

vessels or boats belonging to the ports of the said island, or which are let or hired by their owners for the purpose of agricultural labour, commonly called task-work, on plantations not belonging to the owners of such slaves, and in general all slaves within or belonging to the said island, which are not attached to any particular plantation or plantations, and therewith owned, held or possessed; all which several descriptions of slaves shall for the purposes of this Order be distinguished from plantation slaves, by the general name of Personal Slaves.

And it is hereby further ordered, that within three calendar months from and after the public notification of this Order in the Isle of France as aforesaid, every person who shall then be resident in the island or its dependencies, and who shall be in possession of any plantation slaves or slave within the said island or its dependencies . . . , or who then shall own or possess any slave or slaves whatsoever within the said island or its dependencies, whatever his tenure of or title to the same may be, shall respectively make and deliver upon oath to the registrar so to be appointed, such schedules, lists and particulars in writing, subscribed by him, her or them, to be called his or her Original Return of Slaves, as are hereinafter mentioned; (that is to say), every person in possession of any plantation as aforesaid, shall so make and return a schedule or list in writing for each plantation within the said island or its dependencies, of which he or she shall be then in possession in any of the rights or characters aforesaid, therein specifying, in the first place, the name by which the plantation is usually called or known, and when two or more plantations are held and occupied together by the same person, and cultivated by the same body or gang of negro slaves, the names of each of the said plantations so jointly held and cultivated, and in what parish, quarter or other division of the said island or its dependencies every such plantation is situated, and whether the same is a sugar plantation, or a coffee or cotton plantation, or of what other description; and in the next place, the name or names of the present owner or owners of such plantation or plantations, as well as of the person or persons then in possession of the same and making such return, and the right or character in which he, she or they then held such possession . . .; and when the property or possession of any such plantation has been changed within seven years prior to such return thereof, then the said schedule shall also mention the name of the late owner or proprietor, and in whose tenure or occupation the same lately was; and every person making a return of any slave or slaves not attached or belonging to any plantation in the said island or its dependencies, hereby called 'personal slaves,' shall so return a list or schedule in writing, containing in the first place his own name and description, or the name and description of such other person or persons being the owner or owners of such slave or slaves on whose behalf the return is made, and the right or character in which he, she or they then hold possession of and claim title to such slave or slaves . . .; and if such personal slave or slaves shall have been purchased or acquired within seven years prior to such return, then the name or names of the seller or former owner thereof; and after such descriptions as aforesaid of such plantation, and of the owner or owners of such personal slaves respectively in the said schedule, the parties making the said returns shall proceed to name, describe and enumerate distinctly thereon the several Negro, Mulatto or other slaves then attached or belonging to the same plantation, or to the same owner or owners, by distinct lists in manner following; that is to say, in the first place, such schedule shall contain a list of all slaves who have husbands or wives, either by actual marriage or known and constant cohabitation, or who have parents or children, brothers or sisters among the slaves of the said plantation, or of the same owner or owners, which list shall be intituled 'The List of Families and Slaves on the Plantation of A.B.' (inserting the proper name of the plantation, or 'of C.D. the owner of personal slaves,' as the case may be); and the said list shall be divided into as many sections as there are different families to be inserted therein, and each section shall be intituled 'The Family of A.B.' inserting the name of the superior relation, or where there are only brothers or other relations of the same degree, the name of the elder individual; and each of the said

schedules shall also contain two other lists, in one of which shall be inserted the names of such male slaves, and in the other of such female slaves, as have no wives or husbands, parents or children, brothers or sisters among the slaves of the same plantation, or the same owner or owners; which lists shall be respectively intituled, 'General List of Male Slaves,' and 'General List of Female Slaves,' on the plantation of A.B. (inserting the proper name of the plantation), or 'belonging to C.D.' as the case may be.

And all the slaves attached to or belonging to the same plantation, or the same owner or owners, shall be named and described in the said schedule respectively, in the particular lists or sections to which they respectively belong, in the manner and form following; (that is to say),

The schedule or paper containing each of the said lists shall be divided into eight perpendicular columns of convenient breadths respectively, intituled at the heads thereof, Names, Surnames, Colours, Employment, Age, Stature, Country, and Marks; to which shall be added, in the lists of families, a ninth column, of convenient breadth, intituled Relations; and the more clearly to distinguish the description of each particular slave, as many horizontal lines, with convenient spaces between them, shall be drawn across the said perpendicular lines or columns, as are equal in number to the number of slaves to be inserted in each list.[1]

And it is further hereby ordered, that within three calendar months, to be computed from the time hereinbefore appointed for the making and delivery of the said returns or schedules, every return or schedule that shall have been duly made and delivered to the said registrar, or any of his said deputies, shall by him, his clerks or assistants, be entered and copied in a fair, distinct and legible manner, in the proper book to be by the said registrar appointed for the registry and enrolment of slaves as aforesaid . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that an office copy, certified as such by the said registrar, of the registry of slaves belonging to any plantation, or to any particular owner or owners, shall at the request and charge of the owner or owners, or party or parties who made the return, be made and delivered to him, her or them by the said registrar, and for which there shall be charged no more than at the rate of one penny sterling for every slave therein named; and all persons shall have free liberty to inspect the said register books, in the presence of the registrar or his assistants, for the purpose of ascertaining that the returns and lists by them, or on their behalf delivered, have been accurately registered in manner aforesaid.

And it is hereby further ordered, that when and so soon as all the original returns or schedules, which shall have been delivered to the said registrar pursuant to this Order, shall have been fairly entered and registered as aforesaid, which shall be done and completed within the term of six calendar months from and after the first public notification of this Order in the Isle of France aforesaid, the registrar shall give notice thereof forthwith to the governor, lieutenant-governor, or other person having the chief civil command under His Majesty within the said island for the time being: and such governor, lieutenant-governor, or commander-in-chief, shall thereupon publickly notify to the inhabitants of the said island and its dependencies, in such manner as he shall deem most fit and effectual, that the registry of slaves is ready to be verified before him, as far as respects the original registry of slaves now within the said island and its dependencies, or belonging thereto, and is and will continue open at the proper office, for the inspection of all persons who have made returns of slaves for insertion therein, for the term of two calendar months from the date of such notification, to the intent that they may be satisfied of the accuracy of the

[1] Here followed detailed instructions concerning the filling-up of each column. To quote one example: 'In the seventh of the said columns shall be inserted, not only whether the slave is an African or Creole negro, but if an African, the name of the country or district of Africa from which he or she was brought, and if a Creole slave, the name of the island or colony in which such slave was born, or from which he or she was brought, according to the best of the knowledge or information and belief of the owner or other party making the return.'

said registry; and that if any owners or possessors of slaves, within or belonging to the said island, have, from any accident or unavoidable impediment, hitherto omitted to return proper schedules or lists of their slaves into the said registry, as by this order required, they must immediately apply to the said governor, lieutenant-governor, or civil commander-in-chief, who, upon satisfactory proof that such omission has not been wilful, has power to make an order for the admission and registration of their returns or schedules by the registrar; but that if this remedy is not taken, so as to obtain such registration within the said term of two months, the omission cannot afterwards be supplied.

And it is hereby further ordered, that after the expiration of twelve calendar months, to be computed from the time when the said original registry shall be completed and authenticated as aforesaid, on the 1st day of January, or within thirty days after that day in every year, every person resident in the said island or its dependencies, who shall be in possession of any plantation within the same . . . , or who shall own or possess any slave or slaves whatsoever within the said island or its dependencies, whatsoever his or her tenure of or title to the same may be, shall make and deliver upon oath to the registrar of slaves for the time being, an account or schedule in writing, by him or her subscribed, to be called, 'The Annual Return of Slaves,' containing a true and particular account of all births and deaths of plantation slaves upon or belonging to the plantation for which, and of personal slaves belonging to the person or persons on whose behalf such annual return is made, within the year preceding; or in the case of the first of such annual returns, within the year and portion of a year that shall have elapsed since the said original returns were made; and also an account of all deductions from or additions to the former stock of slaves belonging to such plantation, or to such person or persons within the same periods, by other means than deaths or births, whether the same shall have happened by permanent desertion, sale, or other transfer of property, or enfranchisement, or by the return of fugitive slaves, formerly registered as permanent deserters, or by purchase, succession, reversion, or other lawful acquisition, within the said island, or lawful importation from other British colonies, which particular cause or mode of deduction or addition shall in all cases be distinctly specified in such annual returns; and in cases of purchase, or other acquisition or sale, or other transfer or manumission of slaves formerly registered, the registered name and description of every such newly purchased, or acquired, or transferred, or manumitted slave, and of his or her former plantation, owner or owners, shall also be set forth at large in such annual return; and in respect of infant slaves formerly registered, or slaves who had not at the time of the original registration thereof attained to their full stature, the said annual returns shall specify their then existing stature, by actual measurement, and shall also state and describe any distinguishing bodily defect or deformity, the effect of accident or disease, which may have materially altered the former description of any slaves, under the title of 'Marks,' since the last return, with the causes of any such alteration; and every such annual return shall also contain all such further particulars, in respect of every newly acquired slave named therein, as are hereinbefore directed to be contained in the said original returns; and when by the death of the owner, or any other cause, there shall have been, within the period to which the return relates, any change of property in, and possession of any personal slave, from the owner or owners under whose names the same were registered, to any new owner or owners, such change of property and possession shall also be mentioned in the said annual returns; and such annual returns shall also state the whole number of slaves then belonging to the plantation, owner or owners, mentioned in such returns . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that the said registrar shall be entitled to demand and receive for registering every return of slaves by him registered the sum of ten shillings sterling money, and the further sum of one shilling like money for every slave mentioned or described in every such return, and no more, to be paid by the party or parties making such return; provided always, that no slave so returned as

new imported into the said island shall be registered, nor shall any return containing any slave or slaves so described be received as a correct return, unless it shall appear by a certificate from the collector or chief officer of the customs, as well as by the affidavit in writing of the importer or party making such return (which certificate and affidavit shall always be brought into and filed in the registry within twenty-one days from the time of the importation of any such slave or slaves), that such slave or slaves was or were lawfully imported with regular certificates from some other British colony . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that no annual return of slaves shall on any pretext be received to be registered, after the said time hereinbefore limited, (to wit) the first day of February in each year; but if any owner or owners, possessor or possessors of slaves within the said island or its dependencies, shall have omitted to make his, her or their return thereof in any year, at or before the said annual period, and if such owner or owners, possessor or possessors, or any other person, who at the time of such omission was or shall have since become the owner or possessor, whether in his own right or in the right of any other person or persons as aforesaid, of any slave or slaves so omitted to be returned, shall at the time of making his or their next annual return, make oath before the said registrar, and prove to his satisfaction by such other credible evidence, as from the nature of the case may be reasonably expected and required, that such omission was not wilful, but arose from some specified accident, or other unavoidable impediment, or from the neglect or default of some person or persons, other than the true and absolute owner of the said slave or slaves, who was in possession thereof at the time of such neglect of default, it shall be lawful for such party or parties, so making his, her or their return for the next following year, with the consent of the said registrar, to insert in such return for the next following year (but not afterwards), such account as is hereinbefore directed of the births and deaths, and of all other deductions from or additions to the stock of slaves, in respect of which such return is made, which happened within the two last preceding years, distinguishing nevertheless the respective deductions and additions in each year . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that on or before the first day of March in each year the said registrar shall carefully make out a general account or abstract of all the annual returns that shall have been made and registered in that year as aforesaid, wherein shall be inserted, in alphabetical order, in two divisions, the one containing plantation slaves, and the other personal slaves, the effect of each annual return, according to the registration thereof, (to wit) the registered names of the plantations or owners, the numbers of births and deaths of slaves, with their names and descriptions, and the amount and particulars of all other deductions or additions, respectively specified in each return; and also the whole remaining or existing number of slaves, then appearing by the registry to belong to such plantation or owner, for which or whom the return has been made . . . .

And it is hereby ordered, that from and after the opening of the public registry of slaves hereby established, it shall not be necessary for any master or owner of slaves within the said island or its dependencies, to make out any other annual list or return of slaves than that hereby required, any previous law or ordinance or proclamation to the contrary notwithstanding.

And it is hereby further ordered, that if any person or persons making any such original or annual return of slaves as aforesaid, shall falsely and wilfully insert therein any name or names, description or descriptions of any slave or slaves, or pretended slave or slaves belonging to any plantation or plantations, owner or owners, knowing that such slave or slaves, or pretended slave or slaves, as shall be so named or described, doth not, or do not in fact belong at the time of making such return to such plantation or plantations, owner or owners, any person or persons so offending shall forfeit for every slave or pretended slave so falsely returned, the sum of 100*l.* sterling money . . ., the one moiety thereof to the use of the governor, lieutenant-governor, or civil commander-in-chief, within the said

island for the time being, and the other moiety thereof to the use of such person as shall inform, sue and prosecute for the same . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that from and after the said final closing and authentication of the said original registry of slaves in the said island, every slave within the said island or its dependencies, not so registered as a slave, shall be deemed and taken to be the property of His Majesty, except only fugitive slaves from any other of His Majesty's dominions, who may be apprehended within the said island, and who shall be detained in custody, by authority of any court or magistrate, for the purpose of being delivered up to their owners.

Provided always, that no such slave not duly registered as a slave upon any annual return of slaves, shall be deemed to be the property of His Majesty, until it shall be seen whether at the next annual period for making such returns, or within such further periods as are hereinafter in certain cases allowed, such defect of registration may not be proved, on the part of his or her owner or owners, to have arisen from accident, or some unavoidable or excusable cause, such as is hereinbefore and hereinafter in certain cases allowed and provided for; and whether such defect may not be thereupon, at such next annual period of registration, or within such further period as aforesaid, lawfully remedied and supplied, in manner hereinbefore and hereinafter directed . . . .

And it is hereby further ordered, that the said registrar shall be entitled to have and receive, for every certificate by him given of any extract from or entry in the said registry, the sum of ten shillings sterling; and for every hundred words therein contained beyond the first hundred words, the sum of two shillings like money, and no more, from the party requiring and obtaining the same; and for every search in the said registry, the sum of five shillings like money, and no more . . . .

The Order in Council was published in Mauritius towards the end of April 1815,[1] and came into force on 1 May. In a Proclamation of 4 July[2] Governor Farquhar complained about the slow progress of registration and warned the slave owners that all the slaves not registered by 31 July would be confiscated. But in a Proclamation of 18 July[3] he extended the time limit to 31 August. In a Notice of 13 September[4] he rejected the request of some inhabitants to grant a further general delay, but advised them that all slave owners would have an opportunity in the following December and January to verify and supplement the registrations. Five days later he wrote to Earl Bathurst:

I have the honour to inform your lordship, that the period for making the Returns of the Schedules of the Slaves in this Colony, under the Slave Registration Ordinance, having expired at the commencement of this month, I have much pleasure in stating, that I have reason to believe that very few, if any, of the inhabitants have neglected to conform to that primary and fundamental provision. This was not, however, accomplished without much perseverance on the part of the officers of government, and an unremitting attention to instruct the people in their true interests, and in the consequences that would inevitably result from any neglect or indisposition to fulfil the conditions of the law. It was not unaccompanied by an appearance of refractory opposition, on the part of a portion of the lower class of inhabitants, whose prejudices against the measure had been worked upon by certain

[1] See Notice of 2 June 1815, *Code Farquhar*, p. 110, No. 167; Proclamation of 19 July 1816, ibid., pp. 158–9, No. 204. Earl Bathurst transmitted the Order to Governor Farquhar on 24 Oct. 1814 (see C.O. 168, vol. iii, pp. 26–7), and the Governor was informed by a letter of 19 Nov. that 'four Boxes containing Books and Papers for the Registration of Slaves in the Isle of France have been shipped for that Colony' (see ibid., p. 29). Governor Farquhar acknowledged the receipt of the first dispatch on 2 Apr. 1815 (see *Papers relative to the Slave Trade 1811–1817*, pp. 100–1).

[2] French text *Code Farquhar*, p. 112, No. 171.

[3] French text ibid., No. 172.

[4] French text ibid., p. 133, No. 178.

ill-disposed and worthless people, who seized the occasion of public irritation to urge the inhabitants to resist the law.

The only consequence that resulted from these mischievous efforts, consisted in an assemblage, at Grand Port, of four or five hundred inhabitants, of the lowest class, which was quelled by the first intimation of the approach of a military force.[1]

But the assumption that very few, if any, of the inhabitants had neglected to conform with the law was wrong. In a further dispatch of 20 October 1816, in which Governor Farquhar submitted to Earl Bathurst the various steps by which he had 'conducted the registration ordinance, from its first appearance in this colony on the 1st April 1815, until its fulfilment', he wrote:

In order to make the proprietors and inhabitants fully acquainted with all the provisions of the law, a number of copies of the ordinance were printed and distributed gratis to all the respectable inhabitants of the different districts of the island, and in our weekly newspaper the law was published entire; the necessity of an unreserved and immediate compliance was also enforced by repeated notices in the Gazette, and circulars to the magistrates and civil commissaries:

It is my duty to inform your lordship, that there appeared, notwithstanding all these steps, a strongly marked disinclination on the part of the proprietors and inhabitants, to the execution of this law,[2] from the enforcing of which they feared the introduction of innumerable evils; and the period prescribed by the law approached, without a single proprietor or inhabitant of note having registered a single slave.

In these circumstances it became indispensable to prevent the extensive calamities which would inevitably have arisen from a confiscation of the great mass of the Slave population to the profit of the State, a measure which its impracticability alone could save from being the source of infinite mischief. It was equally indispensable not to recede, but to carry the law into full execution and effect, as intended by the ordinance of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent in Council. The only unobjectionable means which offered for this purpose were, first, an extension of the time of delay, during which no influence or exertion should be spared to induce the chief proprietors to set an example of obedience to the law in their different districts; for this delay also there was sufficient reason, in the absence of the registrar, who was unable to commence his functions till after the period prescribed by the law.

The expenses attending the execution of this law were also considered as oppressive, from the circumstance of the impost on the Slaves being already as high as the planter could possibly afford to pay, and also that, in its origin, it was levied for the express purpose of defraying all charges connected with the security of that class of the population. I was therefore inclined favourably to consider the application of the registrar on that subject, a copy of which is subjoined; and allowed him to receive in payment of the registration, promissory notes for the amount, until your lordship's pleasure should be known, with a modification in favour of the indigent; exempting such as were absolutely incapable of payment, from the distress they would have been liable to by the seizure and sale of the means of their subsistence.[3]

[1] *Papers relative to the Slave Trade 1811–1817*, p. 104. Governor Farquhar stated, furthermore, that the opposition against registration was instigated by 'Emissaries dispatched from France, for the purpose of seizing the first favorable opportunity, of subverting the Government of the Colony, and restoring it to France' (C.O. 167, vol. xxvi), and Earl Bathurst, in his reply of 5 Mar. 1816 said: 'It is in no degree surprising that the Emissaries of Bonaparte should have availed themselves of this Disposition to excite a feeling in the Colony favorable to the Objects of his Ambition' (C.O. 168, vol. iii, pp. 82–3). See also Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1810–1823)*, p. 102.

[2] See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), p. 13.

[3] *Papers relative to the Slave Trade 1811–1817*, pp. 110–11. See also the Memorial of the Registrar to Governor Farquhar, 19 June 1815 (ibid., p. 111):

'... the state of actual indigence, in which a very large portion of the inhabitants exists, render

While the opposition of the slave owners greatly hampered progress, the Administration itself was likewise slow in entering the declarations in the registry book, and by a Proclamation of 7 December 1815[1] the time limit for closing the registry was extended from 10 December to 10 April 1816.[2]

The delays in registration made it impossible to take a new census in 1816,[3] and an Order in Council made by the Prince Regent on 18 September 1816[4] stipulated that in future only triennial Returns of Slaves be made by persons possessing slaves in the Isle of France and its Dependencies.[5] The next slave census, therefore, became due in 1819,[6] and a Proclamation of 24 December 1818[7] prescribed that all possessors of slaves should furnish the data concerning their slaves on 1 January 1819 or in the course of the following 20 days in accordance with the Order in Council of 24 September 1814.[8] But this census proved to be a failure, and since moreover the earlier tradition of enumerating every year the whole population had fallen into oblivion,[9] Major-General Darling, on 18 June 1819,

them utterly incapable of paying the fees enjoined by the law; and the more affluent will, but with the utmost difficulty, be induced to submit to this additional burthen; the more particularly since a tax already exists, as your excellency is well aware, intituled the "Taxe du Maronnage," which was imposed with a perfect understanding, that no further contribution would at any time be demanded on account of slaves.

'It may be objected that the law provides for the due execution of its enactments, by the penalties to which persons refusing to conform to them become amenable; but the inutility of adopting measures of extreme severity for default in the payment of fees, on the part of persons utterly destitute of all means, (and it is to be observed, that such persons constitute not less than one-third of the community), must be perfectly apparent to your excellency.'

[1] French text *Code Farquhar*, p. 140, No. 189.

[2] By a Government Notice of 10 Apr. 1816 (French text ibid., p. 147, No. 196) the inhabitants were advised that the two months granted for verifying and supplementing the registrations would start on that date. See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), pp. 13-14: ' . . . returns of upwards of 7,000 slaves were licensed by the Governor to be registered in the succeeding two months . . . .'

[3] The direct taxes for 1816 were assessed on the basis of the registrations for 1815; see Proclamation of 19 July 1816 (French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 158–9, No. 204). See also *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, pp. 4–5: 1816–17. 'The annual Census having been discontinued, in consequence of the triennial registration of slaves, no Returns for these years exist in this office, and the Collector's Tax Roll was ordered to be made up from the Returns deposited in the Registration of Slaves Office. The rolls thus framed served for the whole of this period . . . .'

[4] French text *Code Farquhar*, p. 201, No. 282.

[5] See also Dispatch from Earl Bathurst to Governor Farquhar, 28 Oct. 1818 (C.O. 168, vol. iii, p. 116).

[6] However, a Proclamation of 30 Oct. 1818 (French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 199–200, No. 277) had ordered that a slave census be taken in Port Louis and suburbs within ten days.

[7] French text ibid., p. 201, No. 282. See also Bonnefoy, p. 395.

[8] By Government Notice of 29 Jan. 1819 (English text *Recueil des Lois 1819*, pp. 2–3) the time limit was extended to 28 Feb. A model of a filled-up schedule was published in a Government Notice of 5 Feb. (French text ibid., pp. 3–4). A Government Notice of 18 Feb. (English text ibid., pp. 7–8) urged the inhabitants once more to act speedily and in any case before the end of the month, but a new Notice (ibid., p. 8), of 26 Feb. extended the time limit to 6 Mar. See also Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1810–1823)*, pp. 243–5.—Whenever I found a French and an English text, I give the source only for the latter.

[9] See ibid., p. 263. Charles Telfair, in a letter to the Acting Chief Secretary to Government, dated 27 Sept. 1826 (*Return of Slaves on the Bel Ombre Estate*, &c., pp. 42–3), described the position as follows:

'The tax-rolls had, in their original form, not only served for the collection of the capitation tax, but had also been considered as numerical returns of the various castes and ages of which the

issued a new Proclamation,[1] the main provisions of which were as follows:

Whereas it has been recognized that the Laws of this Colony, which at all times have required that the Inhabitants should furnish a yearly census of their families and slaves, have for object, on the one hand the regulation of the Taxes, established for meeting the Public expenditure, and on the other, to make Government fully acquainted with a subject at once connected with the Internal Police and good order; and whereas the Order in Council of September 24th 1814, relative to the Slave Registration, and the Triennial Census by which it has been followed, have a tendency totally different, and are inadequate to the purposes above related, and which are provided for by old established regulations.—And whereas taking into consideration the great importance of no longer deferring to revive, tho' in a different and more simple form, the execution of previous enactments touching the Yearly Census, the more so as the inconveniences, which have resulted from a non-conformity therewith, since the Year 1815, have been sensibly felt.

It is hereby ordered and directed.

Article 1st. That on or before the fifteenth of July next, all and every Inhabitant possessed of Slaves or immoveable property in the Town of Port Louis,—All heads of Families, and every other Individuals resident on this Island, shall furnish their Census for the Year 1819, according to the form hereafter setforth.

Article 2d. All Persons who within the time prescribed, may not have conformed to the provisions of the foregoing article, shall be subject to a fine of Twenty Dollars, which shall neither be remitted nor modified;—And in the event of a second month, being allowed to pass over without giving in their Census, conformably to the said article, they shall be moreover amerced in double the sum, and further condemned to pay twice the amount of the Tax, to which they may be subject, either on their moveable property, or on the Slaves belonging to them, upon the proofs and verifications which the Collector of Internal Revenues may be enabled to obtain in this regard.

Article 4th. In the course of the present month, printed forms will be delivered at the Offices of the respective Civil Commissaries, for the Country Districts, and at the General Police Office, for the Town of Port Louis, and the mode of filling them up, will be pointed out to those Individuals, who are required to furnish a Census, as prescribed by the First Article of this Proclamation;—The said Census must likewise be in Duplicate, of which one Copy dated and certified by the Person who may have furnished it, shall be returned to him after having been signed by the Civil Commissary of his respective District, or by one of the Chief Commissaries of Police for the Town of Port Louis,—the other Copy, equally dated, certified and

population consists; from which an estimate might be formed of the proportion of each nation and class, white, free, coloured and black, existing in the island.

'But in the year 1814, when the local government established, under Major Waugh, a registry of the black population, the returns were made to comprehend the descriptive and nominative roll of each black, as well as the numerical returns contained in the ordinary tax-rolls, which served for the collection of the revenue—one recensement being thus made to answer these double objects.

'This original institution of a registry having been superseded by His Majesty's Order in Council, which came out and was put in force in 1815, the use of the tax-rolls was again limited to the information of the numerical amount of blacks subject to taxation; and the same degree of attention was not requisite in the summary details, because these could always be found when wanted, with exactness, in the census then established.

'It may be observed also, that the tax-rolls and census will be found rarely to agree even in numbers. This arises partly from their being made out at different epochs of the year, and partly from a practice which was formerly prevalent, and perhaps is still so, of keeping off the tax-rolls all blacks who are lepers or idiots, or unable to work from infancy, or from decrepitude and age. . . .

'Tax-rolls are only furnished when called for by proclamation; and for the period between 1815 and 1819, no tax-rolls were required . . . .'

[1] English text *Recueil des Lois 1819*, pp. 39–42.

countersigned, as is abovementioned, shall be transmitted in the course of the month of August, to the Collector of Internal Revenues, to serve for and constitute the General Census, and the List on which the direct Taxes, for the Year 1819, are to be levied.

Article 5th. The Census which is required by the First Article of this Proclamation, must be made according to the form, and contain the same declarations, as are specified in the regulations, prior to the Year 1815, with this exception, that instead of detailing the name and description of each Slave, it will be sufficient in the new Census, to enter so many male Slaves, and so many female Slaves of each cast, the number of Children, under seven years of age, and the number above sixty years of age, and a recapitulation of these several numbers.

Article 6th. Every false or untrue declaration in the Census of the Slaves, will subject the Individual, who may have made it, to a penalty of Ten Dollars for the first, and double that sum, for the second offence, and this for each erroneous statement contained in the said declaration —for every wilful omission in the number of Slaves, which ought to be borne on the said Census: —the fine incurred for the first time, shall be Twenty Dollars, for the second, Fifty Dollars, and the same for each Slave, who may have been omitted; and for the third time, as is enacted by former regulations, the Slaves so neglected to be borne on the Census, shall be confiscated. . . .

Article 7th. The direct Taxes for the Year 1819, shall be precisely the same as those established and collected during the preceding years; adding thereto any further duties that may have been imposed by subsequent Proclamations. . . .

According to the attached form the 'Inhabitant' had to state his name, residence, age, and birthplace, the year in which he had arrived in the Colony and on which ship, his occupation; the name, birthplace, and age of his wife; the names of his male and female children (including those absent); the number of his slaves by sex, age (7 years and over, under 7, over 60), and origin (Creoles, Malagasy, Mozambiques, Indians); details as to immovable property, vehicles, and agricultural acreage.

A Notice of 15 July,[1] extended the period for giving in the returns to 31 July. But the census proved to be unsatisfactory.[2]

On 30 March 1820 the Governor issued a Proclamation,[3] the main provisions of which were the following:

Art. I. In the course of the month of April next, all and every Inhabitant possessed of Slaves or immovable property in the Town of Port Louis, all heads of Families and every person residing in this colony, even if they possess there no property, shall furnish their census for the Year 1820 according to the form setforth and prescribed in the proclamation of 18 June 1819.

Art. III. A duplicate of the said census shall be transmitted in the course of the month of May next to the Collector of Internal Revenues and shall serve to form the General Census or roll on which the direct Taxes for the Year 1820 are to be levied.

A Proclamation of 8 May[4] prolonged 'the period for furnishing the census for the year 1820, conformably to the proclamation of the 30th.

[1] English text *Recueil des Lois 1819*, p. 45.

[2] The Internal Revenues Office reported: 'The annual Census was again deemed necessary, and re-established, in consequence of the defects found to exist in the triennial registration of slaves, as a basis for the levy of the capitation taxes, but circumstances rendered it necessary that the taxes of this year should be levied partly according to the triennial, partly according to the annual declarations of the proprietors, and the two are mixed up together in the Tax Rolls, in a manner which renders the only statement that could be derived from them rather defective' (*Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, 1828, pp. 4–5).

[3] French text *Code Farquhar*, p. 213, No. 302.

[4] English text *Recueil des Lois 1820* (1 Apr. to 31 Dec.), pp. 20–1.

of March last' to 15 June, and a Proclamation of 4 July[1] granted a further delay to 15 July.[2]

'The annual Census was not effected' in 1821,[3] and a Proclamation of 12 July[4] provided that the levy of direct taxes for that year was to be based on the declarations furnished for the year 1820.

The triennial census of slaves was taken in the early part of 1822.[5] A Proclamation of 24 July 1822,[6] which was almost identical with that of 18 June 1819, provided that the inhabitants should furnish their declarations within a fortnight after the publication of that Proclamation as a basis for the levy of the direct taxes for the year 1822.[7] By a Proclamation of 16 August[8] the time limit was extended to 31 August, and by a Proclamation of 2 September[9] it was further extended to 25 September.

A Proclamation of 10 June 1823,[10] which in many respects was similar to that of 24 July 1822, asked for declarations to be furnished within a fortnight after its publication.[11]

A Proclamation of 25 January 1824[12] resembled in many respects the Proclamations of 24 July 1822 and 10 June 1823, but emphasized more strongly the all-inclusive character of the census. This will appear from the following provisions:

> His Excellency . . . deeming it expedient to require the full execution of the original regulations, at one time duly observed in this Colony, which direct that the Annual Census should contain and specify the families of the Inhabitants and of every other free person residing therein, and also to make such new provisions as may more especially tend to shew the actual state of the free population in all its classes, and in short to particularly recommend to the Civil Commissaries, each in his respective district, the most scrupulous observance of these regulations not less essential for securing the internal tranquillity of the Island, than for giving effect to the measures which are calculated to meliorate its situation and promote its welfare.
>
> Has decreed and decrees: . . .
>
> Article 2d. From the date hereof to the 15th of March next, all Inhabitants possessed of Slaves or immoveable property in the town of Port-Louis, are required to furnish their Census or annual declaration, as is provided by the Proclamation of the 24th of July 1822.
>
> This Census, independent of the slaves and immoveable property of which they may be possessed in the Town of Port-Louis, must also contain their Christian and

[1] English text *Recueil des Lois 1820* (1 Apr. to 31 Dec.), p. 42.

[2] See also Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1810–1823)*, p. 348.

[3] See *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, p. 4.

[4] French text *Recueil des Lois 1821*, p. 90.

[5] A Government Notice of 4 Feb. 1822 (English text ibid. *1822*, p. 6) provided that 'in consequence of several intervening Holydays together with a succession of heavy Rains, by which the regular communications in the several districts of the Island have been considerably impeded and in many cases rendered impracticable' the period for the completion of the Triennial Returns be extended to 20 Mar. A further Government Notice of 19 Mar. (ibid., p. 30) extended the period to 1 May. See also Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1810–1823)*, p. 453.

[6] French text *Recueil des Lois 1822*, pp. 77–9.

[7] The new Proclamation stated explicitly that 'even those who may not possess any property shall furnish a declaration'.

[8] French text *Recueil des Lois 1822*, p. 84.

[9] French text ibid., pp. 87–8.

[10] French text ibid. *1823*, pp. 69–71.

[11] By a Proclamation of 16 July (French text ibid., p. 80) the time limit was extended to 31 Aug. See also Proclamation of 26 Aug. (English text ibid., pp. 100–2).

[12] English text ibid. *1824*, pp. 5–10.

surnames, those of the several persons composing their families and those of such persons of the free population as may dwell or be resident with them specifying their employment, trade or profession.

All persons not possessing Slaves or other property, residing, or having a simple permission to remain, in the Island, are also required to furnish their Census or declaration, which shall contain their Christian and surnames, their families and their employment, trade or profession. . . .

By Government Notice of 17 March[1] the time limit was extended to 31 March.

A Proclamation similar to that of 25 January 1824 was issued on 1 March 1825,[2] the time limit fixed expiring on 15 May.

A similar Ordinance of the Governor in Council[3] 'for prescribing, with respect to the Inhabitants of this Colony, the furnishing of Declarations or annual Returns for the present year 1826'[4] was issued on 17 April 1826. The time limit was to be 15 May, but it was extended by Government Notice of 24 May[5] to 15 June.

In the meantime the King, on 30 January 1826, had made a new Order in Council[6] concerning the registration of slaves in Mauritius. In his letter of transmittal, dated 26 February 1826, Earl Bathurst wrote to Lieutenant-General Cole:

In the Order in Council which I transmit to you, the various suggestions which have been made for the improvement of the law by your predecessors in the government of the Mauritius, and by Mr. Smith, the late chief judge, have been adopted as far as they appeared consistent with the spirit of the original measure. For your guidance it will be convenient to explain in general the nature and the reasons of the new regulations which are now to be established.

The imperfect manner in which the returns have been hitherto made by the proprietors of Slaves, whether attributable to the difficulty of understanding the duty required of them, as the defaulters themselves appear to allege, or to causes of a more discreditable nature, as has been suggested by others,[7] is the first evil against which it has appeared necessary to take securities for the future. For this purpose it has been decided to establish, in each of the quarters of the Island, an officer, who will be called the Assistant Registrar of Slaves of the quarter. . . .

The defects in the existing registry of Slaves appear so numerous and considerable, that after the most serious attention to the subject, I have found myself compelled to lay before His Majesty my humble advice to commence again the whole process of registration from the beginning. For very obvious reasons I should have desired

[1] French text ibid., p. 49.

[2] English text ibid. *1825*, pp. 42–7.

[3] The King had ordered on 9 Feb. 1825 the establishment of a Council in Mauritius (see Proclamation of 12 Aug. 1825, English text ibid., pp. 191–2).

[4] No. 13, English text ibid. *1826*, pp. 69–76; see also Correction, Government Notice of 26 Apr. ibid., pp. 82–3. The Ordinance prescribed the establishment of a Committee in Port Louis and in each District of the island for 'the verification of the Returns'; see also Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1823 1828)*, p. 145.

[5] English text ibid., p. 95.

[6] *Mauritius Gazette*, 16 Sept. 1826; reprinted in *Correspondence relative to Slaves, including Copy of the Order in Council* (1826), pp. 6–16.

[7] Many official documents and private publications deal with the inadequacy of slave registration in Mauritius at that time. See, for example, letter from the Earl Bathurst to Major-General Darling, 20 July 1819 (C.O. 168, vol. iii, pp. 259–63); letter from Governor Farquhar to the Earl Bathurst, 7 Nov. 1822, *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius*, p. 122; *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), passim; Telfair, pp. 84–6; *Mémoire par un Colon*, passim; Pridham, p. 156.

to avoid this measure if possible; but I fear it would be vain to anticipate any effectual observance of the law hereafter, if future returns were to be verified by a comparison with such a registry as I am led to conclude exists at present in the Island.

The Order in Council has therefore directed you to appoint, by proclamation, a day on which the registrar of Slaves, in their several quarters, are to inspect the whole Slave population, with this distinction, that the personal Slaves must be brought to the registrar or assistant registrar at some convenient place in the quarter, and that the plantation Slaves are to be mustered, each on the estate to which they belong. At the time of this inspection, a return is to be made on oath, by every proprietor, in the form prescribed by the former Order respecting original returns. You will observe, that to secure the punctual performance of this duty, it is required that printed blank forms of the returns should be left at every house and plantation in the island, with printed instructions for the guidance of all persons in filling them up. The registrars are also required to assist all owners of Slaves with every necessary advice, as to the proper modes of proceeding.

The assistant registrars are authorized to accept or reject the returns thus to be delivered to them; and it will be their duty to reject all which are not made out in the prescribed form, or which do not contain all the requisite entries, or which, upon the personal inspection of the Slaves to which they refer, may appear to be fraudulent or false. The assistant registrars will be required to sign at the foot of each return they may receive, a certificate of its apparent accuracy.

The returns thus received are to be transmitted to the General Registry Office at Port Louis, with a list of all defaulters, and of all returns rejected, with the reasons of the rejection in each case.

The rules for registering all certified returns, with the process for verifying and authenticating the registry, will be the same as were laid down in the previous Order in Council.

Among the difficulties in the execution of his office, of which the present registrar complains, none has been stated so frequently or with so much earnestness, as that which arises from the necessity of tracing to his former registered owner each Slave returned at the triennial registration, as acquired by purchase. It is said that the same Slave is frequently the subject of many intermediate sales, of which no record is preserved, and that therefore almost each return, at the triennial registration, gives rise to questions which cannot be resolved without all the delay and inconvenience arising from the production of witnesses at the office of the registrar, whose attendance he has no power to compel. To obviate this inconvenience or evasion for the future, the present Order in Council requires, that no sale or alienation of a Slave shall have any effect unless it be registered in the office of the Registrar of Slaves. It is further required that the birth, or death, or enfranchisement of any Slave, shall be immediately made known to the registrar, and recorded in his office. . . .

The interval of three years between each periodical registration, is represented as inconveniently long, and as multiplying needlessly the number of mutations which are to be recorded at each successive period; the present Order has therefore required the repetition of the returns at intervals of two years.

At the recurrence of each biennial registration, the assistant registrars will be employed in their various quarters, to inspect the Slaves; to accept or reject returns; to certify the accuracy of such as are accepted, and to transmit them, together with lists of the rejected returns, to the General Registry Office at Port Louis, in the same manner as is required with regard to the original returns.

The mode of registering the biennial returns, is adopted from the former Order in Council, without alteration, excepting that no biennial returns can be received which are inconsistent with the records of sales, alienations, births, deaths and enfranchisements in the office of the registrar, unless where some satisfactory explanation of the inconsistency can be given. . . .

In conclusion, I have to impress upon you the urgent importance of giving effect

to the wishes of His Majesty's Government on this subject, by every exertion it may be in your power to make. There is no duty connected with the administration of the government of the Mauritius, to which your attention could be more advantageously directed; and I shall anxiously expect your report of the measures adopted in compliance with the present Order in Council, and of the consequences resulting from it.[1]

Instructions for the filling up of the new forms were issued in a Government Notice of 4 October 1826.[2] A Proclamation of 11 October[3] gave details about the examination and inspection of the slaves, which was to be carried out between 16 October and 16 December. Another Proclamation of the same day[4] stipulated new fees to be levied at the Registry Office. An Ordinance of 13 December[5] prolonged the period for the examination and inspection of slaves and 'for the giving in of the Slave Returns' until 16 January 1827. On 28 January Governor Cole wrote to Earl Bathurst:

I have the honour to report to your Lordship . . . the completion of the slave registry at the Mauritius, and that the slave population in this island, according to the enclosed Returns, amounts to 69,004 individuals, of both sexes and of all ages. . . .

The number of slaves borne on the collector's tax-roll amounts to about 62,000; and the difference between that number and the return of the registrar of slaves will be accounted for in the following manner, viz. that the latter contains the Government slaves (which the former does not), as also the old invalid slaves and young children, who, to avoid the capitation tax, have not been included by their proprietors in the numerical returns furnished to the collector of the revenue.[6]

An Ordinance of 27 June 1827[7] required the inhabitants 'to furnish their annual Declaration and Return as is prescribed by the Ordinance in Council (No. 13) for the year 1826'.

Printed sheets, shewing the nature of the Return, and pointing out what it will be necessary to insert therein, will be delivered to the Inhabitants at the Civil Commissary of the respective Quarters, and at the Police Office in Port-Louis: It will not be necessary as heretofore, that any mention of Slaves should be made in these Returns, as the number of those liable to be taxed, and possessed by each Inhabitant on the 1st of January of each year, will, for the present year 1827, be determined by the Returns which the Registrar of Slaves is required to furnish to the Collector of Internal Revenues; and such number will be taken, in subsequent years, from the Return which the Registrar of Slaves ought to furnish to the Collector of Internal Revenues on the 31st of January in each year.

Thenceforward there was no longer a connexion between the recording of slaves and the population censuses.[8]

[1] *Correspondence*, pp. 4–6.

[2] French text *Recueil des Lois 1826*, pp. 137–42 (reprinted with English translation in *Return of Slaves on the Bel Ombre Estate*, &c., pp. 58–63). See also Government Notice of 11 Oct., English text *Recueil des Lois 1826*, p. 155.

[3] English text ibid., pp. 143–7. [4] English text ibid., p. 152.

[5] No. 19, English text ibid., pp. 192–4. See also Government Notice of 18 Aug. 1827, French text ibid., pp. 222–4.

[6] *Correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Governor of the Mauritius, respecting the Slave Registry*, p. 30.

[7] No. 24, English text *Recueil des Lois 1827*, pp. 194–7.

[8] As regards slaves there was issued on 30 Sept. 1829 'An Ordinance for ensuring regularity at the approaching Biennial Census, and for assisting the Inhabitants in making accurate declarations of the various mutations that occur among their Slaves' (No. 52, English text ibid. *1829*, pp. 193–6). A Proclamation of 9 Dec. (English text ibid., pp. 305–11) stipulated that the Biennial Census shall be completed 'within the delay of one month, from the 1st January 1830, to the 1st

An Ordinance of 24 September 1828[1] made a request similar to that contained in the Ordinance of 27 June 1827. The time limit for the delivery of the declarations was fixed at one month after the publication of the Ordinance; it was extended by Government Notice of 14 November[2] to 25 November, and by Government Notice of 20 March 1829[3] to 10 April 1829.

From 1829 onwards the population censuses were dissociated also from the establishment of the tax rolls.[4] The Ordinance of 23 September[5] contained revised Regulations concerning the general annual censuses and asked in particular:

I. Within the fifteen days following the publication of the present Ordinance, all Heads of Families and all other Persons whomsoever, domiciled in the Colony, whether possessed of property or otherwise, are to furnish a Return setting forth their own names individually, those of their family, the real property, animals, carriages, &a. they may possess, in manner and form as is hereinafter prescribed.

An Ordinance of 12 August 1830,[6] similar to that of 23 September 1829, required that the Annual Returns for 1830 be furnished 'within a period of fifteen days from the date of the publication of the present Ordinance', but a Proclamation of 12 April 1831[7] extended this term 'to one month from the day following the publication of the present Proclamation'.

The annual census of 1830–1 was the last of its kind.

of February of the same year'. An Ordinance of 27 Jan. 1830 (No. 59, English text ibid. *1830*, pp. 17–19) extended the term to 1 Mar., and a Government Notice of 11 Feb. (French text ibid., p. 23) warned the slave owners that the delay granted was 'irrevocably fixed' at 1 Mar. But an Ordinance of 27 Feb. (No. 61, English text ibid., pp. 45–7) prolonged the term until 21 Mar. An Ordinance of 31 Mar. (No. 62, English text ibid., pp. 72–4) extended the term for the Districts of Pamplemousses and Grand Port until 22 Apr. See, furthermore, 'Ordinance for the purpose of rectifying such involuntary omissions as may have arisen on the part of several Persons in neglecting to give in the Biennial Census as prescribed by the Order in Council under date the thirtieth of January 1826' (No. 63 of 11 May, English text ibid., pp. 76–8). See also in this connexion 'Extract from the Minutes of the Court of Appeal of the Isle of Mauritius', 16 June 1830 (French text ibid., pp. 93–7).

A Proclamation of 28 Mar. 1832 (English text ibid. *1832*, pp. 72–4) stipulated that the Biennial Census provided by the Order in Council of 30 Jan. 1826 be completed 'within the delay of one month from the first day of May in this present year, to the first day of June then next ensuing'. See also Government Notice of 18 Apr. (English text ibid., p. 76). An Ordinance of 30 May (No. 5, English text ibid., pp. 95–6) extended the term to 1 July. An Ordinance of 3 July (No. 6, French text ibid., pp. 119–21) extended it to 1 Aug., and an Ordinance of 13 Aug. (No. 10, French text ibid., pp. 142–3) to 1 Sept. See also in this connexion Ordinances Nos. 8 and 9 of 1834 (18 June and 14 July, English text ibid. *1834*, pp. 36–40).

[1] No. 40, English text ibid. *1828*, Part II, pp. 70–5.

[2] English text ibid., pp. 87–8. [3] French text ibid. *1829*, p. 61.

[4] The Tax Ordinance of 27 May 1829 (No. 48, English text ibid. *1829*, pp. 109–17), it is true, resembled in many respects the Ordinance of 24 Sept. 1828, but it did not ask for new declarations of persons. Similar Ordinances were enacted for the following years on 9 July 1830, 2 Mar. 1831, 9 July 1832, 29 July 1833, 12 May 1834, and 13 June 1835 (Nos. 64 of 1830 and 71 of 1831, English text ibid. *1830*, pp. 103–10, *1831*, pp. 26–7; No. 8 of 1832, French text ibid. *1832*, pp. 122–4; Nos. 1 of 1833, 6 of 1834, and 9 of 1835, English text ibid. *1832–3*, pp. 50–1, *1834*, pp. 23–4, *1835*, pp. 48–9).

[5] No. 50, 'An Ordinance for establishing Regulations, with respect to the annual Returns which are required to be furnished in the Colony by the Inhabitants, Proprietors, Heads of Families and others, to date from the present year 1829', English text ibid. *1829*, pp. 171–5. See also Correction, ibid., p. 192.

[6] No. 66, English text ibid. *1830*, pp. 137–42.

[7] English text ibid. *1831*, pp. 82–4.

The abolition of slavery,[1] of course, made an end to slave censuses and extended the scope of the general censuses. An Ordinance 'respecting Field Labourers and Workmen',[2] enacted on 2 November 1835, began as follows:

Whereas the progressive changes which must take place in the population and the habits of the colony from the effect of the Abolition of Slavery; the natural inclination to idleness and sloth of Individuals passing from a state of servitude to one of liberty; the daily introduction into the Colony of foreign labourers; and lastly the insufficiency of the existing laws to compel the lower classes of society to labour, urgently require that measures should be taken of a nature to conciliate the maintenance of good order with the demands of industry and agriculture as well as to protect the respective interests of masters and servants.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has decreed and decrees:

Art. 1.—There shall be made before the first day of January 1836, by the Chief Commissary of Police of Port-Louis, and by the Civil Commissaries of the Districts, a general Census or Return of all the inhabitants of the Colony (except the Apprentices subject to the provisions of the Act for the Abolition of Slavery)[3] by means of statements to be made and verified by the said officers, and on the declaration which all persons are hereby required to make within a month from the publication of the present Ordinance, setting forth their names, age, place of birth, last residence, profession, occupation, or means of subsistence under a penalty not exceeding £2 Sterling.

This general Census shall be verified at the end of every year; at which period any changes that may have taken place during the twelve months shall be noted.

An Ordinance of 14 December[4] prolonged the period for 'the returns to serve as a general Census of the inhabitants' to 1 February 1836. The census was carried out although the Ordinance of 2 November was disallowed by the King.[5]

[1] See in particular the Ordinance for enforcing the Act for the Abolition of Slavery of 28 Aug. 1833 (No. 1 of 1835, 6 Jan., French text ibid. *1835*, following p. 6), and the Ordinance for the due execution of the Slave Abolition Act (No. 8 of 1835, 21 Mar., French text ibid., following p. 44).

[2] No. 16 of 1835, English text ibid. *1835*, pp. 83–9; see also Correction, p. 92.

[3] According to this Act (28 Aug. 1833) the predial, i.e. the agricultural, slaves were to be definitely liberated on 1 Feb. 1841 and the non-predial on 1 Feb. 1839. But an Order in Council of 5 Nov. 1838 stipulated that the apprenticeship of the predial slaves should likewise be terminated on 1 Feb. 1839. Since, however, the Order in Council was not registered in Mauritius until 11 Mar. 1839, the predial slaves were liberated only on 31 Mar. See Proclamation of 11 Mar. 1839, English text *Recueil des Lois 1839*, pp. 42–3; Toussaint, *Missions d'Adrien d'Epinay*, p. 144.

[4] No. 21 of 1835, English text *Recueil des Lois 1835*, pp. 112–13.

[5] See Government Notice of 6 Oct. 1836, English text ibid. *1836*, p. 50. The Governor received an official announcement from His Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonial Department that Ordinance No. 21 had become inoperative in consequence of the disallowance by His Majesty of Ordinance No. 16 of 1835; see Government Notice of 23 Mar. 1837 (English text ibid. *1837*, pp. 15–16). Lord Glenelg denounced the preamble of Ordinance No. 16 of 1835 as wanting not only in perspicuity but in adaptation to the enactments which follow, and added that 'the design of the law might more accurately have been described as the substitution of some new coercion for that state of slavery which had been abolished'. As regards the provisions for the census he said: 'The Ordinance commences (sec. 1) by directing an annual census of all the inhabitants of the colony. To accomplish such an object with any approach to accuracy, requires a large body of minute regulations, especially in reference to the case of those who are too young, too infirm, or too ignorant to perform aright the duty of returning their own names. But this enactment disposes of the whole subject in a single sentence, subjecting every person who shall not make a return comprising the various particulars enumerated, to a penalty not exceeding two pounds. Such legislation cannot but be attended by great uncertainty and much occasional injustice.' (*Report of the Royal Commissioners* [Frere and Williamson], p. 29.)

3. *1838–1944*

In submitting to the Council of Government the estimates of the public revenue and expenditure for 1839 Governor Nicolay, on 26 June 1838, said:[1]

. . . I would also submit for your consideration the expediency of having an accurate census of the population now taken.—If once satisfactorily established, the ordinary means would be sufficient to continue it hereafter as the Ordinance No. 10 of 1837[2] and the Official Returns of arrivals and departures, will always enable Government to form an accurate approximation afterwards.—Such a census would require to be taken with very great care, which will involve some expence; but any sum that you may vote for this purpose will be money well appropriated.—Moreover a legislative enactment will, I apprehend, be necessary to give it full effect.

Thereupon there was enacted on 30 October 1839 the following Ordinance 'for the purpose of establishing a general Census of the Population of the Island of Mauritius':[3]

Whereas divers Laws and regulations namely Ordinances Nos. 50 of the 23rd September 1829, and 66 under date 12th August 1830, have provided that a general Census of the inhabitants of the Colony be made, and whereas in the actual state of the Population such measure becomes still more necessary in all that relates to an efficient public Administration.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has ordered and does hereby order:

Art. 1.—From the first of December 1839 to the first of February 1840, all heads of families and all persons being of twenty one years of age and upwards residing in the Colony, shall each of them be bound to furnish, as well in the places of their respective places of abode as in the district where they may possess real property, a declaration in writing of themselves, their families, the individuals residing with them or employed in their service, and containing besides all the particulars set forth in the Schedule hereunto annexed.

All sons being of full age and all persons residing with others, shall moreover be bound to furnish a separate and distinct census of themselves.

Art. 2.—For this purpose printed forms specifying the particulars required to be filled up by the party making such declaration shall be delivered in the districts by the respective Civil Commissaries and their Assistants, and in Port-Louis at the General Police Office. Such declarations shall be made in triplicate and signed by the party making the same, or, in case of inability to sign, they shall be attested by the Public Officer who shall have received them.

Art. 3.—The declaration of every individual who shall not himself be capable of drawing up the same, shall be received by the Chief Commissary of Police and the Civil Commissaries of the districts, who shall verify, as far as practicable, the accuracy of the declarations which shall have been made to them, and shall provide for such as shall not have been forwarded according to the informations which it shall be their duty to obtain.

Art. 4.—Within the month following the expiration of the term fixed by article 1st. the Chief Commissary of Police and the Civil Commissaries of the districts shall forward to the Colonial Secretary a counter part of the declarations received by them, the two other counter parts remaining one with the Civil Commissary and the other with the party making the declarations. There shall be made up, at the office of the Colonial Archivist, from these declarations a general census of the Population, a column being set apart therein for exhibiting such successive changes or mutations as may occur.

[1] *Recueil des Lois 1838*, pp. 43–4.

[2] This Ordinance referred to the declaration of births, deaths, and marriages; see p. 843 below.

[3] No. 18 *of* 1839, English text *ibid. 1839*, pp. 120–2.

Art. 5.—Every person desirous of removing or changing his place of residence from one district to another shall be bound to make a declaration to that effect to the Civil Commissary previously to leaving the district; and where the residence of the party be in Port-Louis, the like formality shall be fulfilled at the General Police Office. The same declaration shall also be made to the Civil Commissary of the district to which the party shall remove, or, as the case may be, at the General Police Office, within a fortnight at latest after his arrival in the district.

Art. 6.—Every person who shall take into his service any workmen or servants shall be bound to make, within a fortnight afterwards, a declaration thereof to the Chief Commissary of Police or to the Civil Commissary of the district respectively.

The same declaration shall be made for every workman or servant of whatever description who may be released from his contract whether on account of the expiration of the term agreed upon, or from any other cause.

Art. 7.—Every person arriving in the Colony with a view to settle therein shall be bound to make known at the general police office within eight days after his arrival, the place where he purposes to reside; and if elsewhere than in Port Louis the same declaration shall be renewed before the Civil Commissary of the district.

Art. 8.—The Chief Commissary of Police and the civil commissaries shall every three months forward to the Colonial Secretary a statement of the declarations of residence, changes of residence and other mutations which may have been made to them during that interval in order that the same may be mentioned on the general census.

Art. 9.—Every contravention to the provisions of the present Ordinance shall be punished by a fine of not less than four shillings and not more than five pounds sterling and in case of non payment of the fine by an imprisonnement which shall not exceed one month and which shall be pronounced by the same judgment.

Such penalty shall be pronounced in Port-Louis by the 'Juge de Paix' Court, and in the districts by the Assistant 'Juge de Paix' respectively.

The annexed schedule[1] asked the party making the declaration to enter (1) his name, residence, occupation, age (in years), birthplace, and the year in which he arrived in Mauritius; the name of his wife, her age (in years), and her birthplace; (2) the sex, names, and ages of his children, distinguishing between those who reside with him and those who are absent or are enumerated separately; (3) the sex, names, occupations and descriptions, and ages of persons residing with him, other than salaried persons; (4) the sex, names and descriptions, and ages of domestic servants, employees, labourers, apprentice workers, and others. A Notice of 14 January 1840[2] reminded the inhabitants that the declarations to be made for the general census were 'to be delivered before the 1st of February next'.

An Ordinance of 18 May 1846 'for the purpose of ascertaining the number of inhabitants, within the Colony'[3] provided for a new census,[4] the main difference from the preceding census being that this time a definite census day was appointed. The Ordinance read as follows:

Art. 1.—Every Proprietor, Tenant or Occupier of a house, or of land, within this Colony, shall make to the Chief Commissary of Police, if resident in Port-Louis, or to the Civil Commissary of his District, if resident in the Country, a declaration

[1] The schedule (in French) is reproduced ibid., pp. 123–4.

[2] English text ibid. *1840*, p. 5.

[3] No. 4 of 1846, English text ibid. *1846*, pp. 41–4.

[4] *Census Report 1901*, p. 1, says: 'The first Census of the Island appears to have been taken in August 1846 . . . .' Dozens of censuses had been taken before that.

containing all the information concerning himself and all the members of his family or other persons residing with him on the 1st day of July, in the form A of the Schedule hereto annexed.

Art. 2.—Every employer of Artificers, Labourers, Domestic or other Servants, whether under a written or verbal engagement, shall make a separate return of the said persons in his service on the 1st day of July in the form B of the aforesaid Schedule.

Art. 3.—Every person who has immigrated to this Island as a labourer, from India or elsewhere, and is not serving as an Artificer, Labourer, Domestic or other Servant on the 1st day of July, shall furnish a return in the form C of the Schedule hereto annexed.

Art. 4.—Every inhabitant having no fixed residence, shall before the 8th day of July attend at the Office of the Civil Commissary of the District in which he slept on the night of the 1st of that month and shall furnish to the said Officer the information required in the forms A and C.

Art. 5.—Before the 25th day of June the Chief Commissary of Police and the Civil Commissaries, in their respective Districts shall give to each Proprietor, Tenant or Occupier of a house, printed forms as above stated, which the said Proprietor, Tenant or Occupier shall deliver duly filled up to the said Officers respectively before the 8th day of July.

Art. 6.—Every person required to make a Return under this Ordinance, and being unable to write, or to obtain a correct insertion of the required information in the forms delivered to him, shall between the 1st and 8th days of July attend at the Office of the Chief Commissary of Police, or Civil Commissary of his District, and shall furnish such information orally to the said Officer.

Art. 7.—Every person required to make a Return by this Ordinance, who neglects or refuses to make the same in the form and within the time prescribed in this Ordinance, or makes a false return, shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £1 in case of neglect, and £5 in case of refusal or making a false return, recoverable in a summary manner before the 'Juge de Paix' or 'Assistant Juge de Paix'.

Art. 8.—For the better execution of the present Ordinance, a sufficient number of fit and proper persons for each District, shall be appointed to distribute and collect the aforesaid returns and to ascertain that they contain all the particulars specified in the above forms.

Art. 9.—The Chief Commissary of Police and the Civil Commissaries, shall verify as far as they are able, the returns of their respective Districts and correct or supply any error or omission therein, according to the information which it shall be their duty to obtain; and they shall transmit them duly certified to the Colonial Secretary, on or before the 1st August.

Art. 10.—For the better regulation of the proceedings under this Ordinance, and for the preparation of a digest of the returns to be made under it, the Governor may appoint a Committee of public Officers,—and such number of Clerks as may be required for their assistance and may, if necessary, prolong any of the periods fixed by this Ordinance for the distribution or collection of the Returns, and may issue all instructions necessary to carry this Ordinance into execution, not inconsistent with the provisions thereof.

Art. 11.—Ordinance No. 18 of 1839 is hereby repealed.

The headings of the various forms were as follows:

Form A. Return for this house, or for such part as is occupied by me [Proprietor, Tenant, or Occupier], and for the dependencies occupied by me, exclusive of persons returned in Form B.

Name and Surname of each person resident in this house or in its dependencies occupied by me on the 1st day of July.

Age of Males.

Age of Females.

Of what profession trade or employment, or if of independent means.
Country of birth.
Whether an ex-Apprentice.
Whether insane, blind, or deaf and dumb.

Form B. Return of all Artificers, Labourers and domestic or other Servants in my employment whether under a written or verbal engagement, or employed on the Estate of which I am the Manager (in the case of Proprietor not being resident), on the 1st day of July 1846.

Names and Surnames.
Whether artificer, labourer, domestic or other servant.
Age of Males.
Age of Females.
Country of birth.
Whether an ex-apprentice.
If an Immigrant labourer, and provided with a ticket, copy from it the undermentioned particulars: No. of Ticket; Name of ship; Parent's name; Date of Ticket.
If an Immigrant labourer, and not provided with a ticket, state as far as possible: From what Country or Presidency; Year of Immigration; Name of ship if known; Name of 1st Master if known.

Form C. Return to be made by every person who has immigrated to this Island as a Labourer from India or elsewhere, and is not serving as an artificer, labourer, domestic or other servant on the 1st July.

Name.
Age of Males.
Age of Females.
Of what profession, trade or employment, or whether following none.
If provided with a ticket [as in Form B].
If not provided with a Ticket [as in Form B].

An Ordinance issued on 29 June[1] stipulated that the Declarations and Returns 'shall be made on the 1st August instead of the 1st July'; that 'the distribution of the Forms may be continued to the 31st July'; and that 'the delivery of the Declarations and Returns as aforesaid to the Civil Commissaries, or other persons appointed to receive them, shall take place between the 1st and 8th August'.[2]

An Ordinance passed on 17 September 1851[3] made similar provisions for a census to be taken as of the night preceding 11 November 1851.[4] But the census area was no longer confined to Mauritius.

Art. 11.—The provisions of this Ordinance shall be applied, as far as may be practicable, to the several dependencies of the Island of Mauritius; and the Civil Commissioner at the Seychelles Islands, the Police Magistrate in Rodrigues, and the several proprietors holding concessions of any of these dependencies shall make to the Commissioners, to be approved under this Ordinance, the returns hereby required, of the population of such islands respectively, within such time as the Commissioners shall appoint.

[1] No. 6, 'An Ordinance to change the day on which the declarations required by Ordinance No. 4 of 1846 are to be made', English text *Recueil des Lois 1846*, p. 49.

[2] A special census, covering the Indian Immigrants within the Colony on 31 Mar. 1847, was prescribed by Ordinance No. 4 of 1847 (10 Feb.), *Collection of Laws 1847*, pp. 26–8. But this census was not taken, and Ordinance No. 22 of 1847 (3 May, ibid., pp. 41–8) repealed the former Ordinance.

[3] No. 31, 'An Ordinance for taking an Account of the Population of Mauritius and its Dependencies', ibid. *1851*, pp. 103–5.

[4] According to *Census Report 1861*, p. 14, the census date was actually 20 Nov. 1851.

The scope of Schedule A was enlarged inasmuch as it asked also for Relationship to head of family and for Religious Creed.

An Ordinance passed on 1 March 1861[1] inaugurated a series of Census Ordinances which asked for the filling up of only one schedule for each dwelling-house. Census dates were 8 April 1861, 11 April 1871,[2] 4 April 1881,[3] 6 April 1891,[4] 1 April 1901,[5] 31 March 1911,[6] 21 May 1921,[7] 26 April 1931,[8] and 11 June 1944.[9] From 1901 onwards the census area excluded the Seychelles.

The most recent Census Ordinance reads as follows:

1. This Ordinance may be cited as the Census Ordinance, 1944.

2. A census for Mauritius and its Dependencies shall be taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-four, on such a day or days as shall be prescribed by Proclamation under section 11 of this Ordinance.

3.—(1) The Governor may appoint a Census Commissioner and a Deputy Census Commissioner for the purpose of taking the census of the Colony and of its dependencies.

(2) The Census Commissioner may, by instrument in writing, delegate any of the powers or duties conferred or imposed upon him by this Ordinance and the regulations made thereunder to the Deputy Census Commissioner and any powers so delegated may thereupon be exercised or performed by the Deputy Census Commissioner.

[1] No. 6, 'An Ordinance for taking the Census of Mauritius and its Dependencies', reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Enacted 1861*, pp. 8–13. This Ordinance was 'framed on the model of the Imperial Statute 23 & 24 Vict. cap. 61, with only a few modifications to adapt it to the peculiarities of the Colony' (Dispatch from Governor Stevenson to the Duke of Newcastle, 3 July 1862, *State of Colonial Possessions 1861*, Part I, p. 99).

[2] Ordinance No. 3 of 1871 (25 Jan.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Enacted 1871*, pp. 20–7, provided for a census to be taken on the night of 3 Apr. 'It was at first intended to take the Census on the 4th April, enumerating the population of the previous night;—but as the Mahomedan festival called the Muharram was to last till the 3rd it was thought proper to postpone the enumeration to the following Monday' (*Census Report 1871*, p. 3).

[3] Ordinance No. 15 of 1880 (5 Aug.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1880*, pp. 39–47, provided for a census to be taken on the night of 3 Apr.

[4] Ordinance No. 6 of 1890 (17 Sept.), reprinted ibid. *1890*, pp. 37–50, provided for a census to be taken in 1891. Proclamation No. 38 of 1890 (12 Nov.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations Published 1890*, p. 57, appointed 5 Apr. as census date. But Proclamations No. 20, 22, and 28 of 1891 (4 and 23 Apr. and 22 May 1891), reprinted ibid. *1891*, pp. 25–6, 28, 37, postponed the census date for the Islands of Rodrigues and Agalega till 3 May, and for the 'Six Islands' till 20 June.

[5] Ordinance No. 20 of 1900 (14 Sept.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1900*, pp. 57–69, provided for a census to be taken in 1901. Proclamation No. 63 of 1900 (30 Nov.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations Published 1900*, p. 76, appointed 31 Mar. as census date for Mauritius and Rodrigues, and Proclamation No. 17 of 1901 (29 Mar.), reprinted ibid. *1901*, p. 21, appointed 31 Mar. 'or the first day thereafter as the necessary instructions and forms may be received' as census date for the other Dependencies.

[6] Ordinance No. 2 of 1910 (30 June), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1910*, pp. 4–15, provided for a census to be taken in 1911. Proclamation No. 34 of 1910 (3 Dec.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations Published 1910*, p. 51, appointed 31 Mar. as census date.

[7] Ordinance No. 41 of 1920 (25 Oct.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1920*, pp. 45–52, amended by Ordinance No. 59 of 1920 (31 Dec.), reprinted ibid., p. 80, provided for a census to be taken in 1921. Proclamation No. 47 of 1920 (23 Nov.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations and Government Notifications 1920*, pp. 34–5, appointed 20 May as census date.

[8] Ordinance No. 5 of 1930 (10 Apr.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1930*, pp. 6–14, provided for a census to be taken in 1931. Proclamation No. 8 of 1931 (20 Mar.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations and Government Notices 1931*, p. 9, appointed 26 Apr. as census date.

[9] Ordinance No. 1 of 1944 (26 Jan.), reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1944*, pp. 1–4, provided for a census to be taken in that year. Proclamation No. 11 of 1944 (20 Apr.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations and Government Notices Published 1944*, Part I, p. 10, appointed 11 June as census date.

4. The Census Commissioner shall, subject to the directions of the Governor, make such arrangements and do all such things as are necessary for the taking of the census in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance and of any regulations made thereunder, and for that purpose shall make arrangements for the preparation and the issue of the necessary forms of return, and for the collection thereof when filled up, and may issue such instructions as may be necessary to carry this Ordinance into effect.

5. The Census Commissioner and the Deputy Census Commissioner shall receive such remuneration as may be fixed by the Council of Government.

6. The Census Commissioner shall cause to be prepared a table of allowances to be paid to the several enumerators, superintendents, and other persons who may be appointed or employed under this Ordinance; and such table of allowances shall be submitted to the Council of Government for approval together with an estimate showing, as far as possible, all other contingent expenses likely to be incurred for the census.

7. Any person obstructing, assaulting or molesting any enumerator, superintendent or other person, while the latter shall be performing any duty assigned to him by this Ordinance or by any regulation made thereunder, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees.

8.—(1) If any person—

(*a*) refuses or neglects to comply with or acts in contravention of any of the provisions of the regulations made under this Ordinance; or

(*b*) being a person required under the regulations made under this Ordinance to make a declaration with respect to the performance of his duties, makes a false declaration; or

(*c*) being a person required by any regulations made under this Ordinance to make, sign, or deliver any document, makes, signs or delivers, or causes to be made, signed or delivered, a false document; or

(*d*) being a person required in pursuance of any regulations made under this Ordinance to answer any question, refuses to answer or gives a false answer to that question;

he shall for each offence be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees.

(2) If any person—

(*a*) being a person employed in taking the census, without lawful authority publishes or communicates to any person otherwise than in the ordinary course of such employment any information acquired by him in the course of his employment; or

(*b*) having possession of any information which to his knowledge has been disclosed in contravention of this Ordinance or of any regulation made thereunder, publishes or communicates that information to any other person;

he shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year and to a fine not exceeding one thousand rupees.

9. For the purpose of enabling the census to be taken and to be carried into effect, the Governor in Executive Council may make regulations—

(1) prescribing the duties of the Census Commissioner, providing for the appointment or employment of enumerators, superintendents and such other persons as may be necessary for the purpose of the census and prescribing their duties;

(2) requiring persons appointed or employed for the purpose of the census to make a declaration with respect to the performance of their duties and authorising the Census Commissioner to prescribe the form of such declaration;

(3) providing for the division of the Colony into sub-districts and sections and the appointment of persons to act in those sub-districts and sections in connection with the census;

(4) providing for the appointment of a central office and of branch offices for the purpose of taking the census;

(5) with respect to the preparation, issue, filling up and collection of returns to be used in the taking of the census;

(6) requiring information to be given to the persons liable to make returns by the persons with respect to whom the returns are to be made;

(7) requiring officers of public or charitable institutions, or of any other institutions prescribed by the regulations, to make returns with respect to the inmates thereof and to comply with such instructions as may be issued to them by the Census Commissioner;

(8) with respect to the making of returns by captains, masters or other persons in charge of ships, with respect to persons who spent the night of the day fixed for taking the census on board their ships;

(9) making provision with respect to any other matters with respect to which it is necessary to make provision for the purpose of carrying this Ordinance into effect and of taking the census.

10.—(1) The provisions of this Ordinance and of the Regulations made thereunder shall apply, as far as practicable, to the several dependencies of Mauritius.

(2) In the Island of Rodrigues the necessary staff for the taking of the census shall be appointed by the Magistrate in accordance with such instructions as shall be sent to him by the Census Commissioner, and, in the other dependencies of Mauritius, by the manager of every establishment in such dependencies, or by any other person appointed by the Census Commissioner.

11.—(1) The Governor, by Proclamation, may prescribe the day for taking the census and may change such day, and may prolong any period fixed by regulations made under this Ordinance for the distribution, completion or collection of returns.

(2) The Governor may revoke, amend or vary any such Proclamation.

Under section 9 of the Census Ordinance, the Governor in Executive Council, on 10 March, made the following Regulations:[1]

1. These Regulations may be cited as the Census Regulations, 1944.

2. In these Regulations—

'Commissioner' means the Census Commissioner appointed under the Census Ordinance, 1944;

'Dwelling-house' shall include all buildings, outhouses and tenements which shall be used wholly or partly for the purpose of human habitation;

'Occupier' and 'Employer' shall include managers of estates and persons in charge of property when the owner of such estate or property does not live thereon;

'Premises' shall include dwellings, lodgings or rooms, hotels, clubs, boarding-houses, common or other lodging-houses, residential schools or colleges, residential institutions of any kind, barracks, estates;

'The Ordinance' means the Census Ordinance, 1944.

3.—(1) The Governor may appoint such enumerators, superintendents, and other persons as may be necessary for taking the census.

(2) The Commissioner shall, subject to the directions of the Governor, organize the staff of enumerators, superintendents and other persons so appointed, and shall, before the day fixed for the census, ensure that all such enumerators, superintendents and other persons thoroughly understand the manner in which they shall perform their respective duties.

4.—(1) For the purpose of taking the census the Commissioner shall divide the districts of the Island into sub-districts and each of such sub-districts into sections.

(2) The limits of each section and of each sub-district shall be clearly defined in a census map to be prepared by the Commissioner.

(3) Each section shall be assigned to an enumerator, and each sub-district to a superintendent who shall supervise and direct the enumerators whose sections shall lie within his sub-district.

[1] Government Notice No. 62 of 1944, reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations and Government Notices Published 1944*, Part II, pp. 46–51.

5. The Commissioner shall appoint a central office and one or more branch offices in each of the rural districts for receiving declarations and for otherwise carrying out the objects of the Ordinance.

6.—(1)[1] Forms of return shall be prepared under the directions of the Commissioner for the purpose of enabling returns to be made by, or on behalf of, every occupier of a dwelling-house or of premises, as hereinafter provided. Such returns shall be in the form annexed to these Regulations and shall state the particulars specified on such form in respect of every living person who abode in such dwelling-house or on such premises on the night of the day fixed for taking the census.

7.—(1) Every person with respect to whom it is the duty of another person to make a return shall give to that other person such information as the latter may reasonably require for the purpose of enabling him to make the return:

Provided that no person shall use, publish, or communicate to any other person any information so given otherwise than in accordance with these regulations.

(2) The Commissioner shall at least five days before the day fixed for taking the census, cause one or more forms of return to be left at every dwelling-house or premises in the Colony, and on every ship in any harbour or anchorage or roadstead thereof.

8. Every occupier of a dwelling-house or premises with or for whom any such form of return shall have been left as aforesaid and who shall be able to write either in the English or the French language shall to the best of his knowledge and belief make a return on the said form with respect to all persons who abode in such dwelling-house or premises on the night of the day fixed for taking the census, and shall sign such return and deliver it to the enumerator who shall call for it at the said dwelling-house or premises.

9. Every employer having employees who reside on his premises shall make a return on the said form with respect to every such employee and the members of his family who abode on the premises on the night of the day fixed for taking the census, unless any such employee shall have made a return or a declaration on his own behalf under these regulations.

10. Every occupier or employer aforesaid with whom any such form of return shall have been left and who shall be unable to write either in the English or the French language shall make to the enumerator who shall call for the said return a true and full declaration, to the best of his knowledge and belief, of the several particulars specified on such form of return with respect to every person who abode in such dwelling-house or premises as aforesaid on the night of the day fixed for taking the census, and his declaration shall be written down on the said form of return and shall be signed or marked by him and shall be authenticated by the said enumerator.

11. The keeper, manager, resident officer or other person for the time being in charge of any prison or other place of detention, hospital, nursing-house, asylum, workhouse, poorhouse, infirmary, religious or charitable community, or public or private institution shall be the enumerator of the inmates thereof, and shall be bound to conform to such instructions as may be issued to him by the Commissioner with respect to the purposes of the Ordinance.

12.—(1) The captain, master or other person in charge of a ship lying in any harbour, anchorage, or roadstead of Mauritius, on board of which a form of return shall have been left as provided in article 7 (2) of these regulations, shall, to the best of his knowledge and belief, make a return on the said form with respect to every person who spent the night of the day fixed for taking the census on board such ship; and he shall, within eight days, deliver the same, duly completed and signed, to the enumerator who shall call for it on board such ship.

(2) If the captain, master or other person in charge of such ship be unable to fill up any such form of return, it shall be filled up by the enumerator who shall call for it.

13.—(1) Every person who, during the night of the day fixed for taking the census, shall not have been abiding in any dwelling-house, premises or ship of which account is to be taken by the enumerators, and with respect to whom no return

[1] There is no subsection (2) to article 6.

shall have been made, shall, within eight days from such day, attend at one of the offices appointed for receiving declarations under these regulations within the district in which he slept on the night of the said day.

(2) Such person shall, if he can write in either the English or the French language, on being provided with a form of return make a return thereon, and shall sign and leave the return in the said office. If he is unable to write in either of the said languages, he shall give full and correct information with respect to the particulars specified on the form of return to any enumerator who may be in such office, and such enumerator shall thereupon fill up the form of return in the name of that person and the return shall be signed or marked by such person and shall be authenticated by such enumerator.

14. Every enumerator shall visit every dwelling-house and premises in his section and shall collect all the returns relating thereto on the day following the day fixed for taking the census, or as soon thereafter as possible, and shall examine each return and satisfy himself that the entries thereon are properly and sufficiently made and shall make all such inquiries as are reasonably necessary for that purpose and shall himself make such corrections in such return as appear to him on inquiry to be required.

15.—(1) Every superintendent shall take an account of the occupied houses whether used as dwellings, stores, warehouses, or workshops, of the number of rooms they contain, and of the houses being built and still uninhabited, and also of all other uninhabited houses, within his sub-district; and he shall record all such particulars on forms which shall be supplied to him by the Commissioner.

(2) The information required for the purposes of this article shall be supplied to the enumerators or superintendents by the owner or occupier of any such house, as the case may be.

16. Every enumerator shall within three days after the day fixed for taking the census deliver the returns collected, and if need be, corrected by him to the superintendent of his sub-district, and the latter shall, after having satisfied himself that the returns are properly filled in, forward them to the central office.

17. The Commissioner shall cause a digest to be made of all such returns and declarations, and shall cause such digest, together with his report on the census, to be printed and laid before the Council of Government within twelve months next after the day fixed for taking the census.

The columns of the 'form of return' annexed to the Regulations had the following headings:

A. Names and surnames.
B. Relation to the head of the family.
C. Condition in regard to marriage.
D. Sex.
E. Age at last birthday.
F. Occupation or Profession.
G. Whether paid by the day or by the month, or working on own account.
H. Can read and write or read only, or can do neither.
I. Can speak English or not.
J. Language habitually spoken at home.
K. Country where born.
L. Nationality.
M. Religion.
N. Remarks.

On the back of the form were printed 'Instructions for the Guidance of Mr. ..... who has to fill up the Form of Return'.

1. You must enter on this form of return all persons who passed the night of the eleventh of June 1944 on your premises, whether they be members of your family,

employed by you or not. If some of them do not reside, but have only spent the night of the eleventh of June 1944 on your premises, kindly state their real residence in the column of Remarks.

2. You are requested to fill up this form of return according to the following instructions—

A—Enter the names in the following order:
(1) head of family; (2) wife and children; (3) other relatives; (4) visitors; (5) boarders; (6) servants.

B—State whether the person inserted is your wife, son, daughter or other relative, or a visitor, boarder or servant.

C—Opposite the name of every adult, enter M for married; enter N.M. for unmarried; and W for widower or widow. If married, religiously only, enter R.M.; if living as man and wife without any form of marriage, enter C.

D—Enter M for males and F for females.

E—The age of each person at his or her last birthday must be accurately stated. Under one year state it in months.

F—The occupation or trade must be specified as precisely as possible.
Every person belonging to the commercial class should state whether he is merchant, banker, broker, shop-keeper or hawker; or what is his peculiar pursuit, calling or rank. Clerks, tradesmen and artisans should mention in what particular branch of business they are employed. Referring to labourers and servants, mention the peculiar calling of each; to those who are employed in cultivation add AGR. Referring to children above 6 years and under 18 years, state whether they attend a Government, Aided or Private School, or receive tuition at home or none.

G—State whether you are paid by the day, or by the month, or whether you are working on your own account. You need not state what you earn.

H—State whether you can read and write, or read only, or can do neither.

I—Indicate whether you can speak English, even though not very accurately.

J—State what language you habitually speak in usual conversation at home, whether English, French, Creole, Tamil, Urdu, etc.

K—Referring to Indians, state whether they were born in the Presidency of Calcutta, Madras or Bombay; and whether they are Immigrants or not. To Immigrants add I.M. Also distinguish the country of birth, and state whether the person mentioned is a British subject, or a naturalised British subject, or a foreign subject.

L—English, French, German, or whatever the nationality may be.

M—If Christian, the denomination, *i.e.* Catholic, Church of England, Calvinist, etc.; if not Christian, whether Jew, Hindoo, Mahomedan, Buddhist, Parsee, Sikh or whatever the religion may be.

N—This column will be filled up by the enumerator except as stated in 1 above.

3. This form must be filled up on the morning of the twelfth of June 1944. It will be called for on that day.

4. Persons who refuse to give information, or wilfully give false information will be liable to a penalty not exceeding five hundred rupees.

5. Any person authorised by you may write in the particulars if you are yourself unable to do so; if so, you must ascertain that the entries are quite correct by having them read over to you.

Official comments on the difficulties encountered and the completeness and accuracy of the censuses are scanty.

1861. Every endeavour was used, and no trouble or expense spared, to make this census as complete as possible; but it is (of course) to be apprehended that, with the mixed and peculiar population with which we have to deal, the great majority of whom can neither read nor write, and the comparatively few who could give assistance to the Commissioners, together with the mixed languages and complicated

interpretations which it was necessary to use, there may be many inaccuracies of details as well as of numbers.[1]

1871. It is presumable that Deserters, Vagrants, and others liable to arrest kept aloof from the Enumerators, dreading the risk of being apprehended; and I fear that many besides, looking upon the Census as only a means of preparing the way for the levying of the poll-tax which had been the subject of long discussions in the Legislative Council shortly before, likewise avoided declaring themselves, notwithstanding all the endeavors made to re-assure them.[2]

1881. In March last, I published a notice in all the daily papers in English and French, and had posted up throughout the Colony, in all the principal places and in all nooks and corners, 5000 copies, in English, French, Hindi, Tamul, and Chinese, of Appendix No. 2, informing the public of the requirements of the Census Ordinance and the reasons which led to the enumeration of the inhabitants. I adopted this course because, in previous Censuses, the lower classes were led to believe that the object in view was to levy a capitation-tax,—'*taxe la tête*' as it was then currently called—and as I wished to remove all doubts which might exist in the minds of the public generally. I may as well mention that, at the time the notice was issued, some wags had spread the rumour that the Government, in taking the Census of 1881, only wished to ascertain the number of able-bodied men in the Colony in order to enrol them in regiments to be sent from this Colony to Natal to fight the '*White Zulus*' (Boers).[3]

1891. The task of enumerating a population distributed like that of this Colony is a difficult one and it is essential that the persons engaged should be armed with full powers and adequately protected. Much difficulty was experienced by the enumerators and superintendents on account of the objection and dislike shewn to answering the question of the Schedules. In most cases the Schedules were filled up by the Enumerators or Sub-Enumerators who were persons employed to distribute and collect the Schedules and collecting meant in most cases filling up as well. Many people deliberately evaded the Enumerators who had to repeat their visits to obtain the information required by the Ordinance. One of the very able Superintendents who assisted me in this work—Mr. L. Caltaux—in a report on the taking of the Census gives it as his opinion that the law should be more stringent on this point and that adequate penalties should be imposed—and I may add easily enforceable—if after the first requisition the Census Officer fails to obtain the necessary information.[4]

1901. The Ordinance provided that the Schedules of the residents on Sugar Estates were to be filled in by the Accountants or Managers of such Estates, and, in order to avoid any difficulty, each Superintendent placed himself in communication with the owners or managers of the Estates in his District, explained to them the law and obtained satisfactory promises that the work would be done.

These promises were forthcoming at first, but at the last moment, when the Schedules were sent to the Estates, and the arduous nature of the work required became apparent, unexpected difficulties arose; the Managers, in several cases, refused to fill up the forms, sending them back 'en bloc', while in other instances they refused to receive delivery of them at all.

As the population of these Sugar Estates numbered some one hundred thousand persons (100,000), this refusal was a most serious one, and had the Accountants and Managers insisted in their determination not to fill in the returns, their action would have resulted in the Census being a complete failure.

It was a matter of great anxiety to myself since it was only at the very last moment that I succeeded in prevailing upon them to do the work.

That the owners of the Estates could be prosecuted for non-compliance with the Ordinance after putting the law in force, was undeniable, but that step would not

[1] Dispatch from Governor Stevenson to the Duke of Newcastle, 5 June 1861, *State of Colonial Possessions 1860*, Part I, p. 110.

[2] *Census Report 1871*, Part I, p. 18. [3] Ibid. *1881*, p. 3. [4] Ibid. *1891*, p. 44.

have advanced the Census one iota, and I spent several anxious days going from one Estate to another, happily succeeding in every case in smoothing over the difficulties where my Superintendents had been obdurately refused.

A small honorarium of Rs. 10 was given to each book keeper or Accountant on the Estate whose returns exceeded five hundred names, an amount, I am bound to say, quite inadequate when considering the work they had to perform.[1]

That a certain number of Indians may have escaped enumeration is not improbable; their habits of isolation in many instances, the difficulties of obtaining information from their womenkind, especially those who live nefarious lives, and a fear that there was something more than enumeration at the back of the Census work, undoubtedly had its effect; but, all that could be done was done by the Census Officers to reduce, to as small a minimum as possible, any such evasions.[2]

1931. The preparation for the final census had . . . been unusually thorough; but all the arrangements were thrown into confusion by the occurrence on March 5 to 7 of one of the severest cyclones recorded in Mauritius. A very large number of huts were completely destroyed and many substantial dwellings damaged. The census identification numbers on houses, in many cases disappeared.

As a result, it was considered safer to employ a larger staff of sub-enumerators than was originally contemplated, as the men would have had in many cases, to deal with areas in which the distribution of dwellings had markedly changed. The expense incurred was thereby increased.[3]

No special difficulties were encountered beyond those anticipated, viz: for the superintendents to direct a large staff of more or less inexperienced sub-enumerators and for the sub-enumerators to obtain, in the least possible time, the desired information from an almost entirely illiterate population.[4]

The expenditure for the censuses taken in 1881, 1891, and 1901 was in each case estimated at Rs.50,000.[5] If this was the actual cost, the expenditure for each 1,000 enumerated persons would have been about £10.

The total cost of the 1911 census was Rs.39,810 (Enumeration Rs.24,416, Compilation Rs.10,521, Printing Rs.4,873)[6] or £7. 18*s*. 4*d*. for each 1,000 enumerated persons.

The expenditure for the 1931 census was estimated at Rs.62,000.[7] If this was the actual cost, the expenditure for each 1,000 enumerated persons would have been £11. 10*s*. 10*d*.

The expenditure for the 1944 census was estimated at Rs.84,000. If this was the actual cost, the expenditure for each 1,000 enumerated persons would have been £14. 11*s*. 3*d*.

II. Total Population

1. *1598–1710*

When the Dutch first landed in Mauritius in 1598 the island was uninhabited,[8] and it remained so until in May 1638 a detachment of 25 men in the employ of the Dutch East India Company went there to stay.[9]

[1] Ibid. *1901*, pp. 53–4. [2] Ibid., p. 55. [3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 1. [4] Ibid., p. 2.

[5] See Dispatch from Lieutenant-Governor Broome to the Earl of Kimberley, 26 Dec. 1881, ibid. *1881*, covering letter, p. 1, and Report of Census Commissioner Kyshe ibid., p. 45; ibid. *1891*, p. 45; *1901*, p. 55.

[6] See ibid. *1911*, p. xxv. [7] See *Mauritius Estimates 1931–2*, p. 16.

[8] See Grant, *History of Mauritius* (1801), pp. 20–1; Pitot, *T'Eylandt Mauritius* (1905), p. 15.

[9] See ibid., pp. 65, 68–9. The number of people disembarked by the commander, Cornelis Simonsz Goyer, is not known (see Prince Roland Bonaparte, *Le Premier Établissement des Néerlandais à Maurice*, 1890, p. 12), but according to Leupe, 'De Vestiging der Hollanders op Mauritius,

Another ship, arriving in September, landed 20 men,[1] and a third ship, arriving in May 1639, brought 30 men.[2] The Dutch commander 'Gooyer had now at his disposal a personnel of 80 men'.[3] In May 1640 the Directors of the Company sent another ship which was to leave 25 or 30 colonists in Mauritius, but the new commander Adriaan van der Stel[4] did not accept them, as he had received orders from the Governor-General of India never to keep more than 80 men in Mauritius.[5] However, the Governor-General was anxious to procure large numbers of negro slaves from Madagascar.[6]

By June 1642 the number of Dutchmen in Mauritius had decreased to 52,[7] and it remained apparently on the same level in the following three years.[8]

Early in 1652 'the total population of the island, free and slaves, amounted to about 100 persons, of whom 6 were convicts'.[9] This total included the (military and civilian) employees of the Company, who at the end of the year numbered 40 or 50 men.[10] In 1654 'the establishment... consisted of 60 employees of the Company, some free families, some convicts, and sick people'.[11]

By that time the Company, which in 1652 had taken possession of the Cape of Good Hope, was no longer interested in Mauritius, and in 1655–6 a large part of the population was evacuated. There remained only a garrison of 20 men, about as many slaves and convicts, and apparently 6 Maroons (escaped slaves).[12] In July 1658 all the remaining inhabitants, 'except a sailor and two female slaves who had taken refuge in the woods',[13] were embarked for the Cape.

In August 1663 the Company ordered the Governor of the Cape 'to

in 1638' (1854), p. 268, the people who were left in the island consisted of the commander, a *ziekentrooster*, 11 workmen, a corporal, 3 sub-lieutenants (*adelborsten*), a drummer, and 7 soldiers. The word *ziekentrooster* has caused a good deal of confusion. Prince Bonaparte (p. 13) translates it, by mistake, '*le pasteur*'. Pitot, *T'Eylandt Mauritius* (p. 68), says '*le chirurgien (cumulant aussi les fonctions de barbier et d'apothicaire)*'; he is undoubtedly right, since according to a record made by Goyer on 30 July 1638 (see Leupe, pp. 278 9) there was actually in the detachment a 'barber well provided with everything in the way of both medicines and instruments'. Sir Charles Bruce, 'The Evolution of the Crown Colony of Mauritius' (1908, p. 59), assumes erroneously that this barber was included among the workmen and that there was in addition a pastor: '... military and civil Government were represented by the commander, three officers, and nine soldiers; religion by the pastor; in the general population of eleven working-men, science was represented by the barber ....'

[1] A clergyman, an assistant, a cook, a blacksmith, and 16 soldiers; see letter from Goyer to the Directors of the India Company, 20 Dec. 1638 (Leupe, pp. 274–8; Bonaparte, pp. 37–43).

[2] See Heeringa, 'De Nederlanders op Mauritius en Madagascar', p. 878; Pitot, *T'Eylandt Mauritius*, p. 78.

[3] Ibid., pp. 78–9.

[4] He came to Mauritius on 8 Nov. 1639 with his wife who six days later gave birth to a son, the well-known Governor of the Cape, Simon van der Stel (1679–99). See Heeringa, p. 1036; Pitot, *T'Eylandt Mauritius*, pp. 79–80.

[5] See Heeringa, p. 885; Bonaparte, p. 53; Pitot, p. 83.

[6] See Leupe, p. 280; Bonaparte, p. 49; Pitot, pp. 83, 86.

[7] See Heeringa, p. 886.

[8] See ibid., p. 887.

[9] Pitot, p. 111. See also Heeringa, p. 1031.

[10] See ibid., and Pitot, p. 112.

[11] Ibid., p. 114; see also Heeringa, p. 1033. A ship had just disembarked 3 Chinese convicts and 12 sick people; see Heeringa, p. 1032, and Pitot, p. 114.

[12] See Heeringa, p. 1035; Pitot, p. 116.

[13] Heeringa, p. 1036.

send without delay a dozen men to take again possession of Mauritius'.[1] The new commander, Jacobus van Nieuwland, landed in July 1664 with an assistant and twelve men. He died soon, and his men were all brought back to the Cape.[2] His successor, Dirk Jansz Smient, arrived in the following year.[3] The inhabitants then numbered 32, all employees of the Company.[4] The number of whites was apparently still the same at the beginning of 1671,[5] but in September 1671 a French captain found there 48 Dutchmen and 2 women.[6]

In 1673 'the general population amounted to 110 souls, of whom 54 were employees of the Company and 56 free settlers, including the women, the children, and the slaves'.[7]

In 1677–8 the 'official population' amounted to 135 (the Commander and his Council, 10; Garrison, servants, and slaves, 125). In 1679 the 'general population', i.e. the total population, amounted to 153. It was composed as follows:[8]

Commander and the servants of the Company	28
Slaves of the Company (39 men, 22 women, 2 children)	63
2 Convicts, 2 banished women, 2 banished children	6
Free settlers (16 men, 9 women, 18 children)	43
Slaves of the free settlers (11 men, 2 women)	13

Leguat, who arrived in Mauritius in 1693[9] and left in 1696, wrote:

> The Company maintains, at the fort, a garrison of about fifty men; and there are thirty or forty Dutch families dispersed in different places of the island.[10]

In the autumn of 1703 the population is said to have been about 400.[11] This figure, I suppose, included the garrison.

On 20 March 1706 the free settlers numbered 128 (33 men, 25 women, 38 boys, and 32 girls) and their slaves 57 (40 men, 14 women, 2 boys, and 1 girl).[12] There were in addition (in 1704) a garrison of 50 men,[13] and (in November 1708) 46 employees of the Company, 17 slaves of the Company, and 8 convicts.[14]

In the meantime, however, the Company had come to the conclusion that it was not worth while to bear the heavy expense of the establishment, and in 1706 it decided again to abandon the island completely.[15]

[1] Pitot, p. 119. See also Theal, *History of South Africa (1652–1795)*, vol. i, p. 136: '. . . the directors resolved to take possession of it again, more for the purpose of keeping other nations away than for any direct profit which they could draw from it.'

[2] See Pitot, pp. 119–21.

[3] See ibid., p. 121. De Burgh-Edwardes, *History of Mauritius* (1921), p. 8, says: 'In May 1664, Dirk Smient landed with thirty-two white men and twelve slaves.' But this occurred probably in 1665.

[4] See Pitot, p. 121.

[5] See ibid., p. 124.

[6] See I. Guët, *Les Origines de l'Ile Bourbon* (1888), p. 25.

[7] Pitot, p. 157. De Burgh-Edwardes, p. 8, says: 'Hubert Hugo, appointed Governor . . . landed at Mauritius on the 13th February, 1673, with sixty white men, eighteen women, and thirty-five slaves he had brought from Madagascar.'

[8] See Pitot, p. 210.

[9] See p. 886 below.

[10] François Leguat, *Voyage et Avantures* (1708), vol. ii, p. 64. In another place (p. 69) he speaks of 'the garrison, the black slaves, and all those whom it [the Company] maintains at the fort'.

[11] See de Burgh-Edwardes, p. 10.

[12] See Pitot, p. 343.

[13] See Bourde de la Rogerie (1934), p. 118.

[14] See Pitot, pp. 339–41. The above statement does not include the families and servants of the employees of the Company.

[15] See ibid., p. 331.

Between September 1707 and February 1710 the whole population was shipped partly for the Cape and partly for Batavia,[1] with the exception of 4 Europeans and 2 Malays who all 'pretended to be sick and absolutely refused to embark'.[2] How many escaped slaves (who, of course, do not figure in any of the population accounts) stayed on, it is impossible to tell.[3]

2. *1712–1810*

1712–35. When by 1712 it became evident that the Dutch had finally abandoned Mauritius,[4] the Governor of the neighbouring Isle Bourbon (later named Réunion), de Parat, envisaged an occupation of Mauritius by Frenchmen.

The population of the Isle of Bourbon having become considerable in 1712, an opportunity was offered of forming a French settlement on the island of Mauritius, which the Dutch had at this time abandoned.[5] Accordingly a small number of French people landed there at this time, and changed its name to that of the Isle de France.[6]

Though this effort at settlement failed, de Parat pursued his plan. In December 1712 he recommended to the French minister de Pontchartrain the occupation of Mauritius by the India Company.[7] In a Memorandum dated 19 September 1714 he repeated his recommendation. 'The Company could not do better than to seize it and send there part of the inhabitants of the Isle Bourbon who are getting to be very numerous and find it difficult to exist.'[8] But before the Minister received this Memoran-

[1] See ibid., pp. 331–51. Pitot says that the ship which arrived in September 1707 'took only 54 passengers' and that thirteen months later 'there still remained 320 people in the island' (*Mauritius Illustrated*, p. 17).

[2] Pitot, *T'Eylandt Mauritius*, p. 351.

[3] De Rauville says that in 1722 'the forests and the mountains were infested with escaped slaves who had fled from their Dutch masters and whom these had abandoned when they left' (*L'Ile de France contemporaine*, 1908, p. xxxii).

[4] Grant (1801), p. 29, gave 1712 as the year of the final abandonment, and this date has been accepted by most writers, for example by Pitot in 1899, *L'Île de France (1715–1810)*, p. 1. But after a more comprehensive study of the Dutch period, Pitot wrote in 1905 (*T'Eylandt Mauritius*, p. 353) that 'no one has given as yet the exact date of the final abandonment'. The exact year, I think, is 1710.

[5] See also 'Journal of the Voyage of Abbé de la Caille, from the Cape of Good Hope to the Isle of France, and his Operations there' [1753–4]: 'The great number of establishments which that republic maintained in India, occasioned them to abandon it in 1712: and the French, who had long occupied the Isle of Bourbon, which is not more than thirty-five or forty leagues from it, did not fail to possess themselves of it' (Grant, p. 377).

[6] Grant, p. 28. See also D'Epinay, *Renseignements pour servir à l'histoire de l'Ile de France* (1890), p. 73: 'It seems that as early as that same year [1712] the commander (or Governor) of the isle Bourbon, Antoine de Parat, having learned of this abandonment [by the Dutch] sent to the island of Mauritius a military official with five or six volunteer inhabitants and some blacks.'

[7] See Guět, p. 263. This was the old (French) India Company, which a few years later came to an end; see Pitot, *L'Ile de France (1715–1810)*, pp. 1–2.

[8] Kaeppelin, *Les Escales françaises* (1908), p. 95. The Isle Bourbon, with an area of nearly 1,000 square miles and a present population of over 200,000, was occupied in 1665 by the French India Company (see Guět, pp. 66–70, 298). The number of inhabitants for some time remained small although it was reinforced by fugitives from Madagascar in 1674. There were very few white families and the Administration prohibited intermarriage with blacks. An Ordinance issued on 1 Dec. 1674 'par nous Jacob de Lahaye, lieutenant général des armées du roy, admiral, gouverneur et son lieutenant général dans toute l'étendue des mers et pays orientaux de son obéissance' stipulated: 'Deffense aux François d'épouser des négresses, cela dégoûterait les noirs

dum he had already decided to act and had invited the Associated Ship-owners of Saint Malo to take possession of the island in the name of the French King.[1] Their captain Dufresne did so in September 1715[2] after having assured himself that the island, which he again named *Ile de France*, was uninhabited, and he left none of his men there when he

du service, et deffense aux noirs d'épouser des blanches; c'est une confusion à éviter.' (Guët, p. 125.) A captain who visited the island in 1676 wrote: 'The entire island colony consists of about 200 or 250 persons, French as well as black. All the Frenchmen present are very resolute, and it is a pity that there is no means of peopling this island since for so many men there are only 7 or 8 white women, although there is not a single man who would not like to get married' (ibid., p. 128). A count made in Dec. 1686 showed a total population of 269, including 36 French husbands—10 married to French women, 12 to Portuguese women from India, and 14 to negresses from Madagascar (see ibid., p. 141). The French Government at that time was greatly interested in the development of the population of the island. The instructions issued by the King to de Vauboulon, who was appointed Governor on 20 Mar. 1689, said among other things: 'M. de Vauboulon shall take an exact census of all the inhabitants by families, individuals, sex, and age, the total of their livestock, slaves, and arms in order to send it after his arrival' (ibid., p. 162). The census was apparently taken early in 1690. According to Guët (pp. 189–90) who scrutinized the original census lists there were then in the island 201 whites (55 men, 36 women, 110 children) and 108 blacks (57 men, 27 women, and 24 children). The population apparently increased to 488 in 1697 (see ibid., p. 224), to 734 (423 whites, 311 blacks) in 1705 (see ibid., p. 217; Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 79), and to 894 (507 whites, 387 blacks) in 1709 (see Bourde de la Rogerie, ibid.). The whites numbered 643 in 1711. In 1713 there were 633 whites (excluding the military staff and the agents of the Company) and 538 negroes (see ibid.). The latter evidently included Indians (see Guët, p. 232). The increase in the number of whites was apparently due only in part to immigration. 'The Bourbon Colony . . . felt only one instinctive duty: that of perpetuating itself by an infinite number of offspring; a duty which it fulfilled conscientiously without regard to the colour of those born' (ibid., pp. 211–12). Even so, abortions and infanticide worried the Administration, and on 20 Feb. 1715 the Provincial Council of the island issued a Regulation which stipulated among other things: 'Whereas the Council has been informed on good authority that girls were found to be pregnant without their fruit having appeared afterwards, in order to remedy so great a disorder and to ensure the life and the safety of the children, we order all girls, widows, and wives whose husbands are absent and who shall become pregnant to declare their pregnancy as soon as they shall have noticed it to the secular councillors, on pain of death, whether free or slaves, if it should be discovered that they were pregnant and that their fruit has disappeared' (Azéma, *Histoire de L'Ile Bourbon*, 1862, pp. 27–8; *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 24 May 1891, pp. 605–8).

That the island with about 1 inhabitant to the square mile in 1714 was considered to be over-populated was due to the fact that 'the colonists lived on hunting and fishing' (Guët, p. 213). But the position changed when in the following year the cultivation of coffee was started. The immediate effect of this measure on the growth of the population is not known. Legentil de la Barbinais, it is true, reported in 1717: 'There are to-day in the Isle Mascarin [Bourbon] 900 free persons and 1,100 slaves. Among the free persons there are only six persons whose blood is not mixed' (Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 91). But his statement about the colour of the free persons does not inspire much confidence in his sense for figures. In any case the population increased very much in the following decades. It is said to have numbered 15,000 in 1750 (see D'Epinay, p. 486) and 19,776 (4,627 whites, 15,149 blacks) in 1764 (see Raynal, *Histoire philosophique et politique*, 1774, vol. ii, p. 83). A census taken in 1767 showed 2,803 male and 2,434 female whites and free persons, and 25,047 slaves, or altogether 30,284, and a census taken in 1777 3,551 male and 3,061 female whites and free persons, and 28,457 slaves, or altogether 35,069 (see Azéma, pp. 144–5, 336). Although 'for seventy years, that is until the cultivation of sugar was started (1785), the speciality of Bourbon was to furnish to the whole of France a delicious coffee' (Guët, p. 275), the island seems to have been considered over-populated most of the time. '. . . the white population which lacked soil was not always well off, and it was a commonplace in the 18th century to say that emigration was necessary: Réunion was regarded as a nursery for colonists and for soldiers to occupy Madagascar and make war in India' (Prentout, p. 69).

[1] See Pitot, p. 1.

[2] See 'Act of taking possession of the Isle of France', 20 Sept. 1715, reprinted in Magon de Saint-Elier, *Tableaux historiques*, vol. i (1839), pp. 243–4; see also *Revue Historique*, 1 June 1887, pp. 9–10. For an English translation see Austen, *Sea Fights*, p. 180.

sailed after a short stay.[1] It seems also that the island remained uninhabited (by whites) for six years more, although attempts to induce people from Bourbon to move to the Isle of France were made repeatedly.[2]

On 2 April 1721 the King ceded the island to the new India Company,[3] which immediately sent there the Chevalier du Fougeray to take possession on behalf of the Company. He arrived on 23 September and left again on 3 November.[4] In the meantime, the Provincial Council of Bourbon had resolved to send 12 or 15 inhabitants of that island, a lay-priest, and a surgeon under the command of Major Durongouët Le Toullec as Acting Governor to the Isle of France.[5] The expedition proceeded to Mauritius in December.[6] Finally, in January 1722, there arrived the Governor de Nyon. He had sailed from France in June 1721 with 'a Swiss platoon of 210 men with 20 women and 30 children, several officers, engineers, clerks, and workmen',[7] all destined for the Isle of France. But during his long

[1] Kaeppelin says (p. 96) that the King's detailed instructions, signed 31 Oct. 1714, which requested Dufresne to transport some settlers from the Isle Bourbon to Mauritius failed to reach him. See also ibid., pp. 92–3.

[2] The available information concerning the attempts to promote emigration from the Isle Bourbon to the Isle of France prior to Oct. 1721 is rather vague.

10 Nov. 1717. The Directors of the East India Company instructed captain Sieur Dufour that at his return from Madagascar to the Isle Bourbon 'if some inhabitants of the Isle Bourbon are willing to move to this Isle of Mauritius he may conduct them there with one of the missionaries to maintain them in the religion' (*Revue Historique*, 23 Jan. 1888, pp. 379–80).

Feb. 1718. 'The Governor of Bourbon, M. Beauvollier de Courchant, proposes to several families to colonize the Isle of France which was said to be uninhabited. They refuse to expatriate themselves.' (D'Epinay, p. 78; see also Kaeppelin, p. 98.)

23 Sept. 1721. 'Settlers of Bourbon having been requisitioned to go to the Isle of France, flee to the mountains. One had to fetch them again and to embark them by force under the command of captain Hubert. But they found means of escaping.' (D'Epinay, pp. 80–1; see also Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 126.)

Pitot, p. 2, speaks likewise of 'the repeated efforts of M. Beauvollier de Courchant, Governor of Bourbon, who tried several times, but to no purpose, to have move there [Isle of France] some settlers by persuasion and even by force'. See also De Burgh-Edwardes (p. 11): 'Trials of Settlement (1715–1721). The Governor of Bourbon tried on three occasions to send a few families to Mauritius to settle, but these attempts at settlement were never successful.'

[3] He did so, according to d'Epinay (p. 81), 'since the new colony of the Isle of France proved unable to develop'.

[4] See 'Procès-Verbal de Prise de Possession de l'Ile de France par le Chevalier Garnier du Fougeray', *Revue Historique*, 1 Feb. 1888, pp. 391–2; Guët, pp. 264–5; Pitot, pp. 2, 374–5.

[5] See Resolution of the Provincial Council, 10 Oct. 1721, reproduced in Azéma, p. 44, and in *Revue Historique*, 1 Feb. 1888, p. 393. See also de Rauville, *L'Ile de France contemporaine*, p. xxix: 'M. Beauvollier de Courchant was then Governor of the Isle Bourbon. Shortly after the neighbouring island had been taken possession of he was advised that the Company was to send him a ship on which a Governor and settlers destined to the Isle of France would embark. But as the ship was slow in arriving, M. Beauvollier decided to send there a temporary administrator "fearing that some foreign nation might forestall us and seize it".'

[6] See Resolution of the Provincial Council of Bourbon, 27 Nov. 1721, *Revue Historique*, 8 Apr. 1888, p. 506; Pitot, p. 3; de Rauville, *L'Ile de France contemporaine*, p. xxx. The instructions to Durongouët Le Toullec, dated 1 Dec. 1721, are reproduced in Azéma, pp. 44–5.

[7] *Revue Historique*, 16 Feb. 1888, pp. 422–3. The *Revue* published first (ibid., pp. 422–4) under the title 'Lettre des Directeurs de la Compagnie des Indes du 31 mai 1721' extracts from such a letter and later (ibid., 16 and 23 Sept., 1 and 8 Oct. 1889, pp. 165–8, 179–82, 192–6, 207–10) under the title 'Lettre des Directeurs de la Compagnie des Indes au Conseil Provincial de Bourbon, 31 mai 1721' another such letter in full. Both letters were apparently handed to de Nyon for delivery in Bourbon but the former letter was, I think, written somewhat later than the other.

journey many, particularly among the Swiss soldiers, died[1] and the total number landed in the Isle of France possibly did not exceed 100.[2]

The India Company, in a letter written before de Nyon sailed, had urged the Provincial Council of Bourbon to send some families to the Isle of France.

The Company has no doubt that you will persuade some of the inhabitants of the Isle Bourbon to move to the Isle of France in order to settle there, notwithstanding what you stated in your letter of 10 October 1720. Now that they will see that the settlement of the latter island is being seriously considered, it must be presumed that they will be more ready to go. Sr Denyon is charged with the execution of this plan in agreement with you. You will select four or six families to be moved there to which will be granted concessions in proportion to their size (*forces*) and an exemption for six years from all taxes on coffee and on the other products of the island. This privilege must contribute to make them move there, since the new inhabitants who go there will enjoy this exemption only for three consecutive years, reckoned from the date of their concession.

It is, as you see, extremely important that some families go there in order to instruct the new settlers in the cultivation of coffee and the other products and to chose the proper seasons for sowing and planting, since the conditions in these two islands are nearly the same.[3]

De Nyon himself was very anxious to get this succour from Bourbon.[4] He went there and attended on 16 May 1722 a meeting of the Provincial Council.

There was also brought under deliberation the absolute need, which M. Denion, the Governor of the Isle of France, bore witness to have, of some Creole inhabitants of this island and of several slaves to help him in the settlement of the Isle of France until other people would have come to him.

Having considered the measures which would be swiftest to attain it and the least costly to the Company, it has been resolved that it is proper to enlist at least six Creole inhabitants of this Island and to draw from the other inhabitants 30 black slaves, all to be moved to the Isle of France, and to obey there the commands of the Governor, and that the inhabitants and the blacks, apart from their food, will be paid for each day from their departure until their return, namely the creoles 20 *sols* per day and the masters of the blacks 10 *sols* for each day of their slaves.[5]

Pitot, after having mentioned this resolution, says regarding the population:

It consisted then of altogether 160 persons, including the Governor, the personnel

[1] See ibid., 16 Feb. 1888, p. 423; L. H. de Froberville, 'Le premier Apôtre de l'Ile de France', ibid., 10 Aug. 1890, p. 124.

[2] De Burgh-Edwardes reports wrongly (p. 12): 'In January, 1722, Mr. de Nyon . . . landed at Port South-East with 210 soldiers, 140 Frenchmen (mostly engineers, ex-soldiers, and sailors), 40 women, 2 priests, and 2 brothers, all of St. Malo, and 30 slaves.' Saint Elme Le Duc, *Île de France* (1844), p. 31, was also mistaken in saying: 'The military strength of the island consisted of a Swiss platoon of 210 men, including officers and non-commissioned officers. . . . At that time there were in the Colony hardly 186 whites, including women and children.' But De Burgh-Edwardes was right in saying that two priests and two brothers (not mentioned by the Company) had sailed with de Nyon and landed in the Isle of France; see L. H. de Froberville, pp. 123–4.

[3] *Revue Historique*, 8 Oct. 1889, pp. 209–10.

[4] 'He needed hands all the more since during the passage . . . the major part of the Swiss—and possibly also of the other settlers sent from France—had died' (Gaud, 'Nos premiers Gouverneurs français et hollandais', p. 506).

[5] 'Délibérations du Conseil de l'Isle de Bourbon', *Revue Historique*, 8 Apr. 1888, p. 508. See also Azéma, p. 46.

of the Company, the inhabitants, the slaves, and two regiments formed partly of Swiss platoons.[1]

Pitot gives as his source E. Piston who had stated:

The personnel of the Company was limited to 160 persons, the Governor, 30 men, 20 slaves, men, women and children, and two regiments of 53 men among whom there were Swiss platoons.[2]

But Piston does not say that this was the population in 1722, and his statement, as will be seen presently, referred rather to 1726.

The resolution of the Provincial Council of Bourbon had been carried out,[3] but after a few months the Council decided to recall the settlers and slaves and to procure other slaves for the Isle of France.[4]

Considering [1] the extreme importance of fortifying instantly the harbours of the Isle of France in order to safeguard it against the attempts of the Dutch of the Cape who are reported to have threatened to take arms and seize it by force; [2] that the delay of the ship *St. Albin*, destined for the purchase of the blacks necessary for the fortification work, which has not yet arrived, might give those Dutch the time to carry out that project; and [3] that finally the inhabitants and blacks of this Isle who were sent to that of France caused too considerable an expense to the Company not to seek all the means to stop it by recalling as soon as possible those inhabitants and blacks whose return is the more necessary as the cultivation of the coffee-trees suffers from their absence—the Provincial Council of the Isle Bourbon, assembled in the district of St. Paul, has decided to dispatch as soon as possible the ship the *Ruby* and to send it for the purchase of blacks to Matatana and to fort Dauphin [Madagascar] in order to carry them directly to the Isle of France and after having deposited them there to bring back the inhabitants and the blacks who are in that island.[5]

The *Ruby* arrived in Mauritius on 8 December 1722 with 65 negro slaves (27 men, 18 boys, and 20 women), but almost immediately 15 men and 4 boys 'became maroons'.[6]

[1] *L'Ile de France*, p. 3. See also *Colonial Reports, Mauritius 1938*, p. 3: '. . . by 1722 the population apart from maroons, amounted to 160 persons, soldiers, colonists, and slaves.'

[2] Piston, *La Bourdonnais* (1847), reprinted in *Revue Historique*, 1 June 1887, p. 3.

[3] See Kaeppelin, p. 102: 'He [de Nyon] left Bourbon on 3 June [1722] with six creoles and thirty slaves in the pay of the Company and arrived on the 13th . . . .'

[4] The India Company had wished from the outset that the Isle of France be well provided with negro slaves. In their letter of 31 May 1721 to the Provincial Council of Bourbon they had said that one of the two ships they were sending was 'appropriate for carrying 250 or 300 blacks, among them 50 negresses, as well to the Isle of Bourbon as to that of France, which ship you will use in your slave-trade' (*Revue Historique*, 16 Sept. 1889, p. 168).

[5] 'Envoi de noirs à l'Ile de France, Délibération du Conseil Provincial de Bourbon du 2 octobre 1722', ibid., 13 Dec. 1891, p. 336.

[6] Letter from de Nyon to Hautville, 18 Dec. 1722, quoted by Kaeppelin, p. 103. See also Pridham, *England's Colonial Empire*, vol. i (1846), p. 153: '. . . we find, in the November of that year [1723], that three of the recently imported slaves, being convicted of joining the Marons, then the *ci-devant* slaves of the Dutch, were sentenced to death.' See furthermore Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 32.

In Dec. 1723 the King of France issued a Letters Patent which introduced in the Isle of France and in Bourbon the *Code Noir*, an Edict concerning the status of slaves published in France in 1685; see p. 707 above, and Toussaint, *Missions d'Adrien d'Epinay*, p. 145. This Letters Patent began as follows:

'The Directors of the East India Company having represented to us, that the Isle of Bourbon is extensively peopled by a great number of our subjects, who employ Negro Slaves in the cultivation of their lands; that the Isle of France which adjoins the said Isle of Bourbon likewise begins to be settled upon, and that they are in the intention of making fresh establishments in the neighbouring countries, we have deemed it to be becoming our authority and our justice, for the pre-

Very little is known about the strength of the garrison at that time. A Regulation of the India Company concerning the platoons of troops in the Isles of France and of Bourbon, dated 9 November 1723, said:

> The King having ordered, by his Ordinances of 16 March and 10 April of the present year, the raising of seven platoons of infantry for the defence of the Isles of Bourbon and of France . . . the Company has ordered and orders that each of the seven platoons . . . shall consist in the future of one captain, one lieutenant, one sub-lieutenant, one ensign, two sergeants, two corporals, two lance-corporals, two cadets, fifty fusiliers, and two drummers . . . .[1]

But the Regulation did not say how many of the 7 platoons were to be stationed in the Isle of France.

A count made on 18 October 1725[2] showed the following result:

Officers and employees	*Troops*	*Working-men*	*Servants*	*Women*	*Children*	*Blacks of the Company*	*Blacks of various private persons*	*Total*
20	100	28	5	13	13	24	10	213

An Order of 5 June 1726 by the Provincial Council of the island[3] showed that the garrison comprised 'two platoons of infantry composed of 53 men each'.[4] The same Order stated:

> The number of persons in the civilian service of the Company amounts to 38,[5] including the Governor, the officers of the Administration, and the various workshops. The number of slaves is given as 20, men as well as women and children.[6]

In order to make the figures comparable it is necessary to deduct from the 1725 total the 5 servants, the 26 women and children, and the 10 slaves of private persons. Even so there appears a decrease from 172 to 164 (in spite of an increase in the military). But what is more important is that the count of 1725, which apparently was all-inclusive, suggests that there were no settlers whatsoever in the Colony. Lenoir, who in September 1725 had been appointed superior commander of the French Indian establishments, declared in a comprehensive Memorandum dated 28 September 1726 that 'there were in the Isle of France only the employees and the soldiers of the Company', and that 'if one wanted to get anything useful from this colony one must first of all people it'.[7]

On 29 January 1727 the India Company made a 'General Regulation for the Isles of Bourbon and of France', which established a Council of

servation of those colonies, to establish therein a law and certain rules for the maintenance of the discipline of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic religion, and for fixing all that concerns the state and condition of Slaves in the said Islands . . . .'

[1] 'Les Compagnies de troupes aux Iles de France et de Bourbon (1723)', *Revue Historique*, 16 Apr. 1888, p. 516.

[2] Kaeppelin (p. 104) calls it 'the first census'.

[3] This Council established by a Royal decree of Nov. 1723 was not appointed until 31 May 1726; see Magon de Saint-Elier, pp. 54–6.

[4] It comprised only 41 fusiliers, but otherwise corresponded to the Regulation of 9 Nov. 1723.

[5] The salaries are shown for 7 officials, 2 doctors, and 22 workmen.

[6] 'Les Compagnies de troupes', p. 517.

[7] See Kaeppelin, pp. 105–7.

Administration for the two islands, and which contained also new provisions for the settlement of the Isle of France by colonists from Bourbon.

In view of the intention of the Company to secure the prompt settlement of the Isle of France, they exhort the Council of the Isle Bourbon to invite some families of the latter island to move to the Isle of France, using for this purpose all means of persuasion and all discretion which the Council shall consider appropriate, and they empower it to grant to all the inhabitants of the Isle of France a period of three years for the payment both of the blacks who shall be sold to them at the basic rate of 200 *livres* for each[1] and of the Indian slaves of whom two shall be charged to them as equal to only one black.[2]

And, as a still greater inducement, the Company authorizes the Council to grant, both to the inhabitants of Bourbon who shall move to the Isle of France and to those who shall be conveyed from Europe, the ration for a whole year and the advance of the necessary tools and seeds with the obligation to repay the whole in kind or in money within two years, a period which the Council, if he considers it opportune, may even extend for a third year.

Since it is no less important for the solid settlement of the Isle of France to think seriously of the destruction of the blacks who have there become maroons the Company particularly orders the Council to take all pains with this expedition and to take for this purpose, jointly with the officer who will be in charge,[3] all measures which will seem the most certain to ensure success either by sending there munitions and other help or by inducing the creoles of the Isle Bourbon to move thereto.[4]

The Company itself, not wishing to neglect anything which might contribute to the success of this expedition, authorizes the Council to pay to the creoles or others employed in this expedition a sum of 150 *livres* for each maroon brought dead or alive, granting even in addition to the 150 *livres* the property of the blacks caught alive to those who will have seized them.[5]

[1] See also in this connexion the following passage from the letter of 31 May 1721 from the India Company to the Provincial Council of Bourbon (*Revue Historique*, 1 Oct. 1889, p. 196):

'In article 12 of the instructions which were given to you on 10 November 1717 by the former Company it is said that when the ships of the Company bring you blacks and negresses they shall be publicly sold to the highest bidder. . . .

'The Company has resolved to change the provisions of those articles only as regards the sale of the blacks and negresses . . . and has decided to sell the blacks and negresses *pièce d'Inde* [i.e. those strong and in good condition] at from 150 to 200 *livres* each, according to their quality, and the little negresses and negro boys proportionately, noting that if the prices for blacks should increase in the Isle of Madagascar or at the coast of Sophola you must always charge 100 per cent. more than the price on the bill.'

[2] See also Piston, *La Bourdonnais*, quoted ibid., 8 June 1887, p. 16: 'The communication of the Isle of France with Pondicherry had also suggested to the French Administration the idea of naturalizing the Indian race on our soil. But individual efforts had not been auspicious. In the advances for slaves made by the Company two Indians were counted as only one African. Their dominant crime at that period as to-day was arson; that softness with which one reproaches them at present constituted also at that time one of their weaknesses.' See also in this connexion Prentout, p. 68: 'Under the name of blacks were comprised here [in the Isle of France and Bourbon] all the people imported through the slave-trade, whether they came from India, the [east] coast of Africa, Madagascar, or Senegal, whether they were Malabars, Malays, Kaffirs, or Jollofs.'

[3] M. de Beauvollier, Commander for the Isles of Bourbon and France. He was instructed in the same letter to go to the Isle of France with a Detachment of officers and soldiers stationed in the Isle Bourbon 'and also with the Creoles from the Isle Bourbon who will volunteer to move thereto; M. de Beauvollier, on his arrival in the Isle of France shall ask for an account of the position of the negro maroons and shall take the necessary steps to succeed in purging the island entirely from them'.

[4] Though there is no evidence that any Creoles went immediately to fight the maroons, there evidently were some in Mauritius in the following year. See the reference in Bonnefoy, p. 306: 'Marrons.—Créoles venus de l'Île Bourbon pour aller à leur poursuite. 3 Juin 1728. No. 25 du Reg. 1.'

[5] 'Formation du Conseil d'Administration des Isles de Bourbon et de France', *Revue Historique*, 16 June 1887, pp. 33–4.

The Regulation also authorized the Council to send to Madagascar for the purchase of negroes,[1] apart from the ships used so far for this purpose, the ship which was to be sent each year from Pondicherry 'in order to bring to the Isles of Bourbon and of France the necessary food, munitions, and slaves'.

Since the new efforts of peopling the Isle of France with colonists from Bourbon again failed,[2] the India Company attempted military colonization.

Putting into practice the ideas cherished by the controller Orry, they [the Company] sent ships loaded with girls to the Isle of France as this was done in Louisiana.[3] Every soldier who asked for it was offered a woman and a grant of land with the advances necessary for cultivation. The man was then struck from the military roll in order to become a planter.[4]

Although after 1726 there was apparently a good deal of immigration[5] the white population remained small, but the importation of slaves augmented considerably the number of black inhabitants. When Governor-General Mahé de La Bourdonnais arrived in June 1735 the composition of the population differed essentially from what it had been thirteen years earlier.

In order to know very exactly the resources which the Colony could offer him, one of the first acts of the Governor-General was to take a census of the population; in 1735 it consisted of 190 whites and of 648 blacks.[6]

1735–64. Under the administration of La Bourdonnais (1735–46) the population increased very much. He had hoped at first to obtain colonists from Bourbon, of which island he was likewise Governor. Since none were willing to go for good the Council of Bourbon decided on 6 September 1736 to send 12 Creoles under the pretence that they were to go only for a short time to help destroy the maroons.

Since it has been brought home to us that through the considerable augmentation of the families in this island several inhabitants were from this moment in the

[1] See also Macquet, 'Étude historique sur les commencements de l'administration de l'Ile de France', ibid., 21 Sept. 1890, p. 194: 'Madagascar and Mozambique, being the points nearest to us, furnished originally to the Isles of Bourbon and France their working and agricultural population'. According to Pitot, p. 14, 'a black from Guinea was worth one-quarter more than a black of equal strength from Mozambique'.

[2] See also ibid. pp. 15–16.

[3] For the sending of prostitutes to Louisiana see Prévost, *Histoire du Chevalier des Grieux et de Manon Lescaut* (first published in 1731), Cambridge, 1944, pp. 4, 119, 134. According to Hitié, p. 59, two such ships arrived in the Isle of France, one from Bordeaux in 1728 and the other from Marseilles in 1730.

[4] Crepin, *Mahé de La Bourdonnais*, p. 53. See also L.F., 'Notes sur les premiers colons (Ile de France—1732)', p. 505: 'Among the soldiers and inhabitants who had received these privileges in 1728, the names of some of them have been preserved to us . . . .'

[5] See, for example, 'Observations of Admiral Kempenfelt' (1758): 'It was not till the year 1730 that the value of this island was known to the French, and that it became an object of importance. Five years before, this colony had been so neglected that not a single French vessel ever touched at it: but ships, engineers, and workmen were now sent to assist the inhabitants . . .' (Grant, p. 464). According to Bourde de la Rogerie (p. 138) the Company engaged 'ship carpenters, masons, joiners, *taillandiers* [stone cutters?], and locksmiths, who agreed to serve for three years in the island at yearly salaries of from 300 to 600 *livres*; the contract being renewable if the parties so desired.' Piston, *La Bourdonnais*, mentions also the immigration of some families from St. Malo; see *Revue Historique*, 1 June 1887, p. 4.

[6] Pitot, p. 30. The figure for blacks, of course, excluded the maroons.

position that they could share out to those of their children who were on the point of settling down very little or no land at all, and that it would be extremely advantageous to this Colony to begin early to suggest to the young creoles the idea of settling in the Isle of France . . . . It has been resolved [1] to order a detachment of twelve young creoles to move to the Isle of France in the *Athalante* under the pretence that they were to stay there three or four months in order to work there usefully at the destruction of the black maroons, and [2] that the said detachment by the end of the said period be relieved by another of the same number and thus to continue until either several of them may have decided to settle or the futility of this attempt be well confirmed by their constant refusal, the said creoles being granted a monthly allowance of 15 *livres*.[1]

In the following year La Bourdonnais asked the Council of Bourbon to send a detachment of 50 or 60 creoles to the Isle of France for the destruction of the maroons. But the Council, on 6 September 1737, asked La Bourdonnais to abandon this project 'since in the Isle Bourbon itself the audacity of the maroons was increasing daily, and it was dangerous to deprive the Colony of its best *hommes de bois*'.[2]

La Bourdonnais, however, relates that he succeeded in destroying most of the Maroons with the help of negroes from Madagascar.

There were in the Isle of France a rather large number of black maroons[3] who lived as savages in the woods and attacked in gangs the settlements where they committed the greatest excesses. I discovered the secret of how to destroy them by arming blacks against blacks and in forming a constabulary of negroes from Madagascar who finally succeeded in purging the island of most of these bandits.[4]

[1] Gaud, 'Destruction des noirs marrons, Une Délibération du Conseil de l'Ile Bourbon', *Revue Historique*, 13 July 1890, pp. 78–9. The minutes of the meeting were signed by La Bourdonnais.

[2] Ibid., 20 July 1891, p. 92.

[3] The Company, already on 2 June 1726, had fixed the rewards to be granted to the 'detachments' [special militia] which were to arrest or kill the maroons (see Bonnefoy, *Table générale*, p. 306; see also Pitot, p. 13). But 'in spite of the increase of the rewards granted to the detachments or men-hunters the running-away of slaves had continued to expand at an alarming rate since the beginning of the Colony' (Piston, *La Bourdonnais*, quoted in *Revue Historique*, 23 June 1887, p. 44; see also ibid., 1 June, pp. 5–6). 'Having obtained women, by force or voluntarily, they had organized themselves into tribes and had elected a supreme chief' (Pitot, p. 13).

[4] *Mémoires historiques de B. F. Mahé de la Bourdonnais*, p. 15. In a comprehensive Memorandum to Orry de Fulvy, which described his administration of the isles of France and Bourbon in 1735–40 (reproduced in Margry, 'Les Iles de France et de Bourbon', pp. 343–83) La Bourdonnais said (pp. 353–4): 'You know, Sir, all the harm which the black maroons have done to the Isle of France; there is no means which I have not used to destroy them. Seeing that the soldiers did not succeed, I had creoles come from the Isle Bourbon who fared no better; I formed several general detachments, and this again without result. This determined me to arm blacks against blacks . . . .' He picked out at first '10 loyal men' and then formed a company of 24 (apparently all from Madagascar) which he kept continuously in the woods to trace the maroons. 'Thus they are forced to rove and to suffer much hardship which exhausts them, and the diseases certainly destroy a large number so that at present one reckons in the Isle of France with 20 black maroons and 25 negresses at the the utmost . . . .'

But La Bourdonnais's success was only temporary. The Maroons for many decades more caused constant trouble to the Administration. As shown above (p. 1), a corporation of mutual assurance against losses through the running-away of slaves was established in 1753 in the Isle of France. Some similar institution existed apparently already in the Isle Bourbon in 1721; it led to abuses because slave-holders who wanted to get rid of useless slaves ill-treated them in order to induce them to escape and get a compensation if the maroons were caught and executed. See letter from the India Company to the Provincial Council of the Isle Bourbon, 31 May 1721 (*Revue Historique*, 23 Sept. 1899, p. 180): 'Sur la requête présentée par les habitans de l'isle [Bourbon] au Sr Justamont, tendant a ce que les noirs executes dans l'isle fussent perdus pour les propriétaires et qu'ils ne fussent pas payez par tous les autres habitans, et sur ce que vous marquez a la Compagnie qu'il n'y a que ceux qui sont aisez qui le souhaitent, et, que cela faisoit tort aux

La Bourdonnais's policy apparently was to encourage immigration of Europeans for the management of plantations and for the supervision of negro labourers, but, for financial reasons, to keep the number of European artisans and sailors as low as possible.[1] At the same time he tried very hard to increase the number of slaves. Within four years he imported 2,615 negroes, mainly from Mozambique and Madagascar.[2] But 'many of the negroes died',[3] and the total number of slaves in the island was after all only 2,612 in 1740 as compared with 648 in 1735.[4] As regards the white population the position is somewhat uncertain. La Bourdonnais himself submitted the following table:[5]

	Families					*Slaves*			
Year	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Économes*	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
1740	112	70	79	81	37	1,263	613	458	278
1735	61	39	54	18	18	272	222	106	48
Difference	51	31	25	63	19	991	391	352	230

It seems to have been generally accepted that the figures shown under *Familles* comprised the total white or free population.[6] But it is obvious that the 79 men of 1735 cannot have included the garrison, and I do not see how they could possibly have included all the civilian employees of the Company (who alone, I suppose, numbered not less than a hundred, including workmen). I am, therefore, inclined to assume that the people shown under *Familles*—190 in 1735 and 379 in 1740—represented either only the families of private persons (planters, merchants, &c.) or possibly all families (including those of the few married Company employees).

I shall now reproduce—for what they are worth—some more statements concerning the period of La Bourdonnais's administration.

1735–40. 'From this date [1 October 1735] to 1740 he had send from Bourbon to the Isle of France more than 2,000 persons to work there.'[7]

pauvres, que d'ailleurs d'autres habitans laissent mourir leurs noirs de faim, et les maltraitent très fort pour les obliger a se rendre marons, et par cette evasion à la montagne se faire pendre lorsqu'ils sont pris, preferant l'argent à un mauvais noir, vous ne ferez plus payer a l'avenir les noirs qui seront executez; cet ordre operera que les mauvais habitans dans la crainte de perdre leurs noirs sans en avoir d'argent les traitteront mieux par la suite.'

[1] See La Bourdonnais's Memorandum, Margry, pp. 366, 368, 370.

[2] He estimated their average value at 250 *livres* (see Margry, p. 371). Crepin, pp. 44–5, says that the slaves from Madagascar were sold to the settlers at 300 *livres* a man, 200 *livres* a woman, and 150 *livres* a child. They had in addition to pay a tax. La Bourdonnais reports: ' . . . I have had a resolution passed according to which each inhabitant is obliged to pay at least 30 *livres* a year for each black *pièce d'Inde* . . .' (Margry, p. 347). The number of slaves purchased by La Bourdonnais for the Isle Bourbon was much smaller since he says that in those four years altogether 3,500 blacks were landed in the two islands (see ibid., p. 365).

[3] Ibid., p. 372.

[4] The increase in 5 years was 1,964, while 2,615 were imported in 4 years.

[5] See Margry, p. 349.

[6] See, for example, Pitot, quoted p. 753 above; Tantet, *Survivance de l'esprit français aux colonies perdues*, p. 49; Crepin, p. 89. Similarly Bourde de la Rogerie (p. 160), who omits the *Économes*—the meaning of the word is not clear, and he may have assumed that they were included in the number of men—gives as total number of free persons 172 for 1735 and 342 for 1740.

[7] D'Epinay, p. 96. De Burgh-Edwardes, without specifying the period, says (p. 15): 'Two thousand five hundred persons from Bourbon settled in Mauritius, where some 100 new houses were built.' Actually the total number of people from Bourbon who had settled in Mauritius was very small.

1739. 'There were during this year in the Isle of France, according to Baron Grant 114 different habitations established in the "quarters"'.[1]

1740. 'At this moment (1740) an eighth part of the island is not yet cleared, so that it will be long before the population is equal to the extent.'[2]

'This small town [Port Louis] is the habitation of all those who are employed in the service of government; as well as of merchants and others who are not possessed of plantations.'[3]

1742. '. . . by 1742 more than one-eighth of the island was cleared and 114 plantations were established and in full activity'.[4]

1 June 1743. 'There are not more at present than an hundred fifteen plantations, divided into four districts or quarters, at the distance of about six leagues from each other . . . .'[5]

1746. '. . . when he [La Bourdonnais] left, there were 551 whites and 2,533 blacks [in the Isle of France]'.[6]

It is noteworthy that the slave population was not any larger in 1746 than in 1740. Whether the white population had increased it is impossible to tell, as it is doubtful whether the figures for the two years are comparable. But it is certain that both the free and the slave population grew very much between 1746 and 1764. The available data, it is true, are more meagre than for the period of La Bourdonnais's governorship.

1752. 'A Memorandum of 1752 allocates to the Isle of France 1,500 inhabitants or employees, 1,000 soldiers, and 8,000 blacks.'[7]

1753. 'In 1753, about one-tenth of the Island had been cleared, the remaining nine-tenths (406,157 acres) being all in forest, with the exception of some steep rocky precipices and patches of savanna.'[8]

1 April 1754. 'This island is lacking in inhabitants since not one-third is cultivated (I speak of what is susceptible of cultivation).'[9]

12 March 1756.[1] The garrison there is at present very considerable, being composed of between 1,400 and 1,500 European men of regular troops and about as many well disciplined citizens' militia.'[10]

1757. 'The Isle of France contains about 1,500 employees and 1,000 soldiers; the blacks reach about 8,000.'[11]

[1] D'Epinay, p. 99. But see under 1 June 1743.

[2] Letter from Baron Grant, 12 Feb. 1741, Grant, p. 194.

[3] Ibid., p. 195.

[4] Piston, *La Bourdonnais*, quoted in *Revue Historique*, 23 June 1887, pp. 38–9.

[5] Grant, p. 213.

[6] Tantet, p. 49.

[7] Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 206. This was apparently a *Mémoire sur le commerce de l'Inde et de l'Asie méridionale et notes sur les îles de France et de Bourbon*, a manuscript of 548 pages, written by an inhabitant of Mauritius and dated 6 July 1752; see ibid., pp. 195–6. But see also under 1757.

[8] Meldrum, *Weather, Health, and Forest*, p. 213.

[9] 'Voyages du Sieur D. de La Motte, Lettres écrites dans les années 1754 à 1757', *Revue Historique*, 18 Oct. 1891, p. 234.

[10] Ibid., 29 Nov. 1891, p. 304. But see also 'Instructions given by the Directors of the East India Company to the Governor of the Isles of Mauritius and Bourbon, 24th of May, 1761' (reproduced in English, Grant, pp. 445–7): 'Hitherto we have had but a small garrison at the Island of Mauritius . . . . It may be added, in favour of a numerous garrison at the Island of Mauritius, that it will be the readiest and cheapest method to people the island, and to form a militia on the spot, interested in its defence. At the end of a certain time, those who are willing to settle on the island may have their discharge, on condition that they shall form a company of militia, which shall assemble from time to time, and march when occasion requires.'

[11] 'Les Isles de France et de Bourbon en 1757, Extraits de la "Relation (inédite) d'un voyage aux Indes Orientales par M. de Maudave", manuscript de 400 p.', *Revue Historique*, 16 June 1894, p. 161.

'The Isle of France has three kinds of inhabitants: the cultivators, the traders, and the employees.'[1]

1758. 'It is impossible for me to calculate the number of inhabitants with any degree of precision; but the island appeared to be very populous. The artisans and mechanics are very numerous; and when to these are added the sailors, who are continually coming and going, with the military forces, and the slaves, we may suppose a body of many thousand people. The slaves are brought from Gorée, an island on the coast of Guinea, from Madagascar, the eastern coast of Africa, and Bengal . . . .'[2]

'The plantations require from thirty to two hundred slaves, according to their extent . . . .'[3]

In 1764 the India Company became bankrupt, and by a Decree of 4 August the Isles of France and Bourbon were retroceded to the King.[4] According to Abbé Raynal, 'there were in 1765 in the Colony[5] 1,469 Whites, not including the troops; 1,587 Indians or free negroes; 11,881 slaves . . . .'[6]

1764–1810. The liquidation of the India Company took three years, and in this period conditions in the Isle of France were unstable.[7] The Royal government was established in July 1767.[8] As regards the population at that time the archivist of the French Ministry of the Colonies, Tantet, relates:

A statistical table prepared by Poivre [the King's Commissary] himself on 30 November 1767, a few months after his arrival, shows that there were 2,302 whites and 18,100 slaves, excluding 400 or 500 malabars, lascars, and free blacks.[9]

But this statement has apparently attracted little attention, and nearly all writers who deal with the population in 1767 say that it consisted of

[1] Ibid., p. 163. M. de Maudave arrived in the Isle of France on 17 Dec. 1757, and left on 25 Jan. 1758 (see ibid., 7 June, p. 148; 16 June, p. 168).

[2] 'Observations of Admiral Kempenfelt', Grant, p. 470.

[3] Ibid., pp. 469–70.

[4] See Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 211.

[5] This was possibly the result of a count made by the syndics; see p. 709 above.

[6] Raynal, *Histoire philosophique et politique* (1774), vol. ii, p. 170. There is some confusion as regards this statement. D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice* (1838), vol. ii, p. 164, says that in August 1764 there were, 'in the Colony, according to the returns furnished to the Abbé Raynal, 3,163 whites, 587 free, and 15,022 slaves'. Some later writers accepted this version. See, for example, Austen, *Sea Fights* (1935), p. 35: 'According to the Abbé Raynal there were in Mauritius: In 1764, 3,163 whites; 587 freed slaves and 15,022 slaves.' But Raynal does not give those figures which actually refer to the year 1767. It should be noted, however, that while, for example, the 1774 edition of Raynal, published in The Hague, and the English translation published in London in 1776 (vol. i, p. 496) list '1,587 Indians or free negroes', which probably is an overstatement, the 1778 edition published in Paris (vol. ii, p. 570) shows only 587.

[7] See Magon de Saint-Elier, *Tableaux Historiques*, pp. 138–40. D'Epinay relates (pp. 177–8) that owing to the consternation created by the bankruptcy of the Company the settlers in Jan. 1765 started 'to sell their slaves in order to leave the Colony'. He reports, furthermore (p. 180), that on 24 Apr. 1766 'the King, being informed of the intentions of the settlers to get rid of their slaves in order to flee from the Colonies [Isles of France and Bourbon] issues an Order forbidding in the two Colonies the emancipation of the slaves without a previous and formal authorization by the Governor'. See also the King's Ordinance of 20 Aug. 1766, Delaleu, p. 209, No. 170.

[8] See Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 63; Azéma, p. 88.

[9] Tantet (1900), p. 54. See also memorandum by Count de la Merville, dated 1 Apr. 1767: 'The Isle of France, of which only one-sixth has been cleared, has hardly 18,000 slaves' (quoted in Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 107). Castonnet de Fosses, *Pierre Poivre* (1889), pp. 44–5, said that when Poivre arrived the population 'amounted to only 23,000 inhabitants, of whom 2,400 were whites, 500 free coloured, and 18,100 slaves'. (The total of the items, however, is only 21,000.)

3,163 whites, 587 free coloured, and 15,027 slaves. I am inclined to doubt whether the number of whites (excluding the military) was actually as large as that. The figures for slaves exclude, of course, the maroons who were estimated at 'more than 600'.[1] Two quotations may illustrate the composition of the coloured population.

> In the Population of this Island, I must include the Indians and the Negroes. The first are the Malabars, or Malayans, a mild and gentle people, who come from Pondicherry, where they let themselves as servants for a term of years. They are almost all of handicraft trades, and occupy a suburb, called the Camp of the Blacks. . . .
>
> Our ground is tilled by Blacks from Madagascar . . . .[2]
>
> . . . there were in the slave population only a thousand Asiatics originating from Pondicherry and from Madras, about a thousand from the coast of Guinea, and the rest from Madagascar.[3]

TABLE 1. *Population of Mauritius, 1767–1807*[1]

Year	*White*	*Free Coloured*	*Slaves*	*Total*
1767	3,163	587	15,027	18,777
1777[2]	3,434	1,173	25,154	29,761
1782	3,831	1,418	28,352	33,601
1785	3,379	2,138	32,134	37,651
1787	4,372	2,235	33,832	40,439
1788	4,457	2,456	37,915	44,828
1797	6,237	3,703	49,080	59,020
1806	6,798	7,154	60,646	74,598
1807	6,489	5,912	65,367	77,768

[1] For 1767, 1777, 1787, 1797, and 1807 see D'Unienville, vol. iv, Table 11. For 1782, 1785, and 1788 see de Rauville, 'Population de l'Ile de France de 1782 à 1788', p. 2. For 1806 see Milbert, *Voyage pittoresque à l'Ile de France* (1812), vol. ii, p. 233 *Bis*. There is some confusion as to the exact years to which the data refer; see Tables 2, 3, and 5.

[2] Abbé Raynal (ed. 1780, vol. i, pp. 535–6) gives for 1776 (meaning possibly 1 Jan. 1777) slightly diverging figures, namely 6,386 whites, including 2,955 soldiers, 1,199 free negroes, and 25,154 slaves. Necker, *De l'Administration des Finances de France* (1784), vol. i, p. 316, gives likewise, for 1776, 6,386 whites, 1,199 coloured, and 25,154 slaves.

I have summarized in Tables 1–8 the population statistics available for 1767–1810. It appears that the total civilian population increased from 18,777 in 1767 to 77,768 in 1807. It should be noted, however, that the increase was not as gradual as suggested by Table 1. It seems, for example, that the population which for 1788 was reported as about 45,000 reached

[1] See the address made by Poivre on the day of his arrival (14 July 1767); Poivre, *Œuvres complettes*, p. 221. The comptroller of the Navy in the Isle of France, Bompar, in a letter sent to the French minister in 1775, estimated the number of maroons at 1,200; see Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 127.

[2] Bernardin de Saint Pierre, *A Voyage to the Island of Mauritius*, pp. 98–9 (letter dated 15 Apr. 1769). He misjudged very much the population of the Isle Bourbon (in a letter dated Bourbon, 21 Dec. 1770, ibid., p. 194): 'Sixty thousand blacks are reckoned to live in Bourbon and only five thousand inhabitants. This island is thrice as populous as the Isle of France . . . .' But he gave a most interesting picture of the sources of supplies for the Isle of France (ibid., p. 173): 'I do not know a corner of the earth whose wants are supplied from so many, or so distant parts. Their dishes and plates come from China; their linen and clothes from India; their slaves and cattle from Madagascar; their provisions, or part of them, from the Cape of Good Hope; their money from Cadiz, and their government and laws from France.'

[3] Hitié, p. 59. He says (ibid.) that the slaves included thousands of mulattoes, the issue of European men and African or Asiatic women.

TABLE 2. *Slave Population in Mauritius 1767–1810 according to D'Unienville*[1]

1 Jan.	*A*[2]	*B*[3]	*C*[4]	*D*[5]	*1 Jan.*	*A*[2]	*B*[3]	*C*[4]	*D*[5]
1767	15,027	15,027	..	15,027	1789	36,486	38,034	..	37,915
1768	16,052	16,065	..	..	1790	38,403	40,129	37,915	..
1769	17,071	17,106	..	..	1791	41,210	43,230	..	..
1770	18,085	18,152	..	..	1792	44,003	46,340	..	..
1771	19,195	19,298	..	..	1793	43,716	46,367	..	..
1772	20,299	20,448	..	..	1794	46,696	49,483	..	..
1773	21,398	21,600	..	..	1795	47,962	50,807	..	..
1774	22,491	22,755	..	..	1796	48,322	51,534	..	..
1775	23,579	23,912	..	..	1797	49,080	52,563	..	..
1776	24,660	25,073	..	25,154	1798	50,133	53,896	..	..
1777	25,336	25,735	25,154	..	1799	51,380	55,232	..	55,000
1778	25,909	26,400	..	..	1800	53,619	56,671	55,000	..
1779	26,380	26,966	..	..	1801	55,149	58,313	..	..
1780	26,748	27,434	..	..	1802	56,672	59,959	..	..
1781	27,114	27,902	..	..	1803	58,797	62,112	..	..
1782	27,478	28,372	..	28,352	1804	61,502	65,268	..	..
1783	29,939	28,742	28,352	..	1805	63,115	67,105	..	..
1784	29,099	30,014	..	..	1806	64,351	68,655	60,646	60,646
1785	31,152	32,089	..	32,124	1807	65,367	69,995	..	..
1786	32,496	33,570	32,124	..	1808	66,452	71,412	58,728	58,728
1787	33,832	35,054	..	..	1809	67,310	72,610	60,905	60,905
1788	35,163	36,542	..	..	1810	68,177	73,823	..	..

[1] Baron D'Unienville, archivist of Mauritius, submitted the manuscript of his excellent work *Statistique de L'Isle Maurice cy devant Isle de France et de ses Dépendances*, in 1825 to Governor G. Lowry Cole who forwarded it to Earl Bathurst (C.O. 172, vols. xxxix–xlii). The manuscript was published in 1838 after D'Unienville's death; it was brought up to date and some figures were revised, but the editor was very careless, and it is doubtful whether the revised figures are more correct than the original ones.

[2] See C.O. 172, vol. xlii, pp. 33–4. Figures refer to the beginning of the year. D'Unienville computed them by assuming a birth-rate of 30 per 1,000, a death-rate of 33⅓ per 1,000, an emancipation rate of 2 per 1,000 (for 1804–10 lower figures) and the 'increase through importation' shown p. 789 below.

[3] See *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice*, vol. iv, Table 44. Figures refer to the beginning of the year. They were computed by assuming a higher birth-rate and a lower death-rate (33⅓ and 30 per 1,000 respectively), an emancipation rate of only 0·8 per 1,000 (from 1805 to 1810 the same figures as in A), and a lower 'increase through importation' (see p. 789 below).

[4] Census returns; see C.O. 172, vol. xlii, pp. 33–4.

[5] Census returns; see *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice*, vol. iv, Table 44.

58,000 in 1792 but lost in that year more than 4,000 through smallpox,[1] and amounted in 1797 to not more than 59,000. The population of the capital, Port Louis, was given for 1782, 1785, 1788, and 1806 as 10,119, 11,809, 14,877, and 18,989 respectively.[2] It comprised in the 1780s about one-third and in 1806 about one-quarter of the total population of the Colony.[3]

Port Louis was divided into three parts: the town proper destined to

[1] See p. 873 below.

[2] The population had increased even more rapidly in the 1770s. The Preamble to an Ordinance of 31 Mar. 1784 (Delaleu, p. 276, No. 257; Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 388–91) said that the population had nearly doubled since the establishment of the bazaar. This bazaar had been established by a Regulation of 1 Sept. 1772 (Delaleu, pp. 227–8, No. 189).

[3] Governor-General de Conway, on 20 Mar. 1790, wrote to the minister that the majority of the population lived in Port Louis (see Toussaint, p. 125). Charles Grant, referring to 1799, says (p. 566): 'The population of Port-Louis (or *du Port du Nord-ouest*), is esteemed to be three-fifths of that of the whole Isle of France.' These are gross overstatements.

TABLE 3. *Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1785 and 1788*[1]

Sex, Age	Whites		Free Coloured		Slaves		Total	
	1785	1788	1785	1788	1785	1788	1785	1788
Men	1,354	1,782	485	435	16,928	19,613	18,767	21,830
Women	662	836	670	726	8,786	10,504	10,118	12,066
Boys	740	948	524	697	3,851	4,638	5,115	6,283
Girls	623	891	449	598	2,569	3,160	3,641	4,649
Total	3,379	4,457	2,138[2]	2,456	32,134	37,915	37,651[2]	44,828

[1] See de Rauville, 'Population de l'Ile de France de 1782 à 1788', p. 3. Figures refer probably to 1 Jan. of following year.
[2] Total does not tally with items.

TABLE 4. *Population of Port Louis, 1782–8*[1]

Race	1782 Total	1785 Total	1788				
			Men	Women	Boys	Girls	Total
Whites	2,022	1,541	1,175	448	421	409	2,453
Free Coloured	906	1,480	290	543	464	396	1,693
Slaves	7,191	8,788	5,989	2,797	1,154	791	10,731
Total	10,119	11,809	7,454	3,788	2,039	1,596	14,877

[1] See de Rauville, 'Population de l'Ile de France de 1782 à 1788', pp. 2–3. Figures refer probably to 1 Jan. of following year.

TABLE 5. *Population of Mauritius 1803/4–1808 according to General Administrators*[1]

Year	White	Free Coloured	Total Free			Slaves
			Men	Women	Children	
XII (1803–4)	4,710	4,215	..	..	..	55,665
XIII (1804–5)	13,519		3,969	3,407	6,153	59,000
XIV (1805–6)	6,798	7,154	3,697	3,469	6,786	60,646
1807	7,194	7,366	..	..	..	60,509
1808	..	..	..	..	..	58,728

[1] See Prentout, p. 650. Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 297, gives for 1805–6 the same totals as Prentout, but for 1807 6,289 Whites, 5,912 Free Coloured, and 58,728 Slaves, and for 1808 7,194 Whites, 7,366 Free Coloured, and 60,509 Slaves.

TABLE 6. *Free Population, Mauritius 1806*[1]

Race	Port Louis				Mauritius			
	Men	Women	Children	Total	Men	Women	Children	Total
White	1,511	605	1,247	3,363	2,701	1,312	2,785	6,798
Coloured	452	1,291	2,201	3,944	996	2,157	4,001	7,154

[1] See Milbert, *Voyage pittoresque à l'Ile de France*, vol. ii, p. 233 *Bis*.

TABLE 7. *Slave Population, Mauritius 1806*[1]

Port Louis					*Mauritius*				
Creoles	*Malagasy*	*Indians*	*Mozambiques*	*Total*	*Creoles*	*Malagasy*	*Indians*	*Mozambiques*	*Total*
2,093	2,521	2,013	5,055	11,682	16,784	11,030	6,162	26,670	60,646

[1] See Milbert, *Voyage pittoresque*, vol. ii, p. 233 *Bis.*

habitation by whites, the Eastern Suburb reserved to Indians, and the Western Suburb to free negroes.[1]

The number of white civilians which in 1767, according to Tantet, amounted to 2,302 (but is usually given as 3,163) rose to 7,194 in 1808. This increase was due mainly to immigration. But it is impossible to tell how large immigration was[2] or from where it mainly came.[3] The white garrison up to 1789 was large, comprising usually 3,000 or 4,000 men, but was considerably reduced thereafter. It fluctuated much in the first decade of the nineteenth century and amounted to about 2,000 in 1810.[4]

TABLE 8. *Slave Population, Mauritius 1809*[1]

Port Louis					*Mauritius*				
Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
6,430	2,797	1,403	1,171	11,801	31,826	14,237	7,589	6,348	60,000

[1] See Extract of a Dispatch from Governor Farquhar to the Earl of Liverpool, 8 Jan. 1811, *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 5.

The number of free coloured rose, through natural increase, emancipation of slaves,[5] and immigration of free Indians, from 587 in 1767 to 7,366 in 1808. The majority resided in the capital.

[1] See Toussaint, pp. 188, 268, 273. See also Brunet, *Voyage à l'Ile de France*, p. 27. Of the 11,801 slaves recorded in 1809, 8,970 lived in the town proper, 939 in the Eastern Suburb, and 1,892 in the Western Suburb; see Extract of a Dispatch from Governor Farquhar to the Earl of Liverpool, 8 Jan. 1811, *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 5.

[2] D'Unienville, vol. iv, Table 11, puts the 'increase through arrival of new settlers' in the four decades from 1767–77 to 1797–1807 at 197, 624, 1,673, and 5 respectively, but does not say how he obtained those figures.

[3] One report, irrelevant in itself, deserves perhaps to be mentioned. In Nov. 1774 Governor de Ternay asked the minister to send for 'some twenty Acadian or German families to work on the land in certain districts of the Isle of France'. The minister replies (Aug. 1775) 'that it would be better to send to the Isle of France settlers from the Isle Bourbon' (D'Epinay, pp. 234–5). In his project of the establishment of a colony in the Seychelles, de St. Amans, in Feb. 1775, suggested likewise the transfer of 'Acadian families which vegetate in France' (Fauvel, *Unpublished Documents on the History of the Seychelles Islands*, p. 128).

[4] See D'Unienville, vol. ii, pp. 125–32. See also D'Epinay, pp. 224, 235, 247, 253, 260, 284, 309–10, 409, 515–16, 549, 566.

[5] Very little is known about the number of enfranchisements. D'Unienville, in his computations, assumed that they amounted in each of the years 1767–1803 to 2 per 1,000 of the slave population, totalling 2,520; he entered for 1804 nil, and for 1805–10 73, 89, 17, 40, 29, and 14 respectively. In his book published after his death (vol. iv, Table 44) the yearly number for 1767–1803 is put at only 0·8 per 1,000 of the population, totalling 1,103, and for 1804 at altogether 20, while for 1805–10 the same figures are used as in his manuscript. Actually enfranchisements fluctuated considerably. They were very numerous during the Revolution and according to official statistics numbered 244 between 10 Nov. 1804 and 2 Jan. 1807; see Prentout, p. 140. In a 'Return of all Manumissions effected by Purchase, Bequest or otherwise, since the 1st of

The number of slaves increased from 15,027 in 1767 to 65,367 in 1807. Deaths probably exceeded births. Importations fluctuated considerably and the counts of 1808 and 1809 apparently showed only 58,728 and 60,905 slaves. But all figures concerning slaves are uncertain.

I shall deal more fully with the changes in population in Sections III and VII of this chapter.

3. *1811–34*

The statistics available for this period are extraordinarily ample, but they are difficult to interpret since different figures appear in different documents and since none of the statistics are all-inclusive. In discussing the official returns it will be necessary to distinguish eight classes of people, i.e. (1) Whites, excluding King's Troops and Resident Strangers; (2) Free Coloured; (3) Slaves (privately owned); (4) King's Troops; (5) Resident Strangers; (6) Government Slaves; (7) Apprentices; (8) Indian Convicts.

(1) The number of Whites (excluding King's Troops and Resident Strangers),[1] according to D'Unienville, increased from 6,864 in 1811 to 8,198 in 1827. In other documents it is given as slightly over 7,000 in 1812–18, as about 8,000 in 1819–22, as 9,000–10,400 in 1822–4, and again as about 8,000 in 1825–9. Males exceeded females considerably. The proportion of children seems high.[2]

(2) The number of Free Coloured[3] apparently increased from nearly 8,000 in 1811 to 18,000 by the end of 1829. The increase was largely due to enfranchisements. A 'Return of all Manumissions effected by Purchase, Bequest or otherwise, since the 1st of January 1808',[4] signed by Governor Farquhar on 22 July 1822, may be summarized for 1811–22 as follows:

Year	*Males*	*Females*	*Year*	*Males*	*Females*	*Year*	*Males*	*Females*
1811	62	78	1815	14	14	1819	40	67
1812	117	164	1816	25	27	1820	39	49
1813	95	144	1817	42	55	1821	60	112
1814	96	141	1818	46	71	1822	14	23

January 1808' (Enclosure to letter from Governor Farquhar to the Earl Bathurst, 7 Nov. 1822, *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius*, p. 125) the manumissions in 1808–10 were given as 43, 43, and 23 respectively.

[1] See Tables 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18 below.

[2] It should be noted, however, that the proportion of children shown in different returns varies very much. D'Unienville gives for 1 Jan. 1825 4,440 adults and 3,569 children (see Table 13 below) and for 1 Jan. 1830 5,539 adults and 2,596 children (see Table 18 below). For 1825 the number of 'girls' is about the same as the number of 'women', while for 1830 it is only about half as large. The number of 'girls' appears in all returns higher than the number of 'boys', and the difference in many cases is unbelievably great. At least for one year (1825) apparently contradictory statements are to be explained by confused entries.

Source	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
D'Unienville, vol. iv . .	2,581	1,859	1,649	1,920
Blue Book 1825, p. 228 .	2,763	1,645	1,843	1,927

[3] See Tables 9, 10, 12–15, 17, 18 below.

[4] Enclosure to letter from Governor Farquhar to the Earl Bathurst, 7 Nov. 1822, *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius*, p. 125. For 1808–10 see above.

Of the 650 males manumitted under the British Administration prior to 22 July 1822, 391 were so 'by the masters, as a reward for services rendered, or by affection', 43 by bequest, 9 by purchase, 18 by Government, and 189 by marriage. The corresponding figures for the 945 females were 565, 62, 8, 12, and 298 respectively.

D'Unienville, it is true, gives quite different figures for enfranchisements:[1]

1811	*1812*	*1813*	*1814*	*1815*	*1816*	*1817*	*1818*	*1819*	*1820*	*1821*	*1822*	*1823*	*1824*
686	121	341	183	82	52	76	85	96	51	113	70	52	46

According to a 'Return of the Number of Manumissions effected by Purchase, Bequest or otherwise . . . from 1st January 1821 to 1st June 1826',[2] the manumissions in 1821–5 numbered 167, 104, 52, 54, and 42 respectively, and from 1 January to 1 June 1826 31.[3] In a dispatch to the Secretary of State, William Huskisson, dated 17 May 1828, Sir Lowry Cole said that 'from 1815 to the end of 1826 the emancipations here averaged only 84 a year'.[4] Figures published for 1825–34 may be summarized as follows:

Sex	*1825*[1]	*16 Oct. 1826 to 31 Dec. 1829*[2]	*1830*[3]	*1831*[4]	*1832*[5]	*1833*[6]	*1834*[7]
Males	11	435	160	115	599	278	241
Females	23	706	190	147	506		

[1] See *Blue Book 1825*, p. 228.

[2] See *Mémoire par un Colon*, p. 208. In *Correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Governor of the Mauritius respecting the Slave Registry* (1832), p. 80, the total is given as 1,164.

[3] See *Blue Book 1830*, p. 502.

[4] See ibid. *1831*, p. 410.

[5] See ibid. *1832*, p. 440. But the number of slaves emancipated is given ibid., p. 434, as 1,647.

[6] See ibid. *1833*, folio 215. But the total number of emancipations in 1832 and 1833 is given ibid., folio 212, as 2,900.

[7] See ibid. *1834*, pp. 265–6.

(3) The figures for slaves (privately owned)[5] are most uncertain and contradictory. Leaving out of consideration the evidently defective totals compiled from the 'Annual Returns' furnished by the Proprietors in 1811–14, the figures oscillated in 1811–20 between 60,817 and 80,185, and in 1822–8 between 61,187 and 69,315. The latter total was that given for the end of 1828. The censuses of 2 January 1830 and 1 May 1832 showed

[1] See C.O. 172, vol. xlii, p. 34. In the printed edition (vol. iv, Table 44) figures are given only for 1811–16. They agree with the manuscript for 1811–14, but read for 1815 and 1816 77 and 48 respectively.

[2] *Returns from the West Indies, the Isle of France, and the Cape of Good Hope* (1828), pp. 58–75.

[3] According to Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 7, 76 male and 134 female slaves were emancipated in 1822–4, and 52 male and 73 female slaves between Jan. 1825 and 14 Dec. 1826.

[4] *Papers in Explanation of Measures adopted for the Melioration of the Condition of the Slave Population* (1829), p. 98.

[5] See Tables 9–16 and 19 below.

67,121 and 63,056 respectively. The decrease between the two enumerations may have been due in part to escapes of slaves. B. H. de Froberville, on 25 April 1832, noted: 'The number of slaves having become maroons since the use of chains has been forbidden (25 August 1831)[1] is estimated at 3,000.'[2]

According to Milbert[3] 28 per cent. of the slave population enumerated in 1806 were born in Mauritius (Creoles), 44 per cent. in Mozambique, and 18 per cent. in Madagascar, while 10 per cent. were Indians. According to D'Unienville[4] one-third of the slave population enumerated in 1824 were born in Mauritius (Creoles), seven-sixteenths in Mozambique (or elsewhere on the mainland of Africa), and one-sixth in Madagascar, while one-sixteenth were Indians.[5] But D'Unienville's estimate was wide of the mark. Of the slaves registered between 16 October 1826 and 16 January 1827, 50 per cent. were born in Mauritius (Creoles), 28 per cent. in Mozambique, 18 per cent. in Madagascar, while 4 per cent. were Indians (including Malays).[6]

In 1811–14 the male slaves were more than twice as numerous as the females. Owing to the abolition of the slave trade, the proportion of female slaves increased slightly in the following years. The separate figures for adults and children are not conclusive since the delimitation between the two groups was uncertain.[7]

At the abolition of slavery an indemnity was paid for 68,613 slaves.[8]

(4) A 'Return of the Numbers and Distribution of the Effective Force, Officers, Non-commissioned Officers, and Rank and File, of the British Army, including Colonial Corps, in each Year since 1815; including Artillery and Engineers'[9] yields the following totals:[10]

Year .	*1816*	*1817*	*1818*	*1819*	*1820*	*1821*	*1822*	*1823*	*1824*
Number	2,803	2,516	1,881	1,777	1,534	1,369	1,467	1,381	1,282

Year .	*1825*	*1826*	*1827*	*1828*	*1829*	*1830*	*1831*	*1832*	*1833*
Number	1,252	1,110	1,777	1,760	1,745	1,669	1,671	1,971	2,012

[1] The King's Order in Council of 23 Feb. 1831 (reprinted in *Recueil des Lois 1831*, pp. 115–17) had forbidden the use of chains 'for the detention of Slaves in safe custody' in Mauritius and its Dependencies. A Government Order of 27 July (*ibid.*, p. 115) directed that the Order in Council should come into force on 25 Aug.

[2] De Froberville, *Ephémérides Mauriciennes*, p. 93. This is probably an overstatement.

[3] See Table 7 above.

[4] See C.O. 172, vol. xxxix, pp. 94–7.

[5] According to the printed edition (vol. i, pp. 276–9) more than one-third of the slave population enumerated on 1 Jan. 1830 were born in Mauritius, two-fifths in Mozambique (or elsewhere in Africa), and one-fifth in Madagascar, while one-seventeenth were Indians.

[6] The very informative volume, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, which contains the data summarized in Table 16, exists only in manuscript and has apparently escaped the attention of research workers. Even Ingrams, in his painstaking study 'Some Points of Contact between Mauritius and East Africa', p. 57, relied exclusively on D'Unienville's wrong estimate.

[7] See p. 766 below.

[8] See Government Notice of 8 Dec. 1835, *Recueil des Lois 1835*, pp. 113–14. This figure includes the Dependencies of Mauritius.

[9] *Report from Select Committee on the Colonial Military Expenditure* (1834), *Appendix*, p. 107.

[10] Figures for 1816–30 refer to 25 Jan. and figures for 1831–3 to 1 Jan.

According to Major Tulloch the mean strength of the troops in 1812–34 was as follows:[1]

Year	*White*	*Year*	*White*	*Year*	*White*	*Black*	*Year*	*White*	*Black*
1812	3,788	1818	1,776	1824	1,190	..	1830	1,606	125
1813	4,210	1819	1,650	1825	1,131	126	1831	1,777	129
1814	3,817	1820	1,395	1826	1,338	126	1832	1,861	117
1815	2,819	1821	1,298	1827	1,692	126	1833	2,228	109
1816	2,555	1822	1,346	1828	1,639	140	1834	2,201	110
1817	2,084	1823	1,248	1829	1,650	131			

Meldrum shows 'the Strength of H.M.'s Troops in Mauritius' as follows:[2]

1823	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*	*1827*	*1828*	*1829*	*1830*	*1831*	*1832*	*1833*	*1834*
1,243	1,204	1,145	1,371	1,862	1,729	1,770	1,733	1,875	1,984	2,321	2,312

Other figures given for 'King's Troops' are:[3]

Date	*1822*	*1823*	*Dec. 1824*	*1825*	*25 Dec. 1826*	*25 June 1827*	*25 Dec. 1827*	*25 June 1828*
Number	1,310	1,212	1,204	1,153	1,736	1,762	1,776	1,697

Date	*31 Dec. 1828*	*24 June 1829*	*25 Dec. 1829*	*25 June 1830*	*25 Dec. 1830*	*30 June 1831*	*31 Dec. 1831*
Number	1,766	1,724	1,693	1,666	1,679	1,974	1,975

(5) The persons counted as Resident Strangers[4] were not numerous. But it should be realized that strangers who were not resident were excluded from the censuses.

(6) The numbers of Government Slaves appearing on the Matricule Registers on 1 November 1813[5] and 1 January of each year from 1814 to 1833 were as shown in the table overleaf.[6]

[1] See *Statistical Reports on the Sickness, Mortality, & Invaliding among the Troops in Western Africa*, &c. (1840), pp. 27c-29c.

[2] See Meldrum, *Weather, Health and Forests*, Appendixes, p. lv.

[3] See for 1822 *Returns from the Mauritius under the Registry Act*, p. 2 (Population 15 July); for 1823–5 *Blue Book 1823*, p. 250 (Population 15 July), *1824*, p. 143, *1825*, p. 228; for 1826–31 *Brown Book 1826, Jan. to June 1827* to *July to Dec. 1831* (Sections 'Military').

[4] See Tables 15 and 17 below.

[5] 'From the capture of the Island of Mauritius to the 1st of November 1813, the period of Mr. Mackay's being placed in charge of the Matricule, the public documents, and other papers relative to this Department, are so extremely incorrect and confused as to render it impossible to furnish any Statement or Return of the Blacks belonging to Government, which could be in any manner satisfactory. It has therefore been necessary to commence from this period, when the only correct Return is to be found in the Matricule Registers, signed by Mr. Mackay, who it appears was the first to introduce some order and regularity in the details of this Department.' (*Returns of the Number of Slaves belonging to Government at the Mauritius*, Mar. 1828, p. 26.) But see also 'State and Disposition of the Government Slaves Isle of France July 13th 1812' (C.O. 167, vol. x), according to which there were then 2,188 Government Slaves (1,355 men, 474 women, 110 boys, 91 girls, 77 male infants, and 81 female infants).

[6] See *Returns of the Number of Slaves belonging to Government*, Mar. 1828, p. 26; *Blue Book 1832*, p. 291.

Year	Men	Women	Boys	Girls	Total
1813[1]	875	407	179	177	1,638
1814	882	407	178	171	1,638
1815	819	395	188	178	1,580
1816	854	368	195	182	1,599
1817	810	352	201	186	1,549
1818	761	333	213	193	1,500
1819	738	320	216	203	1,477
1820	837	341	188	171	1,537
1821	801	331	188	186	1,506
1822	781	324	197	184	1,486
1823	756	314	205	191	1,466
1824	726	302	210	201	1,439
1825	685	301	206	192	1,384
1826	663	296	210	189	1,358
1827[2]	635	286	225	196	1,342
1828	622	292	215	188	1,317
1829	585	272	231	201	1,289
1830	607	292	193	180	1,272
1831	581	272	201	183	1,237
1832	564	280	189	162	1,195
1833	490	211	134	139	974

[1] Of the men 79 were above 60 years, and 796 under 60 and above 15; the corresponding figures for women were 30 and 351. Of the boys 74 were under 15 and above 7, and 105 7 years and under; of the girls 95 and 108 respectively. (See *Returns of the Number of Government Slaves*, July 1828, p. 3. The distinction between women and girls is not the same as in the above table.)

[2] Of the men 41 were above 60 years, and 632 under 60 and above 15; of the women 29 and 268 respectively. Of the boys 90 were under 15 and above 7, and 97 7 years and under; of the girls 103 and 82 respectively. (See ibid. The distinction between adults and children is not the same as in the above table.)

(7) The negro slaves seized and condemned by the Vice-Admiralty Court in Mauritius in 1813–26 numbered 2,986. Of these, 291 'died previous to being apprenticed or enlisted'; 52 were 'missing previous to being apprenticed or enlisted'; 10 were 'restored before being apprenticed or enlisted'; 224 were 'taken for Military and sea service', and 2,409 were apprenticed.[1] The numbers apprenticed were as follows:[2]

Sex	1813	1814	1815	1816	1817	1818	1819	1820	1821	1822	1825	1826
Males . .	17	60	404	178	450	132	95	51	285	2	180	1
Females .	14	6	169	28	195	30	36	8	12	—	56	—

Of the 2,409 apprenticed Liberated Africans, 576 had died by the end of 1826, 30 were unaccounted for by their masters or missing, and 5 were 'restored as free, or permitted to return to their native Country'. Those apprenticed by the end of 1826 numbered 1,798 (1,382 males, 416 females), including 137 (135 males, 2 females) apprenticed to the Government.[3]

[1] See *Returns of the Number of Slaves belonging to Government*, Mar. 1828, p. 72.

[2] See ibid., pp. 50–71; see also Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 19. None was apprenticed in either 1811, 1812, 1823, or 1824.

[3] The other available data concerning apprentices are scanty and not quite clear. D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice* (1838), vol. iv, Table 37, states that his population figures for 1 Jan. 1825 exclude 1,818 apprentices (1,222 men, 370 women, 118 boys, 108 girls). *Blue Book 1826*, p. 228, says that the population figures for that year exclude 1,751 'apprentice Negroes'

TABLE 9. *Population of Mauritius, 1810–27*[1]

Year	Whites	Free Coloured	Slaves	Total	Year	Whites	Free Coloured	Slaves	Total
1810	6,865	7,649	63,281	77,795	1819	7,602	12,052	..	..
1811	6,864	7,860	..	..	1820	7,658	12,621	67,699	87,978
1812	6,820	8,698	..	..	1821	7,741	13,060	66,660	87,461
1813	6,854	9,013	..	..	1822	7,827	13,639	..	..
1814	7,076	9,495	64,874	81,486[2]	1823	7,943	14,085	63,277	85,305
1815	7,204	10,079	..	..	1824	7,989	14,495	63,449	85,913[2]
1816	7,231	10,565	79,863	97,169[2]	1825	8,009	14,831	63,432	86,272
1817	7,375	10,979	79,493	97,847	1826	8,111	15,444	69,076	92,631
1818	7,472	11,497	..	..	1827	8,198	15,837	68,962	92,997

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 36. These figures were sent to the Commissioners by D'Unienville on 12 Feb. 1828.

[2] Total does not agree with items.

TABLE 10. *Population of Mauritius, 1812–22*[1]

Year	Whites[2]	Free Coloured	Slaves[3]	Year	Whites[2]	Free Coloured	Slaves[3]
1812	7,099	8,476	..	1818	7,195	10,549	..
1813	7,044	8,985	..	1819	8,036	11,552	80,185
1814	7,076	9,486	78,102	1820	7,991	11,892	..
1815	7,114	9,693	87,352	1821	8,038	12,297	..
1816	7,231	10,075	..	1822	8,078	12,806	..
1817	7,183	10,209	..				

[1] See 'A Return of the Population in each year from 1812 inclusive to March 1822', dated 22 July 1822, Enclosure to Letter from Governor Farquhar to the Earl Bathurst, 7 Nov. 1822, *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius* (1823), p. 127.

[2] 'The persons composing the garrisons of the Colony are not comprised in the statements of the White Population.'

[3] 'For the year 1814, the Return is made from the Collector's Tax Roll, under the proclamations of the Governor. For the year 1815, from original Returns made under the Registration Order in Council. For 1819, from the Triennial Returns under the Order in Council. This is the last Triennial Return stated by the Registrar to be yet complete.' Unlike the figures for free persons those for slaves evidently include the Dependencies. According to Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 1, the 'number of Slaves registered in the Original Slave Registers' (in 1815) was 80,046 for Mauritius and 87,352 for the whole Colony. According to ibid., No. 3, the 'number of Slaves recensed' in 1819 was 72,728 in Mauritius and 80,185 in the whole Colony.

(8) The first Indian convicts arrived in January 1816. In 1817 about 500 were to be employed in repairing roads.[1]

Later statements concerning their numbers read as follows:

1823. Establishment of the Convict Department for the Year 1823. . . . 500 men are employed . . . in the Construction and repair of Roads in the Eight Districts

(1,345 males, 406 females). Bernard, *Essai sur les nouveaux affranchis de l'île Maurice* (1834, reprinted in *Revue Historique*, 8 May 1889, p. 549), says that 'on 1 January 1827 there were in Mauritius 69,076 slaves excluding the 2,045 apprentices of the Government'. Robert Montgomery Martin, *Statistics of the Colonies* (1839), p. 503, states that the population figures which he gives as for 1827 exclude 2,045 'apprentices' (1,486 males, 559 females). D'Unienville, *Statistique*, vol. iv, Table 51, lists for 1 Jan. 1830 753 apprentices (457 men, 107 women, 121 boys, 68 girls).

[1] See p. 797 below.

TABLE 11. *Slave Population by Sex, Mauritius 1811–26*[1]

Year	Source	*Port Louis and Suburbs*			*Mauritius*		
		Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1811	(1)	6,400	3,022	9,422	36,010	17,050	53,060
	(2)	6,447	3,044	9,491	41,885	20,033	61,918
1812	(1)	6,210	2,697	8,907	29,687	14,407	44,094
	(2)	6,363	2,763	9,126	40,922	19,895	60,817
1813	(1)	5,840	2,830	8,670	32,136	15,795	47,931
	(2)	7,203	3,490	10,693	41,099	20,266	61,365
1814	(1)	6,324	2,912	9,236	36,332	17,645	53,977
	(2)	7,242	3,335	10,577	42,395	20,532	62,927
1818	(2)	..	..	15,984	..	..	80,019
1819	(1)	8,721	4,366	13,087	46,754	24,050	70,624[2]
	(2)	11,513	5,764	17,277	52,757	27,211	79,968
1820	(1)	8,177	3,997	12,174	44,084	22,576	66,660
	(2)	8,731	4,268	12,999	47,141	24,138	71,279
1822	(1)	7,850	4,067	11,917	40,895	22,004	62,899
	(2)	8,283	4,291	12,574	42,835	22,988	65,823
1823	(1)	7,374	3,807	11,181	40,252	21,581	61,833
	(2)	8,060	4,161	12,221	42,124	22,585	64,709
1824	(1)	7,995	4,305	12,300	41,298	22,392	63,690
	(2)	8,265	4,448	12,713	42,306	22,958	65,264
1825	(1) (2)	8,789	4,388	13,177	40,107	22,007	62,114
1826	(1) (2)	8,106	4,665	12,771	40,222	22,412	62,634

[1] 'Return of the Slave Population of the Isle of France; comprising, 1st, The Number of Slaves, as shown by the Returns of the Proprietors, denominated Annual Returns, which remain deposited in the Internal Revenues Office . . . 2dly, The Number of Slaves, as shown by the Collector's Tax Rolls, for the same Period, and in the same Form as the first Statement, but differing from it in this respect, that the proportions of Male and Female Slaves which are not stated in the Tax Rolls, have been derived from an approximate Calculation, founded upon the general results of the Proprietors Returns', dated 'Internal Revenues Office, Port Louis, 7th March 1827' (*Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, pp. 522–3).

[2] Total does not agree with items.

TABLE 12. *Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1814–19*[1]

Year	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
		White Population			
1814	2,621	1,350	1,477	1,628	7,076
1816	2,822	1,609	1,298	1,502	7,231
1819	2,403	1,528	1,528	2,067	8,036[2]
		Free People of Colour			
1814	1,951	2,653	2,361	2,531	9,486[2]
1816	2,322	3,048	2,263	2,442	10,075
1819	1,561	2,791	3,642	3,558	11,552
		Slave Population			
1814	44,597	19,110	7,494	6,901	78,102
1815	50,353	24,416	6,331	6,252	87,352

[1] 'A Return of the Population' dated 22 July 1822 (see also footnotes to Table 10). 'It has not been possible to procure detailed statements of the Free Populations for the years 1812, 13, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, and 22.' For 1816 the slave population was given as 85,423 (55,717 males, 29,706 females); see *Returns of the Amount of the Slave Population at the Cape of Good Hope, and in the Mauritius* (1825).

The lower limit for adults was apparently 15 years in the case of free persons (see *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population*, 1823, p. 127), and (at least in 1815) 10 years in the case of the slave population (see ibid., p. 129).

[2] Total does not agree with items.

of the Island. The remainder of those who are effective are employed in the publick Works of the Town, under the controul of the Civil Engineer.[1]

1 January 1825. About 600.[2]

1827–32. Public Works. Convicts on the Strength of the Department:[3]

1 Jan. 1827	*1 July 1827*	*1 Jan. 1828*	*1 July 1828*	*1 Jan. 1829*	*1 July 1829*	*1 Jan. 1830*	*1 July 1830*	*1 Jan. 1831*	*1 July 1831*	*31 Dec. 1831*	*31 Dec. 1832*
581	576	569	564	622	610	607	626	544	549	571	576

These figures are not all-inclusive. They probably do not include invalids. They exclude, moreover, from the end of 1829 till 1 September 1833 a number of convicts who were not employed on country roads.

1829.[4] Department of Roads and Bridges. Forty Convicts having been given over to this Department for the purpose of repairing &c. the Streets of Port Louis and in fulfilment of the Provision of Ordinance No. 56[5] . . . .

TABLE 13. *Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1817 and 1825*[1]

Class	*Men*		*Women*		*Boys*		*Girls*		*Total*	
	1817	*1825*	*1817*	*1825*	*1817*	*1825*	*1817*	*1825*	*1817*	*1825*
PORT LOUIS										
Whites	1,091	1,020	565	770	678	615	713	748	3,047	3,153
Free Col.	888	1,152	1,481	1,679	1,416	2,159	1,509	2,283	5,294	7,273
Slaves	9,468	6,837	4,067	2,978	1,537	1,344	1,426	1,252	16,498	12,411
Total	11,447	9,009	6,113	5,427	3,631	4,118	3,648	4,283	24,839	22,837
MAURITIUS										
Whites	2,635	2,581	1,452	1,859	1,566	1,649	1,722	1,920	7,375	8,009
Free Col.	2,116	2,599	2,752	3,169	2,965	4,418	3,146	4,645	10,979	14,831
Slaves	45,388	34,844	19,445	15,944	7,646	6,461	7,014	6,183	79,493	63,432
Total	50,139	40,024	23,649	20,972	12,177	12,528	11,882	12,748	97,847	86,272

[1] For 1817 see D'Unienville (1825) (C.O. 172, vol. xlii, p. 17); adults are those over 15 years. For 1825 see ibid., p. 19, and D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice* (1838), vol. iv, Table 37; figures refer to 1 Jan. and exclude the troops, the strangers with permit of residence, the apprentices numbering 1,818 (1,222 men, 370 women, 118 boys, 108 girls), and the convicts (about 600).

1830. Public Works. 67 Convicts permanently transferred to the Civil Engineer Department from 1st August 1830, inclusive.[6]

1832. During June there were 62, and during July 47 Convicts employed at the 'Batelage', under the directions of the Collector of Customs & Harbour Master.[7]

[1] *Blue Book 1823.*

[2] D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice* (1838), vol. iv, Table 37.

[3] See *Brown Book, Jan. to June 1827* to *July to Dec. 1831* (Sections 'Public Works'); *Blue Book, 1832*, p. 272.

[4] *Brown Book, July to Dec. 1829*, p. 19.

[5] See 'An Ordinance for the purpose of imposing a special Tax on Carriages, Horses, Mules, &a., the proceeds of which are destined for keeping in repair and good order the Town of Port-Louis' (25 Nov. 1829, English text *Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 272–8). This Ordinance provided:

'1st. That the Corvée Tax as heretofore levied in kind, should be commuted into money at a fair and moderate rate, in order to cover the expences of Indian Convicts whose labour is to be substituted for that of the Corvée Blacks . . . .'

[6] *Brown Book, July to Dec. 1830*, p. 85. See also ibid., *Jan. to June 1830*, p. 18. According to *Blue Book 1830*, p. 306, *1831*, p. 250, 65 convicts allocated to the Civil Engineer's Department were working on the streets of Port Louis.

[7] Ibid. *1832*, p. 181.

TABLE 14. *Free Coloured and Slave Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1821–6*[1]

	Free Coloured					*Slaves*				
1 Jan.	*Males above 15*	*Females above 15*	*Males under 15*	*Females under 15*	*Total*	*Males above 7*	*Females above 7*	*Males under 7*	*Females under 7*	*Total*
1821	2,404	3,021	3,717	3,918	13,060	39,999	18,635	4,013	3,515	66,162
1822	2,521	3,130	3,888	4,100	13,639	37,402	18,476	3,696	3,525	63,099
1823	2,562	3,167	4,081	4,275	14,085	37,150	18,470	3,798	3,658	63,076
1824	2,591	3,159	4,269	4,476	14,495	38,337	18,797	4,152	3,751	65,037
1825	2,599	3,169	4,418	4,645	14,831	34,844	15,944	6,461	6,183	63,432
1826	2,692	3,255	4,463	4,715	15,125	36,049	17,633	4,599	4,307	62,588

[1] See *Returns from the West Indies, and the Isle of France*, &c. (1828), p. 109. The slave figures for 1825 evidently refer to persons above 15 and under 15; *Blue Book 1825*, p. 228, shows 35,237 males and 17,238 females above 7 years, and 4,505 males and 4,207 females 'of 7 years and under'.

TABLE 15. *Population by Sex and Race, Mauritius 1822–8*[1]

Date	*Whites*		*Free Coloured*		*Slaves*		*Total*			*Resident strangers*
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	
PORT LOUIS										
15 July 1822	2,533	1,648	3,947	2,772	7,456	3,669	13,936	8,089	22,025	..
15 July 1823	2,117	1,607	3,282	3,270	6,022	6,377	11,421	11,254	22,675	..
1824	2,153	1,986	3,262	4,108	7,434	4,514	12,849	10,608	23,457	..
16 Oct. 1826	1,929	1,458	3,347	4,164	9,421	6,296	14,697	11,918	26,615	..[2]
(30 June) 1827	1,803	1,434	3,484	4,183	9,525	6,345	14,812	11,962	26,774	216
(31 Dec.) 1827	1,798	1,442	3,559	4,228	9,492	6,371	14,849	12,041	26,890	216
30 June 1828	1,779	1,456	3,620	4,261	9,440	6,347	14,839	12,064	26,903	344
31 Dec. 1828	2,172	1,778	3,568	4,329	9,576	6,375	15,316	12,482	27,798	344
MAURITIUS										
15 July 1822	5,959	4,400	7,542	5,933	41,015	22,754	54,516	33,087	87,603	..
15 July 1823	4,994	4,037	6,615	6,790	35,838	25,350	47,447	36,177	83,624	..
1824	5,214	4,568	7,321	8,574	39,875	22,626	52,410	35,768	88,178	400
1825	4,606	3,572	6,687	7,446	39,742	21,445	51,035	32,463	83,498	278
16 Oct. 1826[3]	4,448	3,663	7,105	8,339	42,621	26,455	54,174	38,457	92,631	257[4]
(30 June) 1827	4,302	3,541	7,192	8,299	42,411	26,531	53,905	38,371	92,276	276
(31 Dec.) 1827	4,331	3,593	7,404	8,424	42,242	26,583	53,977	38,600	92,577	274
30 June 1828	4,305	3,614	7,526	8,558	41,884	26,460	53,715	38,632	92,347	446
31 Dec. 1828	4,453	3,753	7,247	8,387	42,748	26,567	54,487[5]	38,707	93,194	446

[1] See for 1822 *Returns from the Mauritius under the Registry Act* (1825), p. 2; for 1823–6 *Blue Book 1823*, p. 250, *1824*, p. 143, *1825*, p. 228, *1826*, folio 138; for 1827–8 *Brown Book Jan. to June 1827, July to Dec. 1827, Jan. to June 1828, July to Dec. 1828* (Sections 'Population'). Figures exclude King's Troops (Whites), Government Slaves, Apprentices, and Indian Convicts.

[2] According to *Brown Book 1826*, Section 'Population', 219.

[3] *Blue Book 1827*, p. 328, gives the same figures for Whites and Free Coloured as *Blue Book 1826*, but shows 42,676 male and 26,525 female Slaves, and 430 Resident Strangers. This 'Statement has been made up from the Data furnished by the Registrar of Slaves, the Colonial Archivist and Chief Commissary of Police'.

[4] According to *Brown Book 1826*, Section 'Population', 274.

[5] Total does not tally with items.

TABLE 16. *Slaves Registered in Mauritius between 16 October 1826 and 16 January 1827*[1]

Age (Years)[2]	*Creoles*		*Mozambiques*		*Malagasy*		*Malays*		*Indians*		*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Under 7	4,436	4,614	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4,436	4,614	9,050
7–11	2,581	2,607	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,581	2,607	5,188
12–16	2,450	2,377	27	6	78	42	..	2	..	..	2,555	2,427	4,982
17–60	7,843	7,748	14,989	3,507	7,846	4,199	126	104	1,323	785	32,127	16,343	48,470
61–	61	70	428	200	347	155	5	2	136	107	977	534	1,511
Total	17,371	17,416	15,444	3,713	8,271	4,396	131	108	1,459	892	42,676	26,525	69,264[3]

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 4.

[2] The ages are given as '6 years and under'; 'under 12 and above 6 years'; 'under 17 and above 11 years'; 'under 61 and above 16 years'; 'above 60 years'.

[3] Including 63 'Slaves whose Casts, ages, &c. have not been specified on the Returns & the required explanations not yet received'.

From 1 September 1833 on, the figures for convicts comprise again all persons employed as workers.

Since the 1st September when by recommendation of the Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry, the Roads & Bridges Department was united to the Surveyor General & Civil Engineer's Department, all the public Roads & Bridges, causeways or chaussées & Ferry Boats throughout the Colony together with their construction & repair; of the discipline & general economy of 699 Indian Convicts dispersed in different detachments throughout the Island, or its dependencies, as well as in town & who are solely employed on the Roads & Bridges . . . .[1]

TABLE 17. *Free Population by Sex and Race, Mauritius 1829–34*[1]

Date	Males		Females		Total	Resident strangers
	Whites	Coloured	Whites	Coloured		
PORT LOUIS						
30 June 1829	2,158	3,841	1,779	4,432	12,210	344
31 Dec. 1829	2,021	4,000	1,620	4,731	12,372	370
30 June 1831	6,179		7,875		14,054	..
31 Dec. 1831	6,125		7,874		13,999	..
(31 Dec.) 1832	6,100		7,885		13,985	..
31 Dec. 1834	6,290		8,074		14,364	..
MAURITIUS						
30 June 1829	4,407	7,626	3,767	8,603	24,403	423
31 Dec. 1829	4,403	8,348	3,732	9,671	26,154	454
30 June 1831	12,206		13,809		26,015	520[2]
31 Dec. 1831	12,224		13,839		26,063	520
(31 Dec.) 1832	12,489		14,071		26,560[3]	568
31 Dec. 1833	..		..		30,291[4]	..
31 Dec. 1834[5]	12,664		14,279		26,943	473

[1] See for 1829 and 1831 *Brown Book Jan. to June 1829* to *July to Dec. 1831*; for 1832–4 *Blue Book 1832*, pp. 434–5; *1833*, folios 212–13; *1834*, pp. 263–4.

[2] But see also *Blue Book 1830*, p. 502: 'The number of aliens & resident Strangers in the Colony in June 1831 are stated by the Superintendent of Police at 463.'

[3] 'To the statement of the free population, in number 26,560 individuals, may be added 568 Strangers and 1,647 Slaves Emancipated in 1832, it being not quite certain whether they are comprised in the Statements from which the Return is made up.'

[4] 'No returns of the free Population have of late years been called for & the present statement therefore is made up on that of 1831, adding the Births & emancipations in 1832 & 1833 & deducting the deaths during the same years.' The figure was actually obtained by adding to the population of 1832 (not 1831) 2,137 births and 2,900 emancipations and deducting 1,306 deaths. If the 1831 figure given in *Blue Book 1831*, pp. 404–5 (26,188) is substituted, the total would appear to be 29,919.

[5] 'No Returns of the free population have of late Years been called for & the present statement therefore is made up on that of 1831 adding the births & Emancipations in 1832, 1833 & 1834 & deducting the deaths during the same Years.' Since the Blue Book shows, for 1834, 1,753 births, 241 emancipations, and 2,709 deaths, the Free Population would have decreased by 715 through such events (and not by 3,348).

The Blue Books for 1834–7 contained similar statements, the numbers of Indian convicts employed on the roads and bridges being given as 740, 780, 812, and 763 respectively.[2] Backhouse, on 10 April 1838, noted that

[1] Ibid. *1833*, folio 135.

[2] See ibid. *1834*, p. 185; *1835*, p. 262; *1836*, folio 96; *1837*, folio 113.

TABLE 18. *Free Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1 January 1830*[1]

Class	Port Louis					Mauritius				
	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*	*Men*	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
Whites	1,490	1,117	531	503	3,641	3,115	2,424	1,288	1,308	8,135
Free Coloured	2,100	2,932	1,900	1,799	8,731	4,409	5,792	3,939	3,879	18,019
Apprentices	300	59	79	35	473	457	107	121	68	753
Total	3,890	4,108	2,510	2,337	12,845	7,981	8,323	5,348	5,255	26,907

[1] See D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice*, vol. iv, Table 51.

'there are about seven hundred of them in the island'.[1] Finally Frere and Williamson reported that there were 'at one time as many as 835, who were sent to Mauritius to work on the roads, though several of them were employed by private individuals, most notably by M. de Chazal in his silk cultivation'.[2]

TABLE 19. *Slave Population by Sex, Mauritius 1830 and 1832*

Date	Port Louis		Mauritius	
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
2 Jan. 1830[1]	9,395	6,740	41,051	26,070
1 May 1832[2]	8,974	6,445	38,124	24,932

[1] See *Blue Book 1830*, p. 501. *Blue Book 1831*, p. 409, gives for the same date 9,397, 6,742, 41,009, and 26,060 respectively.

[2] See ibid. *1832*, p. 438. *Blue Book 1833*, folio 214, gives for the same date 8,989, 6,443, 38,221, and 24,943 respectively. *Blue Book 1834*, p. 265, gives, without indicating the date, 8,969, 6,443, 38,218, and 26,113 respectively.

4. *1835–1946*

The Blue Books for 1835–51 contain very interesting population data which so far have attracted little attention.[3] They are summarized in Tables 20, 21, and 22. Most figures for free persons and apprentices were probably not wide of the mark, but the data for Indians are far too low for 1843–5 and 1848–50. The numbers of Indians, as computed from the

[1] See *Narrative of a Visit to the Mauritius*, pp. 34–5.

[2] *Report of the Royal Commissioners on the Treatment of Immigrants in Mauritius* (1875), p. 26.

[3] These data indicate that the later census reports contain inaccurate figures for 1846 and 1851. The Indian population is given in those reports as 56,245 for 1846. But as the Blue Books show, this figure actually refers to Indian and other immigrant labourers; it includes an unknown number of natives from China and Madagascar, but excludes, for example, 1,619 Indians counted as 'Aliens and Resident Strangers'. The total population for 1846 is given in the census reports as 161,089 (including military and shipping); this figure excludes not only the 1,619 Indian, but also 625 European and 521 Chinese 'Aliens and Resident Strangers'. The total population for 1851 is given in the census reports as 183,506 (including military and shipping); this figure excludes 990 non-Indian immigrant labourers and about 1,200 European and Chinese 'Aliens and Resident Strangers'. The military population for that year is given in the census reports as 1,315 males and 209 females, while according to the Blue Book the figure 209 actually comprised women and children (of both sexes).

TABLE 20. *Population of Mauritius, 1835–8*[1]

Year	Free		Apprentices		Indian labourers		Total			Aliens and resident strangers
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total	
PORT LOUIS										
1835[2]	6,679	6,664	8,247	6,055	..	..	14,926	12,719	27,645	..
1836[3]	7,570	7,263	9,850	6,660	..	..	17,420	13,923	31,343	..
1837[3]	8,000	8,006	9,850	6,660	613	37	18,463	14,703	33,166	..
1838[3]	9,091	9,090	9,780	6,579	..	..	18,871	15,669	34,540	533
MAURITIUS										
1835[4]	15,282	14,330	36,527	24,518	..	..	51,809	38,848	90,657	1,490
1836	15,926	14,485	33,199	20,602	4,337		49,115[5]	35,085[5]	88,537	670[6]
1837[3]	16,473	15,199	32,725	19,891	11,201	399	60,399	35,489	95,888	700[7]
1838	19,504	18,361	34,994	18,236	23,520	389	78,018	36,986	115,004	665

[1] See *Blue Book 1835*, pp. 282–3; *1836*, folios 142–3; *1837*, folios 164–5; *1838*, folios 133–4.
[2] Excluding Indian labourers.
[3] 'The Return of the free Population as here inserted is taken from the Census of 1836, which was completed during the present year. Various circumstances occurred to interrupt & delay the completion of that Census and it is apprehended that the result is far from being correct.—The above numbers are exclusive of the free children of apprentice Labourers who are found not to be included in the returns from which this statement is made up.'
[4] Indian labourers possibly included in 'Aliens and Resident Strangers'.
[5] Excluding Indian labourers. Total does not tally with items.
[6] 'European Aliens exclusive of Children.'
[7] 'It is impossible to state the Numbers and District with any degree of accuracy.'

records of arrivals, departures, births, and deaths, on 31 December 1834–51 were as follows:[1]

Year	Males	Females	Year	Males	Females	Year	Males	Females
1834	70	—	1840	21,169	939	1846	55,140	10,301
1835	1,224	71	1841	20,332	931	1847	58,156	11,154
1836	4,613	249	1842	18,105	888	1848	59,693	11,788
1837	11,139	582	1843	44,454	5,049	1849	61,240	12,572
1838	21,970	821	1844	48,224	6,715	1850	65,718	14,018
1839	21,881	915	1845	52,896	8,705	1851	70,658	15,746

Meldrum used these figures in computing the total population on 31 December for each year from 1831 to 1860. His basic data were:

1. The records of the Civil Status Office.
2. The annual arrivals and departures among the General Population, as recorded in the Department of the Port Office.
3. The annual arrivals, departures, births, and deaths among the Indian population, from 1834 to 1860, as published by the Registrar General.
4. The results of the Censuses taken in 1846, 1851, and 1861.[2]

But the arrivals and departures among the General Population had not been registered prior to 1850.

For the previous years 1831–49 all that could be done was to assume that the mean annual excess of arrivals over departures was the same, in proportion to the population, as in 1850–60.[3]

Yet the latter statement is not correct. Meldrum gives a Table which shows for each year the total births and deaths, the arrivals and departures of Indian immigrants, and the total population computed for 31 December.[4] The assumed excess of arrivals over departures among the General

[1] See *Mauritius Almanac 1869*, pp. 132–3.
[2] Meldrum, p. 134.
[3] Ibid.
[4] See ibid., p. 135.

Population is equal, of course, to the total population increase minus the excess of total births over total deaths minus the excess of arrivals over departures among the Indians. Since the numbers of Indians were assumed to be the same as the above figures quoted from *The Mauritius Almanac*, the General Population must be equal to the difference between the total population and those figures for Indians. The results may be summarized as follows:

Year	*Excess of births over deaths*	*Excess of arrivals over departures*		*Population 31 December*		
		General Population	*Indian immigrants*	*Total*	*Indian immigrants*	*Others*
1831	−137	380	—	92,951	—	92,951
1832	−293	380	—	93,038	—	93,038
1833	225	380	—	93,643	—	93,643
1834	−885	380	71	93,209	70	92,139
1835	−1,186	380	1,228	93,631	1,295	92,336
1836	−110	380	3,633	97,534	4,862	92,672
1837	−1,137	380	7,158	103,935	11,721	92,214
1838	−859	380	11,654	115,110	22,791	92,319
1839	−1,363	380	862	114,989	22,796	92,193
1840	408	380	−301	115,476	22,108	93,368
1841	−929	380	−547	114,380	21,263	93,117
1842	−990	884	−2,032	112,242	18,993	93,249
1843	−522	884	31,533	144,137	49,503	94,634
1844	−4,545	884	9,088	149,564	54,939	94,625
1845	−1,790	884	8.309	156,967	61,601	95,366
1846	−260	884	4,579	162,170	65,441	96,729
1847	424	−4,105	4,046	162,535	69,310	93,225
1848	730	884	2,380	166,529	71,481	95,048
1849	−176	884	2,533	169,770	73,812	95,958
1850	−266	498	6,305	176,307	79,736	96,571
1851	398	950	6,841	184,496	86,404	98,092

It appears that Meldrum actually put the excess of arrivals over departures among the General Population for each year from 1831 to 1841 at 380, and for each year from 1842 to 1846 and for 1848 and 1849 at 884. But he assumed that in 1847 departures among the General Population exceeded arrivals by 4,105.[1] Furthermore, he did not realize that the

[1] Meldrum, who took enormous trouble to obtain accurate population data for his computations of mortality, made such erroneous assumptions partly because he misinterpreted the Blue Book figures. After having stated that 'the total population' on 1 Aug. 1846, according to the census, was 158,462, he says (p. 136): 'The population on the 31st December, 1846, given in the Blue Book for that year, and said to have been derived from the enumerated population and from the births, deaths, &c., from the 1st August to the 31st December, is 166,872. But this number is evidently too large . . . .' However, the figure 166,872 does not at all represent the population on 31 Dec. It is the census figure including Seychelles (!) and the military. Meldrum himself put the population increase for the five months at 3,708. He states, furthermore, that the 'total population' on 20 Nov. 1851, according to the census, was 180,823, and says: 'On the 31st December, 1851, the population obtained in the same way from the enumerated population on the 20th November of that year, was according to the Blue Book, 184,496.' This too is a mistake. The figure 180,823 represents the resident population (including immigrant Indians) ascertained at the census; the figure 184,496 represents the total census population (including all immigrants, the military, and shipping). Meldrum very much overstated the population increase between 20 Nov. and 31 Dec. by putting it at 3,673. Even so he had to assume a considerable excess of departures among the General Population in 1847–9.

TABLE 21. *Population of Mauritius, 1839–45*[1]

Year	*General population*		*Indian labourers*		*Chinese*[2]	*Malagasy*[3]	*Total population*			*Aliens and resident strangers*
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	
					PORT LOUIS					
1839	18,871	15,069	..	..	—	—	..	..	..	1,395
1840[4]	18,871	15,069	5,264	22	—	..	24,135	15,691	39,826	1,066
1841[5]	19,223	17,355	369	—	..	..	19,592	17,355	36,947	487
1842	20,288	18,210	332		585	1,299	22,172[6]	18,210[6]	40,714	317
1843[7]	20,288	18,210	360		497	902	21,687[6]	18,210[6]	40,257	580
1844	19,839	18,197	340	28	316	12	20,507	18,225	38,732	597
1845	19,453	18,134	832	472	335	54	20,674	18,606	39,280	1,921[8]
					MAURITIUS					
1839	69,800	39,940	23,490	419	—	—	93,290	40,359	133,649	1,548
1840	55,764	43,686	23,071	419	—	..	78,835	44,205	122,940	1,395
1841[5]	71,392	45,574	17,878	512	1,088	1,293	91,651	46,086	137,737	694
1842	71,831	47,896	17,169		1,366	2,609	75,806[6]	47,896[6]	140,871	691
1843[7]	74,288	50,020	43,700		1,478	1,222	76,988[6]	50,020[6]	170,708	943
1844	72,985	49,762	35,956	4,969[9]	564	151	109,656	54,734[10]	164,390	877
1845	72,524	50,173	38,982[11]	6,127[11, 12]	561	157	112,224[11]	56,300[11]	171,408[13]	2,163[8]

[1] See *Blue Book 1839*, folios 152–3; *1840*, folios 178–9; *1841*, pp. 251–3; *1842*, pp. 322–3; *1843*, pp. 314–15; *1844*, pp. 206–7; *1845*, pp. 224–5.

[2] 'Labourers, Natives of China and the Malay Coast.'

[3] 'Labourers, Natives of Madagascar and adjacent Islands.'

[4] 'The numbers of the Population of Port Louis are taken from the Blue Book Returns of 1839, the Census of 1840, not having been collated and extracted.'

[5] 30 Sept. 'The Population Returns now presented make an approach to accuracy; but cannot yet be considered as correct. In the ensuing year it is hoped from the measures taken, that they will be as nearly accurate as possible.'

[6] Excluding Indian labourers.

[7] 'The numbers [for the General Population] here given cannot be depended on, but are to be viewed merely as an approximation to the actual population; of which there are no means at present of ascertaining the exact extent.'

[8] 'Including Chinese & Indian Aliens *on sufferance*' in Port Louis.

[9] Including 1,048 'under no engagement living with their husbands'.

[10] Including 2 female labourers from China or the Malay Coast and 1 from Madagascar.

[11] Excluding Indian children with their parents.

[12] Including 2,547 'under no engagement living with their husbands'.

[13] Including 2,884 Indian children with their parents.

TABLE 22. *Population of Mauritius, 1846–51*[1]

Year	General population		Ex-apprentices		Total resident		Immigrants				Total population			Military	Shipping	Aliens and resident strangers
							Indians		Chinese	Malagasy						
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Males	Males	Females	Total	Males	Males	
PORT LOUIS																
1846[2]	13,863	12,684	6,935	5,599	20,798	18,283	5,664[3]	467[3]	..	..	26,462	18,750	45,212	..	..	2,555
1847[4]	13,724	12,830	6,836	5,598	20,560	18,428	4,941	531	468	—	25,969	18,959	44,928	..	..	1,562[5]
1848[4]	13,732	12,923	6,700	5,660	20,432	18,583	4,376	683	463	9	25,280	19,266	44,546	..	..	834[6]
1849[4]	13,695	12,946	6,504	5,633	20,199	18,579	4,461	760	451	23	25,134	19,339	44,473	..	..	1,065[7]
1850	13,628	12,916	6,243	5,557	19,871	18,473	4,815	848	450	73	25,209	19,231	44,530	..	..	1,065[7]
1851[8]	14,471	13,635	5,788	5,192	20,259	18,827	8,989	1,834	470	80	29,851[9]	20,661	50,512	..	..	1,065
MAURITIUS																
1846[2]	27,531	25,331	28,142	21,223	55,673	46,554	48,935[3]	7,310[3]	..	..	104,608	53,864	158,472	1,801	826	2,765[10]
1847[4]	27,600	25,623	28,101	21,397	55,701	47,020	47,775	8,083	558	107	104,141	55,103	159,244	2,762[11]	1,052	1,766[12]
1848[4]	27,773	25,886	28,234	21,727	56,007	47,613	47,014	9,258	556	109	103,686	56,871	160,557	2,415[13]	1,249	993[14]
1849[4]	27,877	26,005	28,031	21,836	55,908	47,841	49,617	8,454	555	109	106,189	56,295	162,484	2,448[15]	1,057	1,256[16]
1850	27,905	26,101	27,757	22,012	55,662	48,113	54,031	9,455	554	202[17]	110,446	57,571	168,017	1,740[18]	933	1,201[19]
1851[8]	28,406	26,091	26,653	21,677	55,059	47,768	64,282	13,714	579	164	120,331[20]	61,482	181,813	1,524[21]	1,159	1,201

[1] See *Blue Book 1846*, pp. 192–4; *1847*, pp. 220–2; *1848*, pp. 220–2; *1849*, pp. 286–8; *1850*, pp. 258–60; *1851*, pp. 202–3.

[2] Census, August 1846.

[3] 'Indian & other Immigrant Labourers.'

[4] 31 Dec.—General Population is said to be computed by adding births and deducting deaths during the year.

[5] 612 Europeans, 500 Chinese, 450 Indians.

[6] 379 Europeans, 455 Chinese.

[7] 479 Europeans, 586 Chinese.

[8] Census, 20 Nov. 1851.

[9] Including 13 from Coast of Africa and 40 from Comoro Islands.

[10] 625 Europeans, 521 Chinese, 1,619 Indians.

[11] 'Including 121 Women & 196 Children.'

[12] 'The difference in the Number between the Alien Returns of 1846 & the present Year proceeds from Natives of British India being no longer considered as Aliens.'

[13] 'Including 156 women & 218 children.'

[14] 538 Europeans, 455 Chinese.

[15] 'Including 158 Women & 245 Children.'

[16] 620 Europeans, 636 Chinese.

[17] Including 3 females.

[18] 'Not including Women & children.'

[19] 577 Europeans, 624 Chinese.

[20] Including 13 from Coast of Africa and 234 from Comoro Islands.

[21] Including 209 women and children.

population figures for Indians, derived from records of arrivals, departures, births, and deaths, were far too high from 1843 onwards, and that therefore the figures he incidentally assumed for the General Population were too low.

The military strength in this period is given by Meldrum as follows:[1]

1835	*1836*	*1837*	*1838*	*1839*	*1840*	*1841*	*1842*	*1843*
2,002	1,655	1,634	1,589	1,540	1,971	1,948	1,917	1,878

1844	*1845*	*1846*	*1847*	*1848*	*1849*	*1850*	*1851*
1,773	1,749	1,781	1,784	1,914	1,985	1,858	1,423

Table 23 summarizes the principal results of the censuses taken from 1846 to 1944. Unfortunately the data are not strictly comparable, the main reasons being that the earlier figures exclude non-resident strangers and that recent figures do not show separately all the military. Fairly comparable figures for the total population, excluding non-resident shipping, in 1846–1911 would read as follows:[2]

	1846	*1851*	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*
Including military	163,028	184,538	312,400	316,748	360,310	371,309	372,839	370,393
Excluding military	161,227	183,014	310,050	316,042	359,874	370,588	370,226	368,607

In 1921 the population including the military was apparently 376,691. In 1931 the men on service in barracks were not enumerated. It is impossible to give for these years revised figures of the population, excluding military. But it presumably exceeded 375,000 in 1921 and 392,000 in 1931. The figure 419,185 for 1944 includes the Mauritius Regiment and members of the Royal Naval and Air Forces, altogether apparently 2,694 men.[3] 'On the other hand, some 8,000 Mauritians, mostly members of the general population, were abroad at the time of the Census and were not included in the enumeration.'[4] The total population in Mauritius at census date exceeded 419,185, because no account was taken of the East African troops then stationed on the island. The population, excluding the military (and their families), was about 416,000. In computing for 1944 a figure comparable with the earlier figures of the population excluding military, it is necessary to realize that some persons who in 1944 belonged to the military on the island would have been in the same position if there had been no war and that some Mauritians who were abroad at

[1] See Meldrum, Appendixes, p. lv

[2] The figures 'Excluding military' include in 1846 and 1891 the families of military; they are, therefore, slightly too high. For 1901 the 'Military and Shipping' are given as 2,810 (see *Census Report 1901*, p. 4), and the 'Military in Barracks' as 2,313 (see ibid., p. 9); I have allocated 300 to the military residing out of barracks.

[3] The General Population includes 2,073 Soldiers, R.A.F. and Military, and 8 Engineers R.A.F., the Indian Population 604 Soldiers, and the Chinese Population 9 Soldiers. See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 15–18.

[4] Ibid., p. 2.

TABLE 23. *Population of Mauritius, 1846–1944*[1]

Year	*General Population including Chinese*		*Indian Population*		*Total 'Resident' population*			*Military*		*Non-resident shipping*	
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
1846[2]	55,663	46,554	48,935	7,310	104,598	53,864	158,462	1,801	—	826	—
1851[3]	55,059	47,768	64,282	13,714	119,341	61,482	180,823	1,315[4]	209[4]	1,159	—
1861	61,346	56,070	141,615	51,019	202,961	107,089	310,050	2,105	245	1,044	18
1871	51,771	48,013	141,804	74,454	193,575	122,467	316,042	564	142	314	7
1881	57,303	53,578	151,352	97,641	208,655	151,219	359,874	380	56	525	12
1891	58,539	56,129	147,499	108,421	206,038	164,550	370,588	721	—	344	2
1901[5]	56,452	55,485	143,100	115,986	199,552	171,471	371,023	2,226	87	497	
1911[6]	55,121	55,973	138,974	118,723	194,095	174,696	368,791	1,423	179	314	41
1921[6]	54,958	56,003	139,150	126,374	194,108	182,377	376,485	157	49	847	12
1931[7]	61,976	63,513	139,533	129,116	200,609	192,629	393,238	85[8]		..	..
1944[9]	73,944	79,994	136,382	128,865	210,326	208,859	419,185	..	..	..	..

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, Appendixes, pp. 3–6; *1901*, pp. 4, 9; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. iii, lix, lxxii, Appendix; *1921*, p. 12, Appendixes, p. i; *1944*, pp. 2–3, 16–18; *Mauritius Almanac 1922*, Section E, p. 40; ibid. *1932–33*, Section E, p. 4.

[2] The figures for the Indian population comprise 'Indian and other immigrant labourers'. Not included in the census returns were 2,765 'aliens and resident strangers' (625 Europeans, 521 Chinese, 1,619 Indians). See Table 22.

[3] Not included in these census returns were 990 non-Indian male immigrant labourers (579 from China, 164 from Madagascar, 234 from Comoro Islands, and 13 from the Coast of Africa) and the 'aliens and resident strangers' who in 1850 numbered 1,201 (577 Europeans, 624 Chinese). See Table 22.

[4] This is the figure for 1851 shown in each census report from 1861 on. But according to *Blue Book 1851*, pp. 202–3, the military population comprised 1,315 men and 209 women and children.

[5] The non-resident shipping population and the military residing out of barracks are included in the resident population. The latter are 'the Military who occupied private houses (comprising nearly all the officers and their families, and a large number of non-commissioned officers and their families)'; see *Census Report 1901*, p. 53.

[6] Military residing out of barracks (181 males and 3 females in 1911) are included in the resident population.

[7] The men on service and the non-resident shipping population were apparently not enumerated, but the military out of barracks may have been included in the resident population.

[8] 'Population in Barracks, exclusive of men on service.'

[9] The figures for the resident population include the Mauritius Regiment and members of the Royal Naval and Air Forces, but exclude the East African troops stationed on the Island at the time of the Census.

the time of the census would also have been abroad in peace time. I therefore think that 425,000 or 425,500 may be the appropriate figure for the population, excluding the military, if the effects of the war on the size of the military population inside and outside Mauritius are to be eliminated.[1]

It thus appears that the population, excluding the peace-time military, which in the first 25 years of British Administration had oscillated around 90,000, amounted in 1846 to 161,000 and in 1861 to 310,000. It may have been 365,000 at the outbreak of the malaria epidemic in 1867, but was only 316,000 in 1871 and oscillated between 1881 and 1921 around the 1867 figure. In 1931 it amounted to at least 392,000 and in 1944 to at least 425,000.

Intercensal changes were so great, particularly in 1851–71, that it seems necessary to give some details. The data for 31 December 1851 to 1860 may be summarized as follows:[2]

	General Population			*Indian immigrants*			*Total Population*		
Year	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1851	55,091	47,832	102,923	70,658	15,746	86,404	125,751	63,578	189,329
1852	55,144	48,321	103,465	80,727	19,478	100,205	135,871	67,799	203,670
1853	54,961	48,654	103,615	87,735	21,960	109,695	142,696	70,614	213,310
1854	51,612	46,305	97,917	96,142	25,131	121,273	147,754	71,436	219,190
1855	51,349	46,493	97,842	100,541	28,245	128,786	151,890	74,738	226,628
1856[1]	49,510	45,467	94,977	102,825	31,446	134,271	152,335	76,913	229,248
1857	49,779	46,050	95,829	107,072	35,462	142,534	156,851	81,512	238,363
1858	49,780	46,406	96,186	120,334	43,670	164,004	170,114	90,076	260,190
1859[2]	49,883	46,707	96,590	145,844	56,135	201,979	195,727	102,842	298,569
1860[3]	..	..	96,458	..	..	212,913	..	..	309,371

[1] *Blue Book 1856*, pp. 435–6, subdivided the General Population into 27,873 male and 26,374 female 'Whites' and 21,637 male and 19,093 female 'Coloured', i.e. ex-apprentices. It showed, furthermore, 1,245 male Military, 1,600 male Crews of Mercantile Shipping, 420 Aliens and Resident Strangers, and apart from the 134,271 Indians, 164 males from Madagascar, 250 males from the Coast of Africa, 204 males from the Comoro Islands, and 759 male Chinese.

[2] These figures, according to ibid., *1859*, Section P, p. 4, exclude 6,477 Aliens (96 Europeans, 6,381 Chinese).

[3] These figures, according to ibid. *1860* P, p. 4, exclude 1,684 Aliens (191 Europeans, 110 Indians, 1,383 Chinese).

The figures for the General Population were computed by adding to the 1851 census figures the excess of births over deaths, 'the arrivals and departures being considered to balance each other'.[3] The figures for the Indian population were computed by adding up the arrivals, departures, births, and deaths from 1834 onwards, no account being taken of the 1851 census returns for Indians.[4] The figures for the General Population, therefore, are far too low, while those for the Indian population are far too high.

[1] Since the effects on the numbers of women and children and of Indian and Chinese men are negligible I shall, in discussing the composition of the population, merely raise the 1944 figure for men of the General Population by 6,000.

[2] See for 1851–7 *Blue Book 1857*, p. 309; for 1858–9 *Statistical Tables*, Part vi, p. 367; for 1860 *Blue Book 1860*, Section P, p. 4.

[3] *Blue Book 1857*, p. 310.

[4] It is significant that Governor Stevenson in his Dispatch to Secretary of State Lytton, dated 26 Aug. 1858 (*State of Colonial Possessions 1857*, p. 166), wrote:

'The Census of 1851 divided the population under three heads:—the Indian, the ex-apprentice, and the general.

Meldrum, who took account of the annual arrivals and departures among the General Population, as recorded in the Department of the Port Office, computed the following totals for 31 December 1852–60:[1]

1852	*1853*	*1854*	*1855*	*1856*	*1857*	*1858*	*1859*	*1860*
199,158	208,800	212,482	220,238	223,736	234,153	257,736	297,267	309,901

Since arrivals among the General Population considerably exceeded departures[2] it might have been expected that Meldrum's totals would have been much higher than the official ones. That this was not the case is due to the fact that the death figures used in the official computations were in part very defective, while Meldrum obtained from the Registrar-General revised figures.

For the intercensal period 1861–71 the official figures are most chaotic. The Blue Books for 1861–7, starting from the population ascertained at the census of 8 April 1861 (310,050), computed the population as follows:[3]

	1861	*1862*	*1863*	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*
Natural increase .	−28	−4,395	−1,855	−1,753	−1,637	−1,280	−32,078
Net immigration .	10,027	7,681	1,774	4,162	16,638	1,781	12,411
Population 31 Dec.	320,049	323,335	323,254	325,663	340,664	341,165	321,498

The figures were computed by adding to the 1861 census figures the excess of births over deaths among the total population and the net immigration of Indian coolies and their families. No account was taken of the arrivals or departures of other persons. The population figure thus obtained for 1866 was undoubtedly too low. Governor Sir Henry Barkly, in a Dispatch to the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, dated 23 September 1867, wrote:

> The total resident population on 31st December last is estimated, on the basis of the census of 1861 and subsequent alterations recorded, at 341,165, but I am inclined to believe this to be lower than the reality, as the additions by immigration are confined to those from India returned by the Protector; whilst it will be seen, for example, from the return of aliens, that no less than 1,623 Chinese arrived at their own expense, and were registered by the police within the year.[4]

'The aggregate was then stated at 189,327. . . .
'The Indian was enumerated at 86,404. . . .
'The Ex-apprentice with their families was stated at 48,366. . . .
'And the general population was estimated at 54,557.'

He was not aware that he quoted census figures only for the Ex-apprentice and the General Population, but substituted for the census figure of 77,996 Indians the difference between the sum of Indian arrivals and births and the sum of Indian departures and deaths recorded from 1834 to 31 Dec. 1851.

[1] See Meldrum, p. 135.

[2] Meldrum's table suggests that the excess amounted in the nine years 1852–60 to 8,291. But his figures are difficult to interpret. He shows for 1860 18,289 arrivals and 5,587 departures. Since 13,286 Indian immigrants arrived, while 2,833 left, all other arrivals would have totalled 5,003 and all other departures 2,754. But as the number of Chinese Aliens registered at the Police declined during 1860 from 6,381 to 1,383 (see p. 780 above), the number of departures of Chinese alone must have been at least 5,000.

[3] See *Blue Book 1861*, Section P, p. 4; *1862* P, p. 3, to *1867 P*, p. 3.

[4] *State of Colonial Possessions 1866*, Part iii, p. 44.

Referring a year later to this Dispatch and to his opinion that the population was understated owing to incomplete recording of arrivals, he said:

This is fully proved by the figures given in the Appendix to the present Return, which show that, whilst the arrivals, exclusive of such immigrants, of the military and of shipping, from the 8th April 1861 to 31st December 1867, amounted to 30,903, the corresponding departures were only 15,727, leaving the aggregate population larger by 15,176 than it would have been reckoned at under the old system. The greater portion of these immigrants, at their own expense, no doubt settled in Port Louis and its immediate neighbourhood.[1]

Thereupon the population figures were revised in the following manner:[2]

	1861	*1862*	*1863*	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*
Natural increase .	505	−3,560	−1,198	−1,007	−853	−570	−30,886
Net immigration .	13,227	9,169	5,232	6,232	18,869	4,282	−2,537
Population 31 Dec.	323,782	329,391	333,425	338,650	356,666	360,378	326,955

These figures, however, were revised again in the following year. The results which were shown in the Blue Book for 1868 and subsequently brought up-to-date were as follows:[3]

	1861	*1862*	*1863*	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*	*1868*	*1869*	*1870*
Natural increase	1,043	−2,882	−497	−150	76	432	−29,546	−8,967	−1,316	3,731
Net immigration	13,227	9,169	5,232	6,232	18,869	4,282	−2,537	369	−162	1,978
Population 31 Dec.	324,320	330,607	335,342	341,424	360,369	365,083	333,000	324,402	322,924	328,633

TABLE 24. *Population of Mauritius. 8 April 1861 to 31 December 1870*[1]

Year	*General Population*			*Indian Population*			*Total Population*		*Grand total*
	Males[2]	*Females*[2]	*Total*	*Males*[2]	*Females*[2]	*Total*	*Males*[2]	*Females*[2]	
8 Apr. 1861	61,346	56,070	117,416	141,615	51,019	192,634	202,961	107,080	310,050
31 Dec. 1861	64,150	56,446	120,596	148,792	54,932	203,724	212,942	111,378	324,320
31 Dec. 1862	64,641	56,254	120,895	151,462	58,250	209,712	216,103	114,504	330,607
31 Dec. 1863	67,297	57,059	124,356	159,220	60,766	210,986	217,517	117,825	335,342
31 Dec. 1864	69,321	58,030	127,351	150,649	63,424	214,073	219,970	121,454	341,424
31 Dec. 1865	70,720	58,767	129,487	161,307	69,575	230,882	232,037	128,342	360,369
31 Dec. 1866	72,169	59,204	131,373	161,362	72,348	233,710	233,531	131,552	365,083
31 Dec. 1867	64,814	53,492	118,306	146,278	66,416	214,694	211,092	121,908	333,000
31 Dec. 1868	63,320	52,183	115,503	141,391	67,508	208,899	204,711	119,691	324,402
31 Dec. 1869	63,604	52,549	116,153	139,883	67,888	206,771	202,487	120,437	322,924
31 Dec. 1870	64,608	53,389	117,997	140,283	70,353	210,636	204,891	123,742	328,633

[1] See *Blue Book 1870* P, p. 2.

[2] 'The figures in these columns are only approximately correct, as the children of the General Population and of Indians (not Immigrants) arriving in or leaving the Colony, since the 8th April 1861, have not been classified with regard to sexes. The births of Males and Females during a long series of years, however, having been nearly in equal ratio, it has been considered that very nearly correct data are afforded, by dividing the number of the Arrivals and Departures in question into equal parts, and that thereby a reliable Return of the number of Males and Females in the Colony is established. The Totals and Grand Total in the Table are correct.'

But the census taken on 11 April 1871 showed a population of 316,042. Since the natural increase from 1 January to 10 April was 1,887, while departures exceeded arrivals by 592,[4] the computed population as of census date was 329,928, or 13,886 more than the actual population.

[1] Same to same, 11 Aug. 1868, ibid. *1867*, Part iii, pp. 22–3. [2] See ibid., p. 29.

[3] See *Blue Book 1870* P, pp. 2–4. The classification by sex and race is shown in Table 24.

[4] See Meidrum, p. 42.

Governor Gordon, in a Dispatch to the Earl of Kimberley, dated 21 August 1872, said:

I find it extremely difficult to give any satisfactory explanation of the numbers thus apparently unaccounted for, nor do any of the proposed solutions of this question commend themselves to me as worthy of attention.[1]

The Registrar-General, who likewise believed that the people 'apparently unaccounted for' at the census were actually not present, thereupon revised the intercensal estimates by adapting them to the census results and published the following population figures for 31 December 1861–70:[2]

1861	*1862*	*1863*	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*	*1868*	*1869*	*1870*
322,046	326,228	328,028	332,188	348,500	350,567	320,606	312,144	306,144	313,179

Meldrum, however, thought that the main reason for the discrepancy was incompleteness of the 1871 census and accepted the intercensal estimates for 1861–70 rejected by the Registrar-General.[3] It may well be, of course, that the population was understated in 1871.[4] But I see no reason to assume that the omissions at the 1871 census exceeded those at the 1861 census by as much as 13,886. I am inclined to think that the figures accepted by Meldrum were fairly adequate up to the end of 1866,[5] the population being then 365,000 rather than 350,000, but that the decline in 1867 and 1868 was much steeper owing to defective death registration during the malaria epidemic.[6]

For 1871–1910 the original intercensal estimates again tended to overstate the population, particularly for the last years of the nineteenth century,[7] but revised estimates were prepared with great care.

[1] *Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part ii, p. 38.

[2] See Meldrum, p. 41.

[3] See ibid., pp. 40–7.

[4] See p. 382 above. But see also Dispatch from Lieutenant-Governor Broome to the Earl of Kimberley, 26 Dec. 1881 (*Census Report 1881*, covering letter, p. 2): ' . . . the [1881] returns bear out in a remarkable degree the accuracy of the annual and quarterly vital statistics prepared in the Registrar General's Office. The month before the Census, the population had been estimated to within 1,054 souls of the number actually counted. This corroborates also the Census of 1871, which had been doubted, and on which the vital statistics of the past 10 years have been based.' The estimate mentioned by the Lieutenant-Governor referred to 31 Mar. 1871; see ibid., Report by the Census Commissioner, p. 10.

[5] I am speaking here only of the total population. The classification by sex and race was most defective all through. It may suffice to show the differences between the estimates for 31 Dec. 1870 and the census returns for 11 Apr. 1871:

	General Population			*Indian Population*			*Total Population*		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1870	64,608	53,389	117,997	140,283	70,353	210,636	204,891	123,742	328,633
1871	51,771	48,013	99,784	141,804	74,454	216,258	193,575	122,467	316,042

[6] See also the following statement of the Registrar General J. Kyshe: ' . . . from the number of late declarations of persons who died in the ever-to-be remembered Fever-Epidemic year of 1867 and who were buried without the formalities required by law having been gone through, my impression is that the number of deaths in 1867 was much nearer 50,000 than the number registered, viz: 40,114' (*Census Report 1881*, p. 10).

[7] The original estimates for 31 Dec. 1871–1910 are given in detail in *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, pp. cclii–cclv.

The official published returns of population during the intercensal periods have been seriously affected in past years by errors of registration. At one time the returns of arrivals included all persons entering the Port, whether they were passengers en route for another destination or persons remaining in the Colony; whereas the departures only included passengers from Mauritius who had duly paid their passage money in the Colony. The population during the intercensal years was in consequence greatly over-estimated.

During the periods 1901–1910 the returns were fairly correct so far as foreign ports are concerned but the arrivals from the Dependencies were still erroneous as no account had been taken of the discharge and engagement of crews on board the various vessels calling at Port Louis.

It is hardly necessary to emphasise the fact that correct population statistics form the basis of all administrative work and it has been thought advantageous to re-establish the intercensal population returns.

With this end in view the returns as published were plotted on squared paper and the yearly registration errors assumed to be constant during any given intercensal period. Making due allowance for these errors a continuous curve was drawn for each class and sex, passing through the points obtained from the Census returns. The ordinates of this curve were then read off to the nearest hundred of population and the results are shown in the accompanying table.[1] The values refer to the middle of the year (June 30th) up to the year 1910 and not to the beginning of the year as in the official returns.[2]

No revised data have been published for subsequent years. Table 26 shows the official figures for 1911–46, computed by adding to the returns of the last preceding census the recorded births and arrivals and deducting the recorded deaths and departures.

It appears that the population was considerably understated in the years preceding the 1921 census. The Registrar-General made the following comment:[3]

The total population of the Island on the 20th May 1921, date of the taking of the Census, was estimated at 365,375, indicating a decennial decrease of 5,018. According to the Census returns however the population, at that date, numbered 376,680,[4] showing an increase of 6,287 on the previous Census Enumeration in 1911.[5]

The comparatively large difference between the estimated and censused population viz. 11,305, cannot be easily explained.[6] The 1911 Census showed that the total population on the 31st March 1911 numbered 370,393; the excess of deaths and departures over births and arrivals from the 1st of April 1911 to the 20th May 1921 —date of the new Census—numbered 5,018, and the total population was consequently estimated at 365,375.

[1] The results for 1871–1910 are reproduced in Table 25.

[2] *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, p. 5.

[3] *Report of the Registrar General 1921*, p. 1.

[4] The total population was given in *Mauritius Almanac 1922*, Section E, p. 40, as 376,680 (including 206 military in barracks). The final census result was 376,091.

[5] Leaving out of consideration the military in barracks, the increase was 7,694.

[6] See also *Preliminary Report on the Census of 1921*, p. 2: 'Possible causes are (*a*) the double registration of deaths, (*b*) the non-registration of births. The former may arise from declaration in two districts, when a person lives in one and dies and is buried in another. . . . Such double registration cannot, however, I imagine, be frequent. The non-registration of births is a more fruitful source of error and in many instances, even in the case of members of the Civil Service, children reach advanced age without registration and many are not registered until their death.' There are, of course, some other 'possible causes', for example, defective migration records, and the fact that in the 1920s the population was much *overestimated* weakens the Census Commissioner's argument that the wrong estimates preceding the 1921 census were due to double registration of deaths and non-registration of births.

TABLE 25. *Estimated Population of Mauritius, 1871–1910*[1]

30 June	Total Population			Indian Population			General Population		
	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Total
1871	193,500	122,700	316,200	141,800	74,600	216,400	51,700	48,100	99,800
1872	196,100	126,000	322,100	143,300	77,200	220,500	52,800	48,800	101,600
1873	199,800	129,200	329,000	146,100	80,100	226,200	53,700	49,100	102,800
1874	202,000	132,400	334,400	148,900	83,300	232,200	53,100	49,100	102,200
1875	204,800	135,200	340,000	150,800	85,400	236,200	54,000	49,800	103,800
1876	206,600	137,500	344,100	150,800	86,900	237,700	55,800	50,600	106,400
1877	205,800	139,900	345,700	149,800	88,700	238,500	56,000	51,200	107,200
1878	207,200	143,300	350,500	151,000	91,400	242,400	56,200	51,900	108,100
1879	208,400	146,000	354,400	151,800	93,400	245,200	56,600	52,600	109,200
1880	208,600	148,700	357,300	151,700	95,500	247,200	56,900	53,200	110,100
1881	208,000	151,300	359,300	150,600	97,600	248,200	57,400	53,700	111,100
1882	206,100	152,400	358,500	148,600	98,300	246,900	57,500	54,100	111,600
1883	204,900	153,300	358,200	147,000	99,000	246,000	57,900	54,300	112,200
1884	207,200	155,800	363,000	148,100	101,000	249,100	59,100	54,800	113,900
1885	208,600	157,900	366,500	148,500	102,300	250,800	60,100	55,600	115,700
1886	206,100	158,200	364,300	146,600	102,800	249,400	59,500	55,400	114,900
1887	204,000	159,100	363,100	145,800	103,900	249,700	58,200	55,200	113,400
1888	202,900	160,100	363,000	144,700	104,500	249,200	58,200	55,600	113,800
1889	202,800	161,500	364,300	144,500	105,600	250,100	58,300	55,900	114,200
1890	204,300	163,200	367,500	146,100	107,200	253,300	58,200	56,000	114,200
1891	206,200	164,900	371,100	147,500	108,800	256,300	58,700	56,100	114,800
1892	206,400	166,900	373,300	147,800	110,500	258,300	58,600	56,400	115,000
1893	203,300	166,900	370,200	145,100	110,700	255,800	58,200	56,200	114,400
1894	202,200	166,800	369,000	144,000	110,800	254,800	58,200	56,000	114,200
1895	203,100	168,900	372,000	144,900	112,600	257,500	58,200	56,300	114,500
1896	201,700	168,300	370,000	144,100	112,400	256,500	57,600	55,900	113,500
1897	200,300	168,100	368,400	143,200	112,300	255,500	57,100	55,800	112,900
1898	200,300	168,800	369,100	142,800	113,200	256,000	57,500	55,600	113,100
1899	199,100	169,500	368,600	142,100	113,900	256,000	57,000	55,600	112,600
1900	198,900	170,600	369,500	142,000	115,000	257,000	56,900	55,600	112,500
1901	199,700	171,400	371,100	143,700	116,000	259,700	56,000	55,400	111,400
1902	201,200	172,100	373,300	145,200	117,100	262,300	56,000	55,000	111,000
1903	200,700	172,800	373,500	144,400	117,900	262,300	56,300	54,900	111,200
1904	200,600	173,500	374,100	144,400	118,400	262,800	56,200	55,100	111,300
1905	200,800	174,900	375,700	145,500	119,500	264,000	56,300	55,400	111,700
1906	198,600	174,400	373,000	143,000	119,000	262,000	55,600	55,400	111,000
1907	197,800	174,500	372,300	142,600	119,000	261,600	55,200	55,500	110,700
1908	196,500	174,700	371,200	141,900	119,200	261,100	54,600	55,500	110,100
1909	194,600	173,900	368,500	140,100	118,600	258,700	54,500	55,300	109,800
1910	193,900	174,000	367,900	139,100	118,600	257,700	54,800	55,400	110,200

[1] See *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, p. 6; reprinted in *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, p. celvi.

TABLE 26. *Population of Mauritius, 1911–45*[1]

31 Dec.	*Total population*			*Indian population*			*General population*		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1911	196,550	175,724	372,274	139,235	119,306	258,541	57,315	56,418	113,733
1912	196,603	175,143	371,746	138,722	119,009	257,731	57,881	56,134	114,015
1913	196,979	176,206	373,185	139,155	119,682	258,837	57,824	56,524	114,348
1914	196,371	177,862	376,233	140,607	120,965	261,572	57,764	56,897	114,661
1915	197,696	177,722	375,420	140,054	120,828	260,882	57,644	56,894	114,538
1916	198,057	178,598	376,655	139,951	121,335	261,286	58,106	57,263	115,369
1917	197,384	179,702	377,086	140,018	122,201	262,219	57,366	57,501	114,867
1918	196,674	180,139	376,813	139,919	122,698	262,617	56,755	57,441	114,196
1919	189,184	175,309	364,493	134,995	119,623	254,618	54,189	55,686	109,875
1920	189,383	175,724	365,107	135,153	120,154	255,307	54,230	55,570	109,800
1920[2]	194,447	181,976	376,423	139,217	126,039	265,256	55,230	55,937	111,167
1921	194,488	181,826	376,314	138,564	125,963	264,527	55,924	55,863	111,787
1922	194,834	182,760	377,594	138,365	126,363	264,728	56,469	56,397	112,866
1923	196,930	184,748	381,678	139,812	127,548	267,360	57,118	57,200	114,318
1924	200,177	187,566	387,743	141,622	129,336	270,958	58,555	58,230	116,785
1925	203,002	190,706	393,708	143,140	131,335	274,475	59,862	59,371	119,233
1926	204,914	193,322	398,236	144,531	133,202	277,733	60,383	60,120	120,503
1927	206,673	195,020	401,693	145,304	134,217	279,521	61,369	60,803	122,172
1928	207,963	196,819	404,802	145,848	135,177	281,025	62,135	61,642	123,777
1929	208,107	197,442	405,549	145,547	135,451	280,998	62,560	61,991	124,551
1930	207,521	196,937	404,458	144,510	134,633	279,143	63,011	62,304	125,315
1930[3]	201,787	193,573	395,360	140,247	129,938	270,185	61,540	63,635	125,175
1931	199,330	191,714	391,044	137,883	127,913	265,796	61,447	63,801	125,248
1932	197,497	190,903	388,400	135,718	126,710	262,428	61,779	64,193	125,972
1933	196,357	192,340	390,697	136,162	127,409	263,571	62,195	64,931	127,126
1934	199,709	194,024	393,733	137,027	128,402	265,429	62,682	65,622	128,304
1935	201,089	195,178	396,267	137,574	128,971	266,545	63,515	66,207	129,722
1936	202,871	197,007	399,878	138,339	129,872	268,211	64,532	67,135	131,667
1937	203,842	198,229	402,071	138,889	130,440	269,329	64,953	67,789	132,742
1938	204,524	199,194	403,718	138,908	130,638	269,546	65,616	68,556	134,172
1939	206,177	200,738	406,915	139,937	131,424	271,361	66,240	69,314	135,554
1940	206,663	201,691	408,354	140,047	131,623	271,670	66,616	70,068	136,684
1941	205,289	203,103	408,392	..	..	272,946	..	..	135,446
1942	205,551	203,990	409,541	140,396	132,810	273,206	65,155	71,180	136,335
1943	206,901	205,919	412,820	141,202	134,025	275,227	65,699	71,894	137,593
1943[2]	209,138	207,604	416,742	135,302	127,742	263,044	73,836	79,862	153,698
1944	212,115	211,511	423,626	137,808	131,019	268,827	74,307	80,492	154,799
1945	212,304	212,149	424,453	137,719	131,465	269,184	74,585	80,684	155,269
1946	214,335	213,938	428,273	138,886	132,750	271,636	75,449	81,188	156,637

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, pp. cclii–cclv; *Report of Registrar General 1921*, p. 1, *1946*, p. 1, *1946*, p. 1; *Mauritius Almanac 1923–4*, Section E, p. 161, *1929–30* E, p. 2, *1931–2* E, p. 2, *1932–3* E, p. 21, *1933–4* E, p. 21, *1934–5* E, p. 2, *1936–7* E, p. 2, *1938–9* E, p. 2, *1939–41* E, p. 2; *Blue Book 1940*, Section N, p. 1, *1942* N, pp. 1–2, *1943* N, p. 1, *1944* N, p. 1.

[2] I have derived these figures from the subsequent census returns.

The General Population had been underestimated by 1,367, and the Indian Population by 9,949. The actual population on 30 June 1911–20 may be roughly estimated as follows:

Population	*1911*	*1912*	*1913*	*1914*	*1915*	*1916*	*1917*	*1918*	*1919*	*1920*
General	112,000	114,000	114,500	115,000	115,200	115,700	116,000	115,500	113,500	111,100
Indian	258,200	259,400	260,600	263,500	265,500	266,400	268,100	269,800	266,800	264,400
Total	370,200	373,400	375,100	378,500	380,700	382,100	384,100	385,300	380,300	375,500

In the years preceding the 1931 census the population was considerably overstated. The original estimate for 31 December 1930 exceeded the figure derived from the census returns by 9,108. The difference for the General Population was 146 and for the Indian Population 8,962. That the enumerated Indian Population was so much lower than the computed Indian Population was mainly due to the fact that many Indians who had been counted as such in 1921 were included in the General Population in 1931.[1]

In the years preceding the 1944 census the population was understated. It was computed for 31 December 1943 at 412,820, while the figure derived from the 1944 census returns was 416,742. But the census returns excluded the Mauritians who were in the forces abroad, and the computed population was actually by about 10,000 too low. This time the computation of the General Population was especially wide of the mark. While the Indian Population was overstated by about 12,000, the General Population was understated by about 22,000. That the enumerated Indian Population was again so much lower than the computed population was due to the same cause as in 1931, and the underestimate of the females among the General Population was largely due to the gradual absorption of Indians into the General Population. But I find it difficult to explain in the same manner the underestimate of the males which, taking account of war conditions, was enormous.

Since 1921 the official intercensal population figures have become so uncertain that I find it impossible to revise them adequately.

Mauritius is very densely settled. The area is only 720 square miles, and there are nearly 600 inhabitants to the square mile. Meldrum was probably right when he said in 1881 that Mauritius was 'the most densely populated country, of the same or greater area, in the world'.[2] This, however, is no longer true to-day.

The population of the capital which in 1846 numbered 48,000 was estimated 20 years later at 87,600.[3] It then declined very much during

[1] See p. 806 below.

[2] Meldrum, p. v. In the same year Lieutenant-Governor Broome wrote in his covering letter to *Census Report 1881* (p. 2): 'It is not in the least extraordinary or alarming that this rich and busy island should be so thickly peopled. The wide difference between the sister-islands of Mauritius and Reunion appears from the fact that the latter only sustains 176 inhabitants where we support 508. I look upon Mauritius as a large manufacturing town; and, if Bermuda and Barbadoes are in no extremity with their much heavier burdens of 726 and 976 people to the square mile, I do not see why we need be in any immediate apprehension.'

[3] See Davidson, *Geographical Pathology*, vol. ii, p. 747. Governor Barkly in his Dispatch to Secretary of State Cardwell, 26 July 1866 (*State of Colonial Possessions 1865*, Part i, p. 110), put the population at 80,000. In his Dispatch to the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, 11 Aug.

the malaria epidemic and was never again as large as before that catastrophe.[1] In 1891 it still numbered 62,000, but after the hurricane of 1892 many well-to-do people left the town.[2] In the following three or four decades the population hardly exceeded 50,000, but it amounted to 66,000 in 1944. The Indian Population was probably never greater than it is to-day, but the General Population is still much smaller than 80 years ago.

TABLE 27. *Civil Population of Port Louis, 1846–1944*[1]

Year	*General Population*			*Indian Population*			*Total Population*		
	Males	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1846[3]	20,798	18,283	39,081	5,664	467	6,131	26,462	18,750	45,212
1851[3]	20,259	18,827	39,086	8,989	1,834	10,823	29,248	20,661	49,909
1861	25,262	21,699	46,961	20,621	6,943	27,564	45,883	28,642	74,525
1871	18,416	17,906	36,322	17,848	9,104	26,952	36,264	27,010	63,274
1881	20,033	19,208	39,241	17,098	10,313	27,411	37,131	29,521	66,652
1891	18,590	18,520	37,110	14,431	10,628	25,059	33,021	29,148	62,169
1901[4]	16,009	15,764	31,773	11,721	9,246	20,967	27,730	25,010	52,740
1911	14,709	14,924	29,633	10,998	9,429	20,427	25,707	24,353	50,060
1921	14,020	13,851	27,871	11,639	10,797	22,436	25,659	24,648	50,307
1931	14,781	15,051	29,832	12,692	11,911	24,603	27,473	26,962	54,435
1944	17,917	19,100	37,017	14,930	14,015	28,945	32,847[5]	33,115	65,962

[1] See *Census Report 1901*, pp. 59–61; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, p. iv; *1921*, Appendixes, p. i; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, p. 3. Figures exclude the shipping population not belonging to the Colony.

[2] The figures for the Indian Population comprise 'Indian and other immigrant labourers'. Not included in the census returns were 2,555 'aliens and resident strangers'. See Table 22.

[3] Not included in these census returns were 603 non-Indian male immigrant labourers (470 from China, 80 from Madagascar, 40 from Comoro Islands, and 13 from the Coast of Africa) and the 'aliens and resident strangers', who in 1849 numbered 1,065 (479 Europeans, 586 Chinese). See Table 22.

[4] Including 497 Foreign Shipping.

[5] Including 826 soldiers present on census date; see *Census Report 1944*, pp. 65–9.

III. IMMIGRATION

A brief survey of immigration will facilitate the understanding of the changes in the composition of the population of Mauritius.

Whites. Until the last quarter of the eighteenth century immigration of Europeans was very small, and many of those who came did not stay for good. When in 1767 the French King assumed the Administration,

1868 (ibid. *1867*, Part iii, p. 32) he estimated it for 1 Jan. 1867 at 100,000, including the garrison and shipping. This was probably an overstatement.

[1] A large exodus, estimated at 10,000, occurred during the cholera epidemic of 1854, many seeking refuge in Curepipe (see *Report of Committee on Cholera Epidemic of 1854*, p. 3; Toussaint, pp. 357, 386). But a lasting evacuation did not take place until 1866 when a considerable proportion of the inhabitants took their permanent residence in Curepipe. 'This was for Port Louis the beginning of the end' (ibid., p. 366). The exodus to Curepipe continued after the epidemic had subsided. By 1889 the new town had 12,000 inhabitants and according to the census of 1944 27,468 (see ibid., pp. 386–7; *Census Report 1944*, p. 34). Curepipe is much cooler and much healthier than Port Louis, but it is among the places of the world with the heaviest rainfalls, and Mark Twain called it 'the nastiest spot on earth' (Toussaint, pp. 388–9). The yearly rainfall at Camp Curepipe was given by Fowler, *Malarial Investigations in Mauritius*, p. 8, as 140 inches.

[2] See ibid., p. 12: '. . . the hurricane of 1892 . . . practically swept away the whole of the good houses around the foot of the hills on the eastern side. Naturally the people who lost their houses preferred to rebuild them up country.' Twelve of the 49 sections of the capital lost more than one-third of their population between 1891 and 1901; see *Census Report 1901*, pp. 41–2.

his Commissary Poivre found there 2,302 Whites, and he told the inhabitants that 'the Government has viewed with indignation the recent emigration of a multitude of planters who have carried away enormous fortunes to France'.[1] But thirty years later the Whites numbered 6,237.

> The colony developed following the War of Independence .... A genuine emigration from Europe and above all from the Antilles took place; on the other hand, the inhabitants who felt sheltered from the thunderstorms of the Revolution were no longer anxious, as formerly, to return to France.[2]

No further European immigration of any size occurred in more recent times (apart from the influx of refugees in 1940). The last census at which the number of Whites was ascertained was that of 1 January 1830 when 8,135 were counted. Leclezio, in 1914, estimated them 'at about 10,000 persons (excluding the military)'.[3]

Africans. Importation of negroes was small prior to the arrival of La Bourdonnais (1735), but he brought within four years 2,615 slaves to the island, mainly from Mozambique and Madagascar, and by 1767 the number of slaves had reached 15,027. Since mortality was very high, and since the birth-rate, owing to the great preponderance of males, must have been fairly low, it is safe to assume that more than 20,000 slaves were landed in the island between 1735 and 1767. But importation of slaves was much larger still in the following decades. D'Unienville gives the following figures for 1767–1810:[4]

Years	*Yearly number*	*Years*	*Yearly number*	*Years*	*Yearly number*	*Years*	*Yearly number*
1767–9	1,100	1783	1,300	1795	600	1804	1,800
1770–5	1,200	1784	2,200	1796	1,000	1805	1,500
1776	800	1785–8	1,500	1797	1,300	1806–7	1,300
1777	700	1789	2,100	1798–9	1,500	1808–9	1,100
1778	600	1790–2	3,000	1800–1	1,800	1810	600
1779–81	500	1793	3,200	1802	2,400		
1782	600	1794	1,500	1803	3,000		

D'Unienville makes the following comment:

> The importation from 1767 to 1811 is based on data from some merchants who carried on this trade.[5] It varied much according to circumstances.[6]

Changes in legislation do not seem to have affected essentially importations under the French régime. On 4 February 1794 the National Convention of France abolished slavery in all French Colonies,[7] and on 19

[1] Poivre, *Œuvres complettes*, p. 208.

[2] Prentout, p. 649. See also footnote 2 to p. 761 above.

[3] *Mauritius Illustrated*, p. 139.

[4] See C.O. 172, vol. xlii, pp. 33–4. In D'Unienville's book published after his death (vol. iv, Table 44), the figures are the same as in the following table for 1790–2, 1795, 1803, and 1810; they are lower by 100 for 1767–75, 1777–83, 1785–9, 1796–7, and 1805–9, by 200 for 1776, 1784, 1793, 1799, and 1804, by 300 for 1794, 1798, and 1800–1, and by 400 for 1802. The figures in his manuscript total 63,600, those in the printed edition 58,200.

[5] It seems, however, that for some years more accurate figures are available. According to a letter from the Comptroller of the Customs, reproduced in *Mémoire pour les Habitans de l'Ile Maurice par un Colon* (1836), pp. 63–4, the imported slaves numbered 3,343 in 1803, 2,949 in 1804, 1,255 in 1806, and 1,561 in 1807.

[6] C.O. 172, vol. xlii, p. 25.

[7] Decree of 16 Pluviose Year II, Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 283.

September the Colonial Assembly proclaimed the abolition of the slave-trade;[1] but the decree of the National Convention was completely ignored in the Isle of France,[2] and the decree of the Colonial Assembly was never seriously enforced. Moreover, the Colonial Assembly on 20 June 1802 passed a decree 'authorizing the slave-trade and enacting measures for the purpose of encouraging the introduction of blacks into the Colony'[3]—a decree which, I suspect, was passed before it was known in the Island that Bonaparte on 20 May had re-established slavery and slave-trade in the French Colonies 'conformably to the laws and regulations prevailing prior to 1789'.[4]

When the British in December 1810 conquered the island they guaranteed to the inhabitants the preservation of their religion, laws, and customs,[5] and Governor Farquhar was inclined to believe that this pledge implied the preservation of the laws concerning the slave-trade. As early as 8 January 1811 he wrote to the Earl of Liverpool:

> I am not prepared to enter so fully as it will be necessary into the state of the Slave Trade at these islands; there is a great deficiency of labourers in consequence of the strict blockade of these islands, which was kept up during the last few years, so that unless some means be speedily devised for supplying these colonies with hands, they cannot continue in cultivation, but must become deserts.[6]

In a dispatch of 15 February 1811 he discussed this subject more fully:

> Various causes, such as interruptions by the blockade and our cruizers, to the Madagascar and Mozambique Slave Trade from these islands, and epidemic distempers following a state bordering on famine, which swept off numbers of the blacks within the period of some years past, have increased the prices of slaves and labour, have contributed to stop the progress of extended cultivation and revenue, have compelled many proprietors to leave manufactures at a stand, and lands to run to waste, and to become totally unproductive; so that, without a fresh importation of slaves, and even not reckoning any disastrous visitation in future, these islands, as I am given to understand and have been led to believe, cannot continue in cultivation and produce, but must become deserts.
>
> I believe it has generally been agreed, that a British Act of Parliament does not extend to a colony, unless that colony be specially mentioned, either by name or general inclusive words; and that an Act made previously to the acquisition of a colony, and which therefore it could not be in the contemplation of the legislature to bind at the time of passing the Act, will not, generally speaking, bind the colony acquired subsequently to the making of the Act.
>
> Besides those general positions, my instructions were to grant these islands, on capitulation, their laws, customs and usages; they have been granted in express terms by the capitulations. Those laws, customs and usages, recognise not only slavery, but the Slave Trade; without that trade, or some other substitute or remedy, these colonies promise shortly to be annihilated; and the inhabitants are likely to be rendered desperate, if the supply of slaves be refused them.

[1] Decree of 3rd Supplementary Day, Year II; see Bonnefoy, p. 442.

[2] See D'Unienville, vol. ii, pp. 198-200.

[3] Decree of 1 Messidor Year X. See Bonnefoy, p. 442; Rouillard, vol. i, p. 793.

[4] Act of 30 Floreal; see Saint Elme Le Duc, p. 450. See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), p. 9: 'Under the French Government, the slave trade was permitted and carried on to the fullest extent at Mauritius. The law of the Revolutionary Legislature abolishing slavery was never recorded, or in any way put in force, so that the decree of Buonaparte, as first consul, re-establishing slavery, was not required to revive what had never been discontinued.'

[5] See p. 713 above.

[6] *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 5.

Another point occurs worthy particular notice, which is, that notwithstanding the British Slave Act, His Majesty was, I understand, pleased to suffer and sanction the Slave Trade, upon a modified scale, to be continued for the island of Trinidad, or some places in the West Indies.

As these matters press for a most speedy decision, I beg leave to request your instructions on the subject generally, with all convenient expedition.[1]

On 2 May 1811 the Earl of Liverpool answered:

It would be improper . . . for me to lose even a single day, in taking notice of that part of your dispatch which respects the Slave Trade.

I cannot sufficiently express my surprise that you should have supposed it possible that when the Parliament of the United Kingdom had thought proper, upon general principles, to abolish the Slave Trade with respect to all the ancient colonies and established settlements of Great Britain, it could have been in their contemplation that this trade should be suffered to exist with respect to those islands or foreign possessions which the fortune of war might place under His Majesty's dominion. You have been entirely misinformed as to the fact that there is any foreign colony in His Majesty's possession, in which the Slave Trade has been tolerated since the abolition of that trade by Parliament; and I should have thought that it would have occurred to you, that such a distinction would have been not only in direct repugnance to the principles upon which the slave trade was abolished, but that it would likewise have been inconsistent with every consideration which was due to the ancient colonies of the British crown.[2]

The planters, of course, were 'inimical to the suppression of the Slave Trade',[3] and there was some clandestine importation of slaves for ten years more.[4] There was, moreover, at times some legal importation of slaves from Madagascar and the Seychelles.[5]

[1] Ibid., p. 6. See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), p. 10: 'The Acts of the 46th and 47th Geo. 3, commonly called the "Abolition Acts", do not appear to have been registered in the courts of the colony, or to have been published in the Gazette; and the inhabitants of both islands seem to have considered that the omission of the first form exempted them from the operation of the law. Their opinion, that the terms of the capitulation by which their laws were preserved has secured to them the right of continuing the slave trade, received, in some degree, the support of Governor Farquhar; and the observations contained in his dispatch, dated 15th February 1811, imply that the inhabitants had begun to consider of the means of rendering the labour of their slaves more profitable, and of increasing their stock.'

[2] *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 7. Twelve days later there was issued 'An act for rendering more effectual an act made in the forty seventh year of His Majesty's reign, intituled: An act for the abolition of the Slave trade', which explicitly prohibited the slave-trade 'within this United Kingdom, or in any of the Islands, colonies, dominions, forts, settlements, factories now or hereafter belonging thereto, or being in His Majesty's occupation or possession . . .' (reprinted in *Code Farquhar*, pp. 58–61, No. 112).

[3] See Dispatch from Governor Farquhar to the Earl of Liverpool, 28 July 1812, *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 21.

[4] See, for example, Dispatches from Earl Bathurst to Governor Farquhar, 31 May 1814, 1 Apr. and 2 June 1817; to Major-General Hall, 5 June 1818; to Major-General Darling, 20 July and 30 Oct. 1819 (C.O. 168, vol. iii, pp. 15–21, 134–7, 145–7, 182–90, 259–63, 294–301); *Three Years Administration* (C.O. 172, vol. xxxviii, *passim*); *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), *passim*; *Recueil des Lois 1819*, pp. 33–5, 46–9, 53–5, *1820*, p. 86, *1821*, pp. 30–1, 34–7, 39–40, 48–9, 80–2, *1822*, pp. 7–8, 42, 104–5, *1824*, pp. 246–7, *1825*, p. 223; Letter from Assistant Commissioners of Compensation, Port Louis, 28 Nov. 1835, reproduced in *Mémoire pour les Habitans de l'Ile Maurice par un Colon*, pp. 166–77; Pridham (1846), pp. 154–60; Toussaint, *Missions d'Adrien d'Epinay* (1946), pp. xii–xiii, 132, 195–6. The Registrar of Slaves, Mylius, estimated that of the 66,913 slaves registered at the census of 1826, 3,384 had been illegally introduced; see *Mémoire par un Colon*, pp. 42, 167.

[5] According to a 'Return of Slaves licensed to be transferred from Madagascar to Mauritius under the Provisions of the Capitulation of Tamatave between September 1811 and April 1812' (Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 35), 650 slaves

When on 31 March 1839 compulsory labour of apprentices (former slaves) was abolished and about 30,000 African labourers 'employed in the production of the sugar-cane, and the manufacture of the sugar' were 'released from all restraint',[1] Governor Sir William Nicolay was 'earnestly solicited by several of the inhabitants to permit the introduction of labourers from Madagascar'. He refused to admit such labourers from a foreign country,[2] but Governor Sir Lionel Smith admitted some in 1840 and reported on 7 July 1841 that 'the number in the island is now stated to be about 650', and that 'in the beginning of the year 202 labourers were introduced from the Comoro Islands'.[3] On 14 August he wrote that 'men from Madagascar continue to come in small numbers, and from different ports upon the east coast'.[4] According to the Population Return of 30 September there were in Mauritius 1,293 male 'Labourers, Natives of Madagascar and adjacant Islands', and at the end of 1842, 2,609. But in 1843 and 1844 departures evidently exceeded arrivals, the numbers present dropping to 1,222 and 151 respectively. On 1 November 1844 there was issued an Ordinance 'for encouraging the Immigration of free labourers from Africa.'[5] However, the influx remained slight.[6] The

were thus transferred. According to a 'Return of the number of Slaves for the transfer of whom Certificates by the Collector of Customs, and Licences by the Governor have been granted from 1818 to 1827' (*ibid.*, No. 11), the number of slaves thus transferred 'to Mauritius from its Dependencies and from Madagascar, from the 10th of July 1818 (the earliest date of any Record extant in the Custom House, relative to the importation of Slaves)' to 26 Nov. 1827 was 3,558 (3,469 from the Seychelles, 61 from the minor Dependencies, and 28 from Madagascar). According to a 'Return of the number of Slaves transferred from Mauritius to the Dependant Islands and other Places, in each year, from 20th May 1818 (the earliest period of any Record extant in the Custom House of Port Louis relative to the embarkation of Slaves) to the 30th November 1827' (ibid., No. 12), the number thus transferred was 1,133 (245 to the Seychelles, 363 to the minor Dependencies, 346 to Bourbon, 35 to Madagascar, and 144 to other countries). See also Enclosures Nos. 1 and 2 to Letter from Governor Farquhar to the Earl Bathurst, 7 Nov. 1822, *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c. and Mauritius*, pp. 123–4; Enclosure No. 8 to Dispatch from Lieutenant-General Cole to the Earl Bathurst, 4 June 1826, *Correspondence respecting the Slave Trade, received from the Governor of the Mauritius* (1827), p. 20.

Between 16 Oct. 1826 and 31 Dec. 1829 the number of slaves introduced from the Seychelles was 1,424 and the number introduced from minor Dependencies 63, while only 11 were transferred to the Seychelles and minor Dependencies (see *Mémoire par un Colon*, p. 208). The importations occurred practically all before 1828. When abuses took place in the transfer of slaves from the Seychelles, the Governor abstained from granting any more licences (see Government Notices of 3 Jan. and 17 Mar. 1828, English text *Recueil des Lois 1828*, pp. 2, 66).

The above statistics do not include Mariners. According to a 'Return of Slaves employed as Mariners, who have arrived at, and departed from Mauritius in Colonial vessels from the 12th February 1819 to the 30th November 1827' (*Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 14), there arrived in that period 6,088, while 6,913 departed.

[1] Letter from Superintending Special Justice C. Anderson to Lord John Russell, 1 May 1840, *Correspondence relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers into the Mauritius* (1840), p. 195.

[2] See his Dispatches to Lord Glenelg, 4 and 21 May 1839, *Despatches from Sir William Nicolay on Free Labour in the Mauritius* (1840), pp. 5–6.

[3] Dispatch to Lord John Russell, *Correspondence relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers into the Mauritius* (1842), p. 3. But see also Government Notice of 29 Jan. 1841 (English text *Recueil des Lois 1841*, p. 8), which interrupted the introduction of labourers from Madagascar, the Comoro Islands, and the coast of Africa.

[4] *Correspondence relative to Indian Labourers* (1842), p. 4.

[5] No. 59 of 1844, English text *Recueil des Lois 1844*, pp. 79–82.

[6] See, for example, Dispatch from Governor Higginson to Earl Grey, 13 May 1852: 'From Madagascar and the coast of Africa only seventy-three men and eleven women have been received' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1851*, Part i, p. 247; see also ibid., p. 252).

census of 1851 showed 164 immigrant labourers from Madagascar, 234 from the Comoro Islands, and 19 from the coast of Africa.[1]

During the last hundred years net immigration of Africans evidently has been small. This, it is true, is not borne out by the statistics of arrivals and departures among the General Population. But these records are not trustworthy, and the census returns show very small figures for persons born in Africa excluding Mauritius.

Indians. There were three classes which came to the Colony in the course of time: (*a*) slaves, (*b*) free persons, and (*c*) convicts.

(*a*) Indians had been brought as slaves to the Isle Bourbon before the French occupied Mauritius,[2] and such slaves were introduced into the latter island shortly after it was taken possession of by the French.[3] The number of Indian slaves in 1767 has been estimated at 1,000.[4] Poivre, who arrived in that year, wanted to import several thousands more.[5] In 1806 the Indian slaves numbered 6,162.[6] Twenty years later there were only 2,590 (including 239 Malays).[7] How many had been emancipated and were included in the Free Coloured Population it is impossible to tell.

(*b*) Free persons. It is usually stated that Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, in 1769, was the first to mention the presence of free Indians in the Isle of France.[8] But it seems likely that La Bourdonnais had already introduced free Indian labourers. In his report for the years 1735–40 he relates that as Europeans were a very expensive labour in the shipyards he got Lascars, sent the Europeans back, and as soon as he obtained Kaffirs discharged (*j'ai réformé*) a portion of the Lascars.[9] However, the number of free Indians remained small for a long time. In 1767 the total free coloured population, including emancipated African slaves, amounted to only about 500.[10] But from then on this number increased steadily, and much more so than can be accounted for by natural increase and manumissions. 'Indian immigration was so brisk at the end of the eighteenth century that under the Revolution the Administration even had to take measures to restrict it.'[11] In the first third of the nineteenth century immigration was apparently negligible, and the number of free Indians increased mainly through emancipation. Stirling, in 1827, estimated their number at 750.[12] But in 1839 the inhabitants declared 'That some thousand natives of India, and their descendants, have been settled here for very many years, as planters, shop-keepers, clerks, and artisans, so that the native languages of India are here all perfectly well understood, and fluently spoken, not only by the domiciliated or Creole Indians, but by a great number of

[1] See Tables 21 and 22.

[2] See Guët, p. 232.

[3] See Crepin, p. 64: 'Dumas [Governor of the Isle of France] went himself to Pondicherry in October 1728. . . . 180 slaves of 8 to 18 years and 95 workers were procured for him.' See also p. 753 above. La Bourdonnais imported likewise Indian slaves; see Billiard, p. 266.

[4] See p. 758 above.

[5] See Castonnet des Fosses, p. 45.

[6] See Table 7 above.

[7] See Table 16 above.

[8] See p. 758 above.

[9] See Margry, p. 366.

[10] See p. 758 above.

[11] Toussaint, *Port-Louis*, p. 267.

[12] See Stirling, p. 26. According to D'Unienville, vol. iii, p. 249, there were, on 1 Jan. 1830, 858 resident Indians and Chinese in Mauritius (the Chinese apparently numbering 69, see p. 798 below).

European residents'.[1] In the following decades there was a considerable influx of Indian settlers.

In the meantime, however, importation of Indian coolies had started on a large scale. Frere and Williamson, in 1874, reported:[2]

The first occasion on which the aid of Government was sought in support of emigration from India was in 1829, when Messrs. Guillardin & Co. were introduced by the Government of Mauritius to the Governors of Madras and Singapore, as being 'a firm of high respectability, desirous of introducing into the colony a number of Indians as hired labourers'; and, as the Government of Mauritius thought it an object of great interest, as holding out the prospect of providing for the cultivation of the island with free labour, they bespoke every countenance and facility for them.[3]

It appears, however, that Messrs. Guillardin & Co. acted as much as agents for others as on their own account, for, on the 9th March 1830, twenty-five Indian labourers left Mr. Potier's estate at 'Albion', in consequence of his not paying them their wages for more than three months, but referring them to Messrs. Guillardin for payment. They therefore came to Port Louis, and the Chief Commissary of Police gave them rations, but had no building in which to shelter them. These men, and some 127 more; many from Mr. Potier's, and the rest introduced by some other masters; were then in a state of vagabondage, or subsisting at the expense of Government in hospital or elsewhere, and Government called upon their masters to show cause why they should not be reshipped forthwith to their native country at their (the masters') cost.[4]

. . . Government were . . . able by calling upon the securities to rid the island in a short time, and at no expense to the Treasury, of 329 men, who, as it was said, had refused to work and abandoned their places of labour; crowding the public roads, the streets, and the police office, and thus the men who had been thrown out of work in consequence of their employer not paying their wages for three months and repudiating his responsibility, were mingled with the vagabond and worthless.[5]. . .

[1] 'Memorial and Petition of the Planters, Merchants, Traders, and other British Inhabitants of the Island of Mauritius to the Court of Directors of the East India Company', *Le Mauricien*, 10 June 1839, reproduced in *Despatches from Sir William Nicolay on Free Labour in the Mauritius* (1840), p. 83. A few Lascars were employed, for example in 1812, by the Victualling Department (see C.O. 167, vols. ix and x) and a large number, apparently from 1831 on, by the Port Department (see *Blue Book 1832*, p. 251; *1833*, folios 126–7; *1834*, pp. 172–3; *1835*, pp. 190, 258–60; *1836*, folios 82–5; *1837*, folios 102–4; *1838*, folio 85; *1839*, folios 97–9; *1840*, p. 118).

[2] *Report of the Royal Commissioners on the Treatment of Immigrants in Mauritius* (1875), pp. 27–8.

[3] B. H. de Froberville noted in his Diary on 21 Sept. 1829: '509 Indians for hire arrived in the *Albion*. Quarantine, smallpox among them' (*Ephémérides Mauriciennes 1827–1834*, p. 46). For further details see Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1828–1833)*, pp. 77–9.

[4] Strangers coming to Mauritius had to name 'respectable persons who consent to be security for their good conduct during the period of their residence in this Colony'; see Proclamations of 14 Sept. 1815, 5 and 20 Dec. 1817, and 2 Dec. 1823 (English text, Rouillard, vol. iii, pp. 169–171, 273–5, 279–81, 377–9), and Government Notice of 10 July 1829 (French text *Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 137–8). On 7 Apr. 1830 the Governor issued the following Government Order (English text ibid. *1830*, p. 61):

'Of the Chinese and Indians lately introduced into the Colony as free Labourers, there are now one hundred and fifty two according to the subjoined list, in a state of vagabondage or subsisting at the expense of Government in Hospital or elsewhere; being, under different excuses on the part of Master and Servant, absent from the Estates on which they had been engaged to labour.

'As such a state of things, so prejudicial to the public peace and good order, cannot be permitted longer to subsist; all persons concerned, are hereby called upon to shew cause why the said Chinese and Indians, agreeably to the subjoined list, shall not be reshipped forthwith for their native Countries at the cost of those who had engaged them, including every other expense incurred by Government for their subsistence and treatment in Hospital, while in the state of abandonment they were found in.'

[5] A Government Notice, dated 'Chief Secretary's Office, 13th August 1830,' (English text ibid., p. 147) said: 'Tenders will be received at this Office until Monday next, at 12 o'clock, for the

We find no further reference to emigration from India, until the introduction of labourers became a question of existence for colonial industry and agriculture; and then, on the 10th September 1834, Mr. Macfarlane, Chief Magistrate in Calcutta, wrote to the Secretary to Government informing him (not with the idea that there was any call for the interference of Government) that 36 Hill Coolies had entered into engagement with Mr. Arbuthnot for five years, to go to Mauritius and work on sugar estates. . . .

These 36 men, and another 39 from Bombay, without any women or children accompanying either party, appear from a Return of the Protector of Immigrants, Mr. Hugon, to be considered, officially, as the first emigrants from India.[1]

In 1835, 1,160 men, 61 women, 22 boys and 11 girls arrived from India . . . .

A Government Notice of 18 February 1836[2] pressed 'upon the Public the necessity of the utmost attention being observed in the selection of the persons who may be engaged to work on estates in this Island', and urged 'that especial care be now taken to ensure that the persons who may be engaged shall have been known as really agricultural Labourers in their own Country (of the class called *Hill Coolies* when coming from Calcutta)'. But this appeal had no success, and on 25 November the following Government Notice[3] was issued:

His Excellency the Governor has received with much regret reports unfavorable to the description of Labourers latterly introduced into this Colony from India; and from which it would appear that the injunctions conveyed in the Government Notice of the 18th February last have not been attended to, where it was recommanded that the utmost attention should be observed in the selection of the persons engaged to work on Estates in this Island, otherwise that much public and private inconvenience might result therefrom.

His Excellency in consequence considers it advisable for the present to discontinue granting further permissions for the introduction of Indian Labourers into this Island, and desires that the same may be notified for general information.

'This determination does not appear, however, to have had the effect of putting a stop to immigration; for in the years 1836, 1837, and 1838, 22,015 men, 716 women, 130 boys and 62 girls, were introduced from the three Presidencies of India.'[4] But 'on the 29th May, 1839, emigration from Calcutta to Mauritius was suspended by the Governor-General of India,[5] on the ground that the protection afforded to emigrants by the

transport of 60 or 70 Indians, from this Port to Madras. . . .' In the printed edition of D'Unienville it is reported (vol. iii, p. 145) that the Indians and Chinese 'were hurriedly sent back to their country so that, on 1 January 1830, there remained in the whole Island only 26 Chinese and 31 Indians, the latter being stablemen, cooks, and laundrymen'. But this is a mistake. There resided on 1 Jan. 1830 in Port Louis 26 Chinese and 32 Indians (see ibid., vol. i, p. 61) who had nothing whatsoever to do with the hired labourers introduced in 1829.

[1] It should be noted, however, that the Committee of Inquiry on Indian Labourers, appointed by the Governor on 15 Oct. 1838 (see *Despatches from Sir William Nicolay on Free Labour in the Mauritius*, pp. 15–16), reported on 5 Dec. to the Colonial Secretary: '. . . we saw in one establishment (Mr. Des Etang's), 29 men from Bombay, originally introduced by Mr. Bickajee in 1831 and 1832, who have twice voluntarily entered into new contracts . . .' (ibid., p. 39). See also their letter of 16 Mar. 1839 (ibid., p. 47).

[2] English text *Recueil des Lois 1836*, p. 8.

[3] English text ibid., p. 59.

[4] *Report of Royal Commissioners*, pp. 34–5. In 1838 immigration was in fact larger than ever before, although a Government Notice of 9 Dec. 1837 (English text *Recueil des Lois 1837*, p. 72) had said: 'His Excellency the Governor considering it expedient in the interest of the Colony to suspend for a time the introduction of Indian Labourers, directs it to be notified that after the close of the present year no further permissions, will be granted for that purpose.'

[5] See Act No. 14 of 1839.

TABLE 28. *Arrivals and Departures of Indian Immigrants, Mauritius 1834–1910*[1]

Year	Arrivals		Departures		Year	Arrivals		Departures	
	Males	Females	Males	Females		Males	Females	Males	Females
1834	75	—	4	—	1873	5,226	2,388	1,936	594
1835	1,182	72	25	1	1874	4,818	2,234	2,429	779
1836	3,639	184	187	3	1875	1,996	923	1,938	634
1837	6,939	353	114	20	1876	330	172	1,991	565
1838	11,567	241	148	6	1877	1,528	659	1,524	377
1839	933	102	170	3	1878	3,203	1,623	1,613	333
1840	107	9	394	28	1879	2,013	1,066	1,660	404
1841	499	43	995	94	1880	371	213	1,543	436
1842	73	10	2,021	94	1881	—	—	1,061	258
1843	30,218	4,307	2,884	103	1882	805	436	1,466	397
1844	9,709	1,840	2,312	149	1883	1,283	632	1,523	413
1845	8,919	2,053	2,492	170	1884	4,450	1,939	1,203	353
1846	5,718	1,621	2,556	204	1885	246	112	2,489	771
1847	5,174	656	1,651	133	1886	511	235	1,446	480
1848	4,739	656	2,639	376	1887	191	73	1,497	453
1849	6,378	1,047	4,298	594	1888	482	231	1,180	362
1850	8,436	1,594	3,283	442	1889	3,234	1,293	910	255
1851	8,257	1,763	2,805	374	1890	2,152	873	793	194
1852	13,671	3,814	2,934	392	1891	713	278	659	146
1853	9,877	2,267	1,767	261	1892	—	—	1,017	281
1854	14,995	3,489	3,166	509	1893	353	132	1,023	319
1855	9,645	3,270	3,702	565	1894	753	273	723	204
1856	9,130	3,523	4,280	677	1895	1,252	472	820	252
1857	8,640	4,085	3,794	809	1896	587	204	825	290
1858	20,932	9,014	6,707	1,458	1897	202	85	658	236
1859	31,643	12,754	4,147	971	1898	—	—	682	185
1860	9,070	4,216	2,290	543	1899	—	—	478	134
1861	10,232	3,753	1,786	471	1900	2,094	796	858	293
1862	7,440	2,443	1,752	460	1901	3,265	1,309	469	162
1863	3,667	1,587	2,553	667	1902	1,865	695	402	186
1864	5,649	1,926	2,692	721	1903	374	134	383	140
1865	14,910	5,373	2,876	769	1904	1,513	544	413	148
1866	3,702	1,894	2,925	890	1905	531	179	270	82
1867	317	33	2,571	827	1906	463	155	266	98
1868	1,968	640	1,880	664	1907	439	147	205	61
1869	1,182	500	1,684	636	1908	—	—	258	81
1870	2,831	1,245	2,172	670	1909	—	—	375	111
1871	2,318	974	2,369	705	1910	397	135	241	94
1872	4,015	1,759	2,499	758					

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, pp. 4–5.

regulations then in operation was insufficient'.[1] The Governor of Mauritius, Sir Lionel Smith, made great efforts to persuade the Governor-General of India to permit again emigration,[2] and an Order of the Queen in Council of 15 January 1842[3] said that 'it is probable that the Laws now in force in British India for preventing the Emigration of Inhabitants

[1] Report of the Protector of Immigrants for 1870, *State of Colonial Possessions 1870*, Part ii, p. 88. The numbers of Indians introduced in 1839–41 were 1,518 men, 144 women, 21 boys, and 10 girls; see *Report of Royal Commissioners*, p. 47. In each of the years 1840–2 the departures exceeded considerably the arrivals.

[2] See ibid., pp. 47–52.

[3] Reprinted in *Recueil des Lois 1842*, pp. 17–23.

thereof to Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions will be shortly repealed so far as respects Emigration to the Island of Mauritius'. With this object in view various Ordinances were passed in Mauritius in 1842.[1] 'These measures proving satisfactory to the Government of India', an Act was passed on 2 December 're-opening immigration to Mauritius,[2] and within a few weeks of that date Governor Sir William Gomm was able to report to Lord Stanley the arrival of the first band of Indian immigrants, numbering 234'.[3] In 1843 there came not fewer than 34,525. From 1843 to 1866 the arrivals numbered 339,706 and the departures 84,949. After that, immigration became smaller. From 1867 to 1910 (the last year in which coolies were brought into the Colony) the arrivals numbered 86,062 and the departures 68,283. The total number of Indian labourers imported from 1834 to 1910 was 451,796 (346,036 males, 105,760 females). The departures in the same period (including children born in Mauritius) numbered 157,539 (128,761 males, 28,778 females).[4]

(*c*) Convicts. A few convicts from Batavia were apparently brought to Mauritius in the seventeenth century by the Dutch.[5] The French did not employ such people, but Governor Farquhar, encountering great difficulties in finding labour for the repair of roads, asked the Governor-General of India to send him for this purpose a certain number of convicts. These men arrived in the first days of 1816 and were lodged in the bagne prison.[6] On 24 January Governor Farquhar issued a Proclamation enacting regulations for a department dealing with the convicts deported to Mauritius from India.[7] But the inhabitants were afraid of the subversive influence which the convicts might exert on the slaves, and those Indians were therefore kept in prison. Finally, Farquhar's successor, Governor Hall, by making concessions to the slave-owners regarding the slave-labour to be furnished to the Government overcame their resistance,[8] and on 25 March 1818 issued a Proclamation enacting that in future no requisitions for men for work on roads shall be made on the inhabitants, and that about 500 convicts from India shall be employed on making and repairing

[1] See No. 2 (28 Feb.), 'An Ordinance for appropriating an annual sum out of the Public Treasury toward the expence of the immigration of Free Labourers into this Colony' (English text ibid., pp. 6–7); No. 7 (23 June), 'An Ordinance for providing the funds which will be required to meet the expense attendant on the introduction of Natives of India who may Emigrate to Mauritius, as Labourers' (ibid., pp. 32–4); No. 11 (20 Aug.), 'An Ordinance for the purpose of securing in favor of Indian Emigrant Labourers the execution of the formalities relative to their future emigration to the Island of Mauritius' (ibid., pp. 42–5).

[2] Act No. 15 of 1842 (2 Dec.), 'An Act for regulating the Emigration of the native inhabitants of the territories under the Government of the East India Company to the Island of Mauritius', reprinted ibid., *1843*, pp. 9–13.

[3] *Report of Royal Commissioners*, p. 53.

[4] The departures in 1911–20 numbered 2,298 (1,680 males and 618 females); see *Census Report 1921*, p. 5.

[5] Referring to the reoccupation of the Island by the Dutch in 1664 (see p. 745 above), Sir Charles Bruce said (p. 60): 'But a new factor—the Labour Question—had now to be taken into account in their enterprise. At the outset of their occupation they had undertaken to provide a labouring population by the importation of natives of Madagascar under the system of slavery .... This agency was now supplemented by the introduction of convicts from Batavia ....'

[6] See Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1810–1823)*, pp. 128–9, 186.

[7] French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 142–3, No. 192.

[8] See Pitot, pp. 186–90.

roads.[1] Their number increased later, the losses caused by deaths being more than offset by new arrivals.[2] Frere and Williamson reported in 1874:

> This supply of forced labour ceased in 1837, and in 1847 Sir William Gomm brought the condition of those that remained to the notice of the Secretary of State with a view to providing for their future employment and disposal, and was authorised to offer freedom to all who were more than 65 years old, with the option of going back to India; and to provide for the maintenance of those who remained in the colony, but were unable to gain their livelihood.
>
> The Government of India objected to the convicts being returned to India; but, on the 11th April 1853, Governor Higginson reported having liberated all the Indian convicts except two, who were undergoing sentences of imprisonment for offences committed in the colony; the conditions of their pardon being that they should not return to their native country. Some were pensioned, and, of them, ten or twelve remain in the island to this day, receiving rations and lodgings.[3]

Chinese. A few Chinese convicts were brought by the Dutch to Mauritius in 1652.[4] Nothing seems to be known about the time of arrival of free immigrants under the French régime, but Billiard wrote on 27 February 1817 that there was in Port Louis 'a small quarter called the Camp of the Chinese'.[5] In August 1829 there came a number of Chinese cultivators.[6] But they proved as unsatisfactory as the Indians who arrived at about the same time, and most of them were sent back in October.[7]

Another attempt to obtain Chinese labourers was made in 1841. There arrived 297 on 4 July and 518 some weeks later.[8] A Population Return of 30 September 1841 shows 1,088 'Labourers, Natives of China and the Malay Coast'. Their number increased to 1,366 in 1842 and to 1,478 in 1843, but dropped to 564 in 1844 and was still about the same in 1851. In the meantime, however, there had arrived some Chinese who were not

[1] French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 189–91, No. 264. See also Ordinance No. 56 of 1829 (25 Nov.), English text *Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 272–8. Earl Bathurst favoured the employment of these convicts (see his Dispatch to Governor Farquhar, 4 Aug. 1817, C.O. 168, vol. iii, pp. 155–63). On 30 Oct. 1819 he wrote to Major-General Darling: 'I see no objection . . . to your obtaining from the Government of India such a further Supply of them as may be consistent with the means of the Colony to maintain, provided it shall appear to you that their Services can be made essentially useful. You will, however, well consider previously to taking measures for procuring them, how far the temporary convenience of having their aid in rebuilding the town and repairing the roads, will counterbalance the inconvenience of entailing upon the Government a permanent charge for the maintenance of so large a number of individuals.' (Ibid., pp. 297–8. One-fifth of the town had been completely destroyed by a fire in 1816; see Toussaint, *Port-Louis*, pp. 239–40.)

[2] In 1828–31 the deaths numbered 26, 21, 23, and 12 respectively, and the arrivals 87, 6, 27, and 39; see *Brown Book, Jan. to June 1828 to July to Dec. 1831* (Sections 'Public Works').

[3] *Report of Royal Commissioners*, p. 26.

[4] See p. 797 above.

[5] Billiard, p. 42; see also ibid., p. 361. D'Unienville (vol. ii, p. 78) speaks of 'a small number of Chinese settled in this Colony for a rather long time'. He lists, for 1 Jan. 1830, 26 in Port Louis and 43 in the District Rivière du Rempart (see ibid., vol. i, pp. 61, 104).

[6] See ibid., vol. iii, p. 145. Pitot, *L'Ile Maurice (1828–1833)*, p. 77, says that 400 arrived in the last days of July.

[7] See entries in Diary of B. H. de Froberville: 4 Sept. 1829. 'The Chinese play pranks (*font des farces*). People begin to get tired of their services which are almost nil. There is no establishment which does not complain about them. This means the end of their introduction' (*Ephémérides Mauriciennes*, p. 45). 17 Oct. 1829. 'Sending back the Chinese. A breed which would ruin the country. The multiplied arsons show how dangerous they are' (ibid., p. 47; see also ibid., entry of 12 Nov.).

[8] See Dispatches from Governor Sir Lionel Smith to Lord John Russell, 7 July and 14 Aug. 1841, *Correspondence relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers* (1842), pp. 3–4.

labourers and were admitted as temporary residents. Their number varied in 1846–50 between 455 and 636.[1] But on 31 December 1859 as many as 6,381 Chinese 'aliens' were registered at the General Police Office. On 31 December 1860–4 the numbers were 1,383, 1,872, 1,982, 1,746, and 1,613 respectively.[2]

Chinese immigration has never been considerable. The census of 1861, which apparently included all Chinese then present in the Colony, showed 1,904 persons born in China. The highest number ever returned at a census as born in China and Hong Kong was 5,529 (1931).

One aspect of the effects of immigration into Mauritius has been revealed by the census of 1944 which was the first to include a question concerning the 'language habitually spoken at home'. The results may be summarized as follows:[3]

Sex	*Hindi*	*Creole*	*French*	*Chinese*	*English*	*Other*	*Not stated*[1]	*Total*
Males .	112,232	73,179	15,682	6,345	1,040	14	1,834	210,326
Females	106,861	76,201	20,213	3,586	346	6	1,646	208,859
Total .	219,093	149,380	35,895	9,931	1,386	20	3,480	419,185

[1] This column evidently includes the refugees from Europe.

Although there has been no French immigration since 1810, the number of people who habitually speak French at home, is probably about three times as large as it was when the English conquered the island. Creole is spoken by the descendants of negro slaves and by a considerable number of Indians.[4] English is spoken at home by only very few persons, but there were altogether 27,539 people able to speak English, 'even though not very accurately'.

IV. Composition of the Population

1. Race

Until 1830 the population statistics in Mauritius distinguished between whites, free coloured, and slaves. The returns for 1831–4 distinguished merely between free persons[5] and slaves, and those for 1835–8 between

[1] See Tables 21 and 22.

[2] See *Blue Book 1859*, Section P, p. 4; *1860* P, p. 4; *1861* P, p. 4; *1862* P, p. 3; *1863* P, p. 3; *1864* P, p. 3.

[3] See *Census Report 1944*, p. 23.

[4] Of the 265,000 persons counted as Indians, 45,000 spoke Creole at home, but there were very many Indians not counted as such, and most of these speak Creole at home.

[5] On 22 June 1829 the King made the following Order in Council (reprinted in *Recueil des Lois 1829*, p. 293):

'Whereas by certain Laws and Ordinances, heretofore made by, or under the authority of the Government of France, before the cession to His Majesty of the Island of Mauritius, and by certain Laws, Ordinances and Proclamations made and issued by, or in the name or under the Authority of His Majesty, or His late Majesty King *George* the Third, or by the Governors or Officers administering the Government of the said Island, His Majesty's Subjects of free condition, but of African or Indian birth or descent, are subjected to various disabilities in the said Island and its Dependencies, to which His Majesty's Subjects of European birth and descent are not

free persons and apprentices (former slaves). The returns for 1839–45 combined all resident persons of European and African descent and gave separate figures for the various groups of foreign labourers (Indians, &c.).

The census of 1846 distinguished between the General Population, Ex-apprentices, and 'Indian and other Immigrant Labourers'. The census of 1851 showed the same classification but gave separate data for the various groups of immigrant labourers. Referring to the 1851 census the Commissioner for the 1901 census relates:

> The term 'Ex-Apprentice' used at this and the preceding Census was applied to all manumitted slaves and their descendants born since their Emancipation in February 1835 and the Commissioners of 1851 in their report explained that the falling off in the number as then returned, was caused through many belonging to that class having merged by marriage with the General population, had doubtless been included therein.[1]

The Commissioners of the 1861 census reported:

> The most important alteration in the details of the present Census is the absorption of the class formerly called ex-apprentices into the bulk of the general population.[2]

Governor Stevenson, in a dispatch to the Duke of Newcastle dated 3 July 1862, gave the following explanation for the change:

> It was considered no longer desirable to distinguish the class formerly called 'ex-apprentices' from the general population of the Island. Death had destroyed the greater part of the adults who had been in actual slavery, and most of the younger portion of that class had become absorbed by inter-marriages in the general classes.[3]

subject, and it is expedient that all such distinctions should be abolished His Majesty is therefore pleased by and with the advice of his Privy Council to order, and it is hereby ordered, that every Law, Statute, Ordinance and Proclamation, or pretended Law, Statute, Ordinance or Proclamation and every part or parts of any Law, Statute, Ordinance or Proclamation in force within His Majesty's said Island of Mauritius and its Dependencies, whereby any Persons of African or Indian birth or descent, being of free condition, are subjected to any disability, civil or military, to which Persons of free condition, but of European birth and descent are not subject, shall be and the same and each of them are, and is hereby repealed, abolished and annulled. And the Right Honorable Sir George Murray, one of His Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, is to give the necessary directions herein accordingly.'

See also the Governor's Proclamation of 2 Dec., English text ibid., pp. 291–2.

[1] *Census Report 1901*, p. 2. However, the number of 'ex-apprentices' had decreased between 1846 and 1851 only from 49,365 to 48,330 (see ibid., pp. 1–2), and it had never exceeded 53,000. Governor Barkly, in a Dispatch to Secretary of State Cardwell, dated 26 July 1866, said: 'These slaves numbered upwards of 63,000 at the commencement of the apprenticeship .... By the close of the apprenticeship in 1838 they were reduced to 53,000, without apparently any corresponding augmentation in the other classes' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1865*, part I, p. 116). Actually, the number of Whites and Free Coloured had increased in 1835–8 from 27,000 to 38,000 (see Tables 17 and 20 above). The reduction in the number of apprentices was due to liberation before the end of the term (see Letter from Superintending Special Justice C. Anderson to Lord John Russell, 1 May 1840, *Correspondence relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers into the Mauritius*, 1840, p. 194).

[2] *Census Report 1861*, p. 1.

[3] *State of Colonial Possessions 1861*, part i, p. 99. The 'ex-apprentice class and their descendants' had suffered particularly from the cholera epidemic of 1854 and the smallpox epidemic of 1855–6 (see p. 881 below). Their numbers are said to have decreased from 48,366 at the end of 1851 to 40,720 at the end of 1856; see *Blue Book 1856*, p. 435, and Dispatch from Governor Higginson to Secretary of State Labouchere, 13 June 1857, *State of Colonial Possessions 1856*, part ii, p. 139.

The report on the 1871 census said:

As was done in 1861, the Population was divided into two classes distinguished by the following designations:—

(1.)—The Indian Population.

(2.)—The General Population.

In order that this classification might be carried out without difficulty and on a uniform system throughout all the operations of the Census, the following rule was laid down:—that the term *Indian Population* was to be held as comprising not only *Indians born in India*, but *all persons of unmixed Indian origin* whatever their birth-place or nationality; and that *all the other inhabitants of the Island* irrespective of descent, birth-place or nationality, were to be considered as belonging to the *General Population*.[1]

In his report for 1881 the Census Commissioner, J. B. Kyshe, after having stated that the division into Indian and General Population was effected as in 1861 and 1871, said:

It has so far been comparatively easy to distinguish the one from the other, but the day is not far distant when such a distinction will be next to impossible, unless the parties themselves give their origin. In the present Census, I have seen the Schedule of an Indian of the name of Ramsamy who, on being christened, assumed the name of Pierre Antoine, and his wife, Meenatchee, that of Marie Rose . . . they have three children, one of whom is called François Xavier, the second Marie Ursule and the third Pierre Antoine. As soon as the parents disappear, who will be able to tell whether the children are of unmixed Indian origin or not? I am rather inclined to believe that any one reading the name of François Xavier, would be sure to state that he belongs to the general population. It is no doubt desirable that the different classes of the population should continue to be enumerated separately from each other, but the time will come when it will be not only difficult but almost impossible to draw clear lines of demarcation between them. The same difficulty arose 20 years ago, when the population was divided into three classes:—

1°. General Population.

2°. Ex-apprentices.

3°. Indians.

The Census Commissioners of 1861 solved the problem by absorbing the class formerly called Ex-apprentices into the bulk of the General Population.[2]

The 1851 census returns apparently classified the Indians according to the country of birth,[3] and this is certainly true of the reports on the censuses taken in 1861–81. But the report for 1891 went one step farther.

The population has been divided into three groups . . . . The three groups are,

1. The General Population.
2. The Indo-Mauritians.
3. Other Indians.

The General population has received this name because of its heterogeneous character and not that it comprehends the majority of the inhabitants; on the contrary it does not form more than 31 per cent. of the whole. It includes all persons born in the Colony, except those of Indian parents or where the father was of Indian

[1] *Census Report 1871*, part i, p. 5.

[2] Report of Census Commissioner, ibid. *1881*, p. 7. See also Dispatch from Lieutenant-Governor Broome to the Earl of Kimberley, 26 Dec. 1881, ibid., covering letter, p. 2: '. . . perhaps the term "Indian Population", as distinguished from the "General population" may have disappeared from the Census of 1901, just as the term "Ex-apprentice" disappeared from the Census of 1861.'

[3] See ibid. *1861*, Appendix No. 5; *1921*, p. 3. The figures for 1861 are most inaccurate. It is impossible that there could have been 13,178 boys and only 7,031 girls born in Mauritius (see Table 34).

origin, besides Europeans, Chinese &c. It is most easily defined as the residuum after separating the Indo-Mauritians and the Other Indians.

The Indo-Mauritians are persons of Indian origin born in the Colony.[1] They are generally the offspring of parents both of whom were Indian immigrants, but where the father belongs to the General population and the mother not, the children are returned as General. If the father was Indian the child is an Indo-Mauritian. These two subordinate classes are not numerous though probably increasing.

The Other Indians are chiefly immigrants from India who have come to Mauritius on contracts of service. The class includes time-expired immigrants who have continued their residence here, applying themselves to other modes of industry .... Some have made trips to India and are known as 'passengers'. A few however there may be who have come to this country like the Chinese, that is to say, with the intention of taking up some industry other than that of labour on a sugar estate, to cultivate the land for instance, but ... the great bulk of the class are immigrants with tickets and numbers and are registered at the Immigration Office. A simple classification of the population would have been that of native and foreign; but in the general population the stranger and alien element is inconsiderable and statistics other than what is given in this report ascertainable without very much trouble; while its adoption would have smothered out important details relating to the Indo-Mauritians, the principal element of the population. The Indo-Mauritian population is the growth of comparatively few years and has been formed by the introduction of immigrants into Mauritius.[2]

It should be noted that the Indo-Mauritians include children of an Indian father and a non-Indian mother, while the figures of earlier censuses, relating to Indians born in Mauritius, include only those where both parents were Indians.[3]

In 1901 an attempt was made to get separate figures for pure Africans. The Census Commissioner reports:

The Secretary of State for the Colonies having called for a return of the population under the following heads:

(*a*) Europeans, whites, mixed and coloured.
(*b*) Africans.
(*c*) Indians.
(*d*) Chinese.

and the Director of the Medical and Health Department having referred to me, in my capacity as Registrar General, for an estimate of the population so divided, I considered that the taking of the Census would be an excellent opportunity of endeavouring to obtain the information accurately; I therefore directed the Superintendents and Enumerators, when collecting and examining the Schedules, to fill in, in the column of remarks, an initial letter against each person, from which the divisions of the population could afterwards be compiled.[4]

But it appeared that only 643 persons had been returned as Africans.[5] The Census Commissioner added the following comment:[6]

I am bound to report that, in my opinion, the return given under the heading (*b*) Africans appears to be much under-estimated and that the officers have taken

[1] As far back as 13 May 1856 Governor Higginson wrote to Secretary of State Labouchere: '... there is gradually growing up amongst us a new Indo-Creole race, not migratory and nomadic in their habits, nor even denizenized immigrants like their parents before them, but Mauritius-born sons and daughters of the soil ...' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1855*, p. 222).

[2] *Census Report 1891*, pp. 4–5.

[3] This fact apparently escaped the attention of the various Census Commissioners who in recent reports entered for 1851–81 figures for Indo-Mauritians.

[4] Ibid. *1901*, p. 5.

[5] 332 males and 100 females in Mauritius, and 180 males and 31 females in the Dependencies; see ibid., p. 7.

[6] Ibid., pp. 5–6.

a very liberal view and have included under (*a*) Europeans, whites, mixed and coloured many hundreds of persons who, to all intents and purposes, bear the racial characteristics of being pure Africans. My reasons for this opinion are as follows:—

In my short references to the Censuses of 1846 and 1851, it was shown that, at these dates, the ex-apprentice class numbered 49,365 and 48,330 respectively, and altho' intermixture then and since the latter date has largely diminished the number of pure Africans by descent, it is difficult to believe that it has been so complete as to leave only 643 persons of that class remaining.[1]

I estimate that there are probably between 2,000 and 3,000 persons who, by racial class, should be included under the heading of Africans and deducted from the number returned under the heading Europeans, whites, mixed and coloured.[2]

In the Indian community there is no such widespread attempt to assimilate themselves with any other class, the few cases in which they may do so, through marriage with coloured people, or influenced by the adoption of Christianity, being too few in number to affect the statistics.

It should be noted that while the Commissioner of the 1881 census had emphasized the increasing difficulties of distinguishing the Indians from the General Population and while the Lieutenant-Governor in 1881 thought that, 'perhaps the term "Indian Population", as distinguished from the "General Population" may have disappeared from the Census of 1901', the Commissioner of the 1901 census considered the assimilation between the two groups to be negligible.

Mr. A. Walter, who was Census Commissioner both in 1911 and 1921, reported on the former occasion:[3]

The classification of the population is effected principally by means of the surnames as, for obvious reasons, it cannot be made a subject of direct census enquiry, and the notes added by the sub-enumerators were in many cases found to be defective. In the case of the Indians and Chinese no serious error in classification has, so far, arisen; but the same control cannot be applied to the General Population.[4] It is probable, however, that in the future some further control will be necessary even in the case of the Indian population. Two influences are at work—intermarriages and Christian baptism—which must inevitably render classification by names defective.

[1] The comparison of the number of persons returned as pure Africans in 1901 with the numbers of ex-apprentices (and their descendants) ascertained in 1846 and 1851 is not very helpful, since only a small minority of the latter were pure Africans, and since, on the other hand, there must have been some pure Africans among the 'General Population' (which both in 1846 and 1851 was more numerous than the ex-apprentice class).

[2] See also ibid. *1911*, p. vi:

'In 1901 the enumerated population under this class was returned as 643, but the Commissioner considering this erroneous, appears to have increased it by 2,000.

'The negro type is still to be found, however, in considerable numbers, round the coast; but except in the case of the more ancient members of the community it is doubtful whether the individuals bearing the African characteristics can be considered otherwise than as recurring types.

'In the 1911 Census no attempt was made to enumerate them separately.'

See furthermore ibid. *1921*, p. 2: 'The African type is still to be found in a peculiarly strong manner in the non-Indian coloured population round the coast and in Rodrigues . . . .'

[3] ibid. *1911*, p. vi.

[4] This statement, it seems to me, is not very clear. (1) What are the obvious reasons for which the classification cannot, as in many other countries, be made a subject of direct census inquiry? (2) If by definition only persons with Indian (or Chinese) surnames are counted as Indians (or Chinese) no serious error in classification may have so far arisen, but the same must also be true of the General Population if by definition all persons with non-Indian (and non-Chinese) surnames were allocated to the General Population. In fact, the difficulty was that while all people with Indian surnames were Indians numerous people with non-Indian surnames were likewise Indians but were included in the General Population.

There is some evidence, corroborated by the occupation statistics, that Indian women tend either to marry or cohabit with Creole husbands . . . .[1]

With regard to the Indian Immigrant, it is becoming more difficult every year to distinguish him from the Indo-Mauritian. The return of Immigrants at the recent Census was so evidently defective[2] that the class has been designated 'Other Indians' i.e., Indians born out of the Colony.

There are probably several reasons for the defective nature of this return. In former years, when the Estate Population was more numerous, a direct control was exercised by the estate managers, the origin of each individual being noted in the estate books. At the present time many of the Immigrants are landed proprietors, and, as such, some of them may have considered it to their advantage to return themselves as natives of the Colony or as passengers. Whatever the cause, however, there can be no doubt that the enumeration of the real Immigrant population is erroneous, the total amounting to only 20,300 as follows:—

	Male	*Female*
New Immigrants . . .	1,122	275
Old Immigrants . . .	13,493	5,410

whereas the return of Other Indians not born in the Colony amounted to 35,396, including the Immigrants.[3]

In his report on the 1921 census Mr. Walter said:

It is a matter for serious consideration whether the time has not come to revise the classification of

General	Other Indian
Indo Mauritian	Chinese

and substitute

European	Indian
Mauritian	Chinese

'European' being reserved entirely for those born in Europe or whose father and mother were born in Europe. 'Mauritian' referring to all those who at present are classed in the General Population and those whose association with the Colony and its aspirations are sufficiently developed to lead them to voluntarily insert in their own Census schedule the classification 'Mauritian', whether they be of European, or Indian or Asiatic descent. At all events the arbitrary classification of more or less efficient enumerators would be checked and the growth of a 'Mauritian' entity directly measured.[4]

The majority of the population consists mainly of Indian Immigrants and their descendants who constitute at the present time about 70% of the population.

The remainder is composed of persons of pure European descent the offspring of connexions or marriages between the different races which have at various times been introduced into the Colony and Chinese. The classification of the population is effected principally by means of the surnames; this method does not permit differentiation of the general population into those of African, Indian or European descent. In the case of the Indians and Chinese, as pointed out in . . . the last Census report, no serious error has so far arisen. As was stated there, some further control will probably be necessary even in the case of the Indian population, and it became very evident, during the work of compilation, the influence of inter-

[1] See also *Census Report 1911*, p. xviii: 'The females employed in Agriculture are steadily increasing. In 1861 they numbered 1,083 while at the recent Census, 7,384 returned themselves under this Order. It will, moreover, be noticed that 176 females appear in this Order under the heading "General Population"—a result due, in all probability, either to inter-marriages between the Creole males and Indian females or to Christian Baptism . . . .'

[2] For similar complaints at earlier censuses see ibid., *1881*, pp. 32–3; *1891*, p. 28.

[3] This suggests that 15,096 of the 35,396 Indians who said that they were not born in the Colony said that they were not 'Immigrants'.

[4] Ibid. *1921*, p. 6.

marriages and Christian Baptism has already become a serious disturbing influence in the accuracy of classification by names.[1]

An attempt was made during the 1921 Census to estimate the extent to which one of the factors referred to—intermarriage—has affected the population. In the summarised statements the offspring, in the case of mixed marriages, have always been classified under the heading of the class to which the father's name appears to indicate that he belongs. Sub-classifications were then made for the offspring when the Indians appeared to have married or co-habited with creole women, creoles with Indian women or Chinese with either Indians or creoles. The following table gives a summary of the sub-classifications and it seems evident from the work in the present Census, and from general economic considerations, that there is a distinct tendency to develop a Mauritian entity, which future commissioners will have great difficulty in classifying otherwise than 'Mauritian'. With regard to the class—Indian Immigrant—there was even more reason during the recent Census than in the previous Census for designating them—'Indians born out of the Colony'—as the returns of immigrants were altogether defective. It is difficult to estimate how far this is due to inattention on the part of the enumerators or to unwillingness or want of interest on the part of the members of the Indian population themselves.

Table shewing the offspring of marriages or Co-habitation between different classes of the population.

Marriage	*Number of children*		
	Male	*Female*	*Total*
General Population and Indians . .	733	1,686	2,419
General Population and Chinese . .	120	266	386
Chinese and Indian	37	111	148

The tendency to change of name as the Indian becomes absorbed into the General Population is unfortunate.[2]

Mr. M. Kœnig, who was Census Commissioner both in 1931 and 1944, reported on the former occasion:

In the 1921 Census Report, Mr. A. Walter, the then Census Commissioner, remarked that the classification of the Population under the previously accepted headings, viz:—General, Indo Mauritian, Other Indians and Chinese, was becoming a matter of some difficulty. He suggested new headings, viz:—European, Mauritian, Indian and Chinese; the term European applying only to those persons born in Europe, of European parents, or born in Mauritius, of European parents; the term Mauritian applying to those persons, of whatever origin, who have become permanently settled in Mauritius and who are following European customs and religions. The Indian section would then have comprized those members of the population following the customs and religions of India.

On the occasion of the present Census, an attempt was made at following this classification, collaterally to the previously adopted one.[3]

The two classifications yielded the following results:[4]

New headings				*Old headings*			
European	*Mauritian*	*Indian*	*Chinese*	*General Population*	*Indo-Mauritian*	*Other Indian*	*Chinese*
645	115,021	268,649	8,923	115,666	261,605	7,044	8,923

As will be seen therefrom, the proportion of true Europeans is negligibly small as compared with the General Population. On the other hand, the 'Other Indian'

[1] Ibid., p. 14. [2] Ibid., p. 15. No explanation is given for the enormous excess of female children.
[3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 6. [4] See ibid., pp. 6, 9.

class is becoming relatively unimportant and could well be blended with the 'Indo Mauritian' into one 'Indian' class.

At present, the 'General Population' are continually recruiting members from the 'Indo Mauritian' while the latter are gradually absorbing the 'Other Indians'. The principal factor operating in the first case is probably religion: a member of the Indian Community embracing Christianity becomes virtually separated from his Clan and it seems probable that his offsprings become permanently separated and are absorbed in the General Population.[1]

In his report on the 1944 census Mr. Kœnig merely said:

The 'other Indian' class, i.e., the class made up of Indians born outside the Colony has become so small that it was not considered worth while tabulating it separately.[2]

Thus, while a hundred years ago it did not seem worth while to distinguish between Indians born in Mauritius and elsewhere because the former were so few it is now no longer worth while to make this distinction because the latter have practically died out.

The number of Indians shown as born outside and inside Mauritius had developed in fact as follows:[3]

Born	*1851*	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
Outside .	72,180	172,425	155,367	135,595	99,329	60,208	35,396	17,056	7,044	1,213
Inside .	5,816	20,209	60,891	113,398	156,591	198,878	222,301	248,468	261,605	264,034

Table 29 summarizes the numbers allocated at various censuses to the General Population (including Chinese) and to the Indian Population. It appears that the General Population oscillated at the censuses of 1846–1921 between 99,784 (1871) and 117,416 (1861) without showing any definite trend, and increased thereafter to 124,589 in 1931 and to 160,000 in 1944. The Indian Population, on the other hand, increased from 56,245 in 1846 to 248,993 in 1881 and oscillated thereafter between 255,920 (1891) and 268,649 (1931).

As shown above, the Commissioner of the 1931 census had pointed out that 'the "General Population" are continually recruiting members from the "Indo Mauritian"'. In his report on the 1944 census he said:

The greater part of the increase in population bears on the General. A certain proportion of this increase probably comes from the transfer of former members of the Indian population to the General.[4]

This statement is not correct. (1) The total population increased by only 25,947, while the General Population, including Chinese, increased by 29,349 and, excluding Chinese, by 27,390. (2) A certain proportion of this increase comes, not probably, but evidently, from the transfer of former members of the Indian to the General Population. While the Indian Population included in 1931 14,953 Christians, it included in 1944

[1] *Census Report 1931*, p. 6. This statement is somewhat misleading. The 'Other Indians' are Indians born outside the Colony; they are, with few exceptions, not absorbed in the Indo-Mauritian population but are rapidly dying out.

[2] Ibid. *1944*, p. 5.

[3] See ibid. *1921*, p. 3; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, p. 14. I doubt whether the figures for 1861 and 1871 of persons born outside Mauritius are strictly comparable. The figure for 1861 is identical with that given for persons born in India. In 1871 only 148,635 persons were returned as born in India; see Table 30 below.

[4] Ibid. *1944*, p. 3.

TABLE 29. *General and Indian Population, Mauritius 1846–1944*[1]

Year	*General*	*Indian*	*Total*	*General per cent.*	*Indian per cent.*
1846	102,217	56,245	158,462	64·5	35·5
1851	102,827	77,996	180,823	56·9	43·1
1861	117,416	192,634	310,050	37·9	62·1
1871	99,784	216,258	316,042	31·6	68·4
1881	110,881	248,993	359,874	30·8	69·2
1891	114,668	255,920	370,588	30·9	69·1
1901	111,937	259,086	371,023	30·2	69·8
1911	111,094	257,697	368,791	30·1	69·9
1921	110,961	265,524	376,485	29·5	70·5
1931	124,589	268,649	393,238	31·7	68·3
1944	153,938	265,247	419,185	36·7	63·3
1944[2]	159,938	265,247	425,185	37·6	62·4

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, p. 3.
[2] Eliminating the effects of the war on the military inside and outside Mauritius.

only 3,725.[1] The increase in the General Population was due in part also to the influx of men in the services and of refugees. While the General Population in 1931 included only 391 persons born in Europe, it included 2,351 in 1944.

In order to obtain a clearer insight into the development between 1921 and 1944 it will be useful to subdivide the population still further:[2]

		General Population excluding Chinese		*Indian Population*				
Year	*Sex*	*Not born in Europe*	*Born in Europe*	*Hindu and Mohammedan*[1]	*Other*	*Total*	*Chinese Population*	*Total*
1921	Male .	49,472	253	248,322	17,202	139,150	5,233	194,108
	Female	54,321	170			126,374	1,512	182,377
1931	Male .	54,512	221	253,660	14,989	139,533	6,343	200,609
	Female	60,763	170			129,116	2,580	192,629
1944	Male .	65,658	1,478	134,502	1,880	136,382	6,808	210,326
	Female	75,047	873	127,020	1,845	128,865	4,074	208,859

[1] Including in 1921: 206 Parsis and 1,282 religion not stated; in 1931: 9 Parsis and 867 religion not stated.

It appears that while the total number of persons returned as Indians had remained stationary the number of Hindus and Mohammedans returned as Indians increased from 248,322 in 1921 to 253,660 in 1931 and to 261,522 in 1944. This increase, to be sure, is small, but it does not represent the total increase among the Indians, since, unlike in earlier times, practically all Indians who have recently become Christians have been immediately absorbed into the General Population. If, on the other hand,

[1] See ibid. *1931*, p. 19; *1944*, p. 22. The transfer of Indian Christians to the General Population was apparently less marked prior to 1931. The numbers of Christians included in the Indian Population in 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911, and 1921 were 9,262, 12,010, 11,578, 14,116, and 17,093 respectively (see ibid. *1881*, p. 36; *1921*, p. 9).
[2] See ibid. *1921*, Appendixes, p. cvi; *1931*, pp. 13, 19; *1944*, pp. 5, 13, 22.

we throw together (1) the General Population, excluding Chinese and persons born in Europe, and (2) the persons returned as Indians, excluding Hindus and Mohammedans, we find in this group an increase from 120,995 in 1921 to 130,264 in 1931, and to 144,430—or, correcting for the military—to about 150,500 in 1944. The large increase between the last two censuses is the more puzzling as it did not affect both sexes to the same degree. If we assume that the ratio of males to females among the non-Hindu and non-Mohammedan Indians was the same in 1931 as in 1944 the number of males would have increased from 62,077 to about 73,500 or by 19 per cent., while the number of females would have risen only from 68,187 to 76,892 or by 13 per cent. I cannot suggest a plausible explanation for this divergency.

As regards the Chinese, the statistics are still more confusing. The numbers of 'Chinese' given in the most recent census report are as follows:[1]

1861	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
1,552	2,287	3,558	3,151	3,515	3,662	6,745	8,923	10,882

Actually these figures show:

for 1861 persons of Chinese nationality;[2]

for 1871–91 persons born in China;[3]

for 1901 persons born in China, Hong Kong, and Singapore;[4]

for 1911–44 all persons of Chinese race, whether born in China, Hong Kong, Mauritius or elsewhere.[5]

The figures, therefore, are not comparable. The apparently great increase from 1861 to 1871 was largely fictitious; the number of persons born in China increased only from 1,904 to 2,287. Between 1891 and 1901 the number of persons born in China did not increase at all; it decreased from 3,151 to 3,119.[6] Nor was there any increase between 1901 and 1911; the number of persons born in China decreased from 3,119 to 2,968 (and the number of persons born in Hong Kong from 377 to 213). While the 1944 census report shows an increase in the number of 'Chinese' since 1861 from 1,552 to 10,882, the number of persons of Chinese nationality increased only from 1,552 to 4,619, and the number of persons born in China from 1,904 to 4,863. But there was, of course, a much larger increase in the number of people of Chinese race, though it was smaller than recent census reports suggest.

The figures for races, therefore, have to be treated with great caution. It is valuable to have separate data for Indians and compare them with similar data for the General Population—although the latter are a haphazard mixture of all kinds of people—because the Indians appearing as

[1] *Census Report 1944*, p. 5.

[2] See ibid. *1861*, Appendix No. 7.

[3] See ibid. *1871*, part i, Appendixes, pp. 97–118; *1881*, p. 34; *1891*, p. 29.

[4] See ibid. *1901*, p. 18. The figures, by mistake, exclude the 6 persons born in Singapore and enumerated in Port Louis, but include the 6 persons born in China and enumerated in Rodrigues (see ibid., pp. 7, 82–101).

[5] See ibid. *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, p. lvi; *1921*, Appendixes, pp. cvi–cviii; *1931*, p. 14; *1944*, p. 14.

[6] Ibid. *1901*, p. 21, called attention to this 'nett decrease of 32'.

such in the statistics constitute a homogeneous group. But it is deceptive to compare the increase or decrease in the number of people allocated to Indians and to the General Population because so many Indians have been gradually absorbed into the General Population. It is also risky, for example, to compare the 'birth-rates' and 'death-rates' of the Indian and of the General Population.[1]

2. *Birthplace*

Prior to the abolition of the slave-trade the vast majority of the population were born outside the Colony. In 1806 only 28 per cent. of the slaves were born in Mauritius. By 1827 the proportion had risen to 50 per cent. No figures are available for the free population,[2] but there is no doubt that when slavery was abolished in 1835 a considerable majority of the total population were colony-born. Owing to the large influx of Indians the proportion was reduced by 1852 to one-half and by 1861 to three-eighths. The proportion increased again with the decline in Indian immigration. At the decennial censuses of 1871–1931 the percentage of persons born in Mauritius amounted to 60, 71, 82, 89, 94, and 96 respectively, and in 1944 to 98. From 1859 to 1865 more than one-half of the population were born in India; by 1944 the proportion had dropped below 0·3 per cent. The proportion of persons born neither in Mauritius nor in India was 6 per cent. at the censuses of 1861 and 1871, but has been below 3 per cent. at all subsequent censuses.

Of the 393,238 persons enumerated in 1931, 379,399 were born in the Colony, 322 in other British possessions in Africa, 504 elsewhere in Africa, 231 in the United Kingdom and Ireland, 160 elsewhere in Europe (129 in France), 6,857 in India, 256 in other British possessions in Asia, 5,309 elsewhere in Asia (5,304 in China), 12 in America, and 15 in Oceania.

Of the 419,185 persons enumerated in 1944, 410,232 were born in the Colony, 174 in other British possessions in Africa, 265 elsewhere in Africa, 850 in the United Kingdom and Ireland, 1,500 elsewhere in Europe, 1,147 in India, 28 in other British possessions in Asia, 4,878 elsewhere in Asia (4,863 in China), 26 in America, and 9 in Oceania. The increase in the number of persons born in Europe was due to the fact that the 1944 figures include members of the Royal Naval and Air Forces stationed in the island at the time of the census, and in addition numerous refugees.[3]

[1] See pp. 871, 882 below.

[2] Chapotin, *Topographie médicale de l'Ile de France* (1812) says (p. 35) that the majority of the Whites were born in Europe.

[3] See Colony of Mauritius, *Interim Report on the Detainment Camp for the period 26th Dec., 1940 to 30th Sept., 1941*, p. 1: 'Towards the end of 1940, His Majesty's Government appealed to the Government of Mauritius to assist them in their task of giving asylum to a considerable number of European Jews who seeking refuge from their Nazi oppressors, were attempting to enter Palestine as illegal immigrants. The Government and people of Mauritius promptly responded to this appeal and on the 27th December, 1940, 1,580 Jewish detainees arrived in the Colony.' Most of the refugees stayed in Mauritius until the summer of 1945. On 22 Aug. 1945, Secretary of State Hall stated in the House of Commons: 'A number of the refugees joined the Czech and Polish Forces, the Pioneer Corps and the Jewish Brigade Group. All the remaining refugees, numbering some 1,300, have now left Mauritius and are due to arrive in Palestine within the next few days.' (*Hansard Official Report*, vol. cccxiii, col. 659.)

TABLE 30. *Population by Birthplace, Mauritius 1851–1944*[1]

Birthplace	*1851*	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
Mauritius	102,995	116,889	143,938	216,619	264,176	305,082	328,480	353,539	378,931	409,789
Elsewhere Africa		7,461	5,326	3,298	2,775	1,817	1,201	621	1,320	883
India	72,356	172,425	148,635	134,432	99,000	59,389	35,219	17,037	6,857	1,147
China		1,904	2,287	3,558	3,151	3,119	2,968	4,173	5,304	4,863
Hong Kong		6,585	7,635	142	216	377	213	409	226	14
Elsewhere Asia					144	271	56		35	41
United Kingdom	2,115[2]	1,331	963	548	408	422	277	251	230	850
France	1,739	1,176	1,048	604	489	357	202	132	129	76
Elsewhere Europe		343	1,742	225	130	112	65	42	35	1,424
America	33	140	873	88	55	43	27	21	12	26
Oceania	—	16	38	21	30	34	27	16	15	9
Not stated	1,585	1,780	3,557	339	14	—	56	244	144	63
Total	180,823	310,050	316,042	359,874	370,588	371,023	368,791	376,485	393,238	419,185

[1] See *Census Report 1861*, Appendix No. 5; *1871*, Part i, Appendixes, pp. 97–118; *1881*, p. 34; *1891*, pp. 28–9; *1901*, pp. 18–19; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. lvi–lviii; *1921*, p. 9, Appendixes, p. cviii; *1931*. pp. 13–14; *1944*, pp. 12–14.

[2] Including other British possessions in Europe.

TABLE 31. *Population by Birthplace, Mauritius 1931*[1]

Birthplace	General Population excl. Chinese		Indian Population		Chinese		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Mauritius and Dep.	54,142	60,306	134,845	126,760	1,835	1,511	379,399
Kenya	—	—	12	9	—	—	21
St. Helena	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Seychelles	75	43	—	—	—	3	121
Union of S. Africa	34	45	44	28	2	2	155
Zanzibar	1	1	15	7	—	—	24
Belgian Congo	2	1	—	—	—	—	3
Egypt	5	4	—	—	—	—	9
Madagascar	43	70	30	19	1	3	166
Portuguese E. Africa	19	5	—	—	—	—	24
Réunion	63	182	29	16	5	7	302
Africa not specified	15	11	—	—	—	—	26
Africa Total	54,399	60,669	134,975	126,839	1,843	1,526	380,251
England	91	65	—	—	—	—	156
Scotland	21	29	—	—	—	—	50
Ireland	15	9	—	—	—	—	24
Jersey	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Malta	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Belgium	3	1	—	—	—	—	4
Czechoslovakia	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Denmark	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
France	69	60	—	—	—	—	129
Germany	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
Holland	—	—	—	—	3	—	3
Italy	5	3	—	—	—	—	8
Portugal	4	—	—	—	—	—	4
Rumania	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Russia	2	1	—	—	—	—	3
Spain	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Sweden	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Switzerland	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Europe not specified	2	1	—	—	—	—	3
Europe Total	221	170	—	—	3	—	394
Ceylon	—	—	14	8	—	—	22
Fed. Malay States	1	—	—	—	4	3	8
Hong Kong	—	—	—	—	170	56	226
India	16	25	4,544	2,269	2	1	6,857
China	1	—	—	—	4,313	990	5,304
French Indo-China	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
Java	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Japan	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
Asia Total	19	28	4,558	2,277	4,489	1,051	12,422
Canada	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
West Indies	2	2	—	—	—	—	4
Chile	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
U.S. of America	4	1	—	—	—	—	5
America Total	9	3	—	—	—	—	12
Australia	9	5	—	—	—	—	14
New Zealand	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Oceania Total	9	6	—	—	—	—	15
Not stated	76	57	—	—	8	3	144
Total	54,733	60,933	139,533	129,116	6,343	2,580	393,238

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 13–14.

TABLE 32. *Population by Birthplace, Mauritius 1944*[1]

Birthplace	General Population excl. Chinese		Indian Population		Chinese		Total
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	
Mauritius and Dependencies	65,380	74,798	135,588	128,469	3,100	2,897	410,232
Seychelles	38	28	1	4	—	—	71
Union of South Africa	24	24	5	9	1	—	63
Other British Poss. in Africa	22[a]	16[a]	2[a]	—	—	—	40
Algeria	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Egypt	—	2	—	—	—	—	2
Madagascar	32	47	11	5	1	—	96
Portuguese East Africa	5	9	—	—	—	—	14
Réunion	31	89	9	16	2	4	151
Tunisia	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Africa not specified	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Africa Total	65,532	75,016	135,616	128,503	3,104	2,901	410,672
England	580	130	—	—	1	—	711
Wales	10	2	—	—	—	—	12
Scotland	61	10	—	—	—	—	71
Jersey	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Northern Ireland	4	—	—	—	—	—	4
Ireland	36	16	—	—	—	—	52
Malta	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
Austria	371	266	—	—	—	—	637
Belgium	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
Czechoslovakia	103	83	—	—	—	—	186
Danzig	63	67	—	—	—	—	130
Denmark	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Finland	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
France	30	44	1	—	—	1	76
Germany	40	47	—	—	—	—	87
Holland	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Hungary	3	—	—	—	—	—	3
Italy	2	5	—	—	—	—	7
Latvia	1	1	—	—	—	—	2
Norway	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Poland	114	42	—	—	—	—	156
Portugal	5	4	—	—	—	—	9
Rumania	15	3	—	—	—	—	18
Russia	11	3	—	—	—	—	14
Switzerland	5	2	—	—	—	—	7
Europe not specified	17	141	—	—	—	1	159
Europe Total	1,477	869	1	—	1	2	2,350
Aden	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Burma	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Ceylon	4	—	—	—	—	—	4
Hong Kong	1	1	—	—	11	1	14
India	23	10	759	355	—	—	1,147
Malaya	4	3	—	—	1	—	8
China	4	1	—	—	3,690	1,168	4,863
French Indo-China	—	3	—	—	1	—	4
Pondicherry	—	1	2	1	—	—	4
Siam	—	—	—	—	—	1	1
Syria	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Turkey	1	4	—	—	—	—	5
Asia not specified	2	1	4	5	—	—	12
Asia Total	42	24	765	361	3,703	1,170	6,065
Antigua	—	1	—	—	—	—	1
Barbados	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
British Guiana	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
Canada	5	—	—	—	—	—	5
Trinidad	1	3	—	—	—	—	4
Argentine	—	—	—	1	—	—	1
Chili	1	—	—	—	—	—	1
Martinique	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
U.S. of America	7	1	—	—	—	1	9
America Total	19	5	—	1	—	1	26
Australia	3	6	—	—	—	—	9
Not stated	63	—	—	—	—	—	63
Total	67,136	75,920	136,382	128,865	6,808	4,074	419,185

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 13–14.
[a] 1 Basutoland, 2 Rhodesia, 1 Tanganyika, 2 Zambesia, 10 East Africa, 6 West Africa. [a] East Africa.

The number of people born in Austria, Czechoslovakia, Danzig, Germany, and Poland had increased between 1931 and 1944 from 3 to 1,196. There were in addition 159 persons entered as born 'in Europe not specified' nearly all of whom were probably also born in one of those five countries.

3. *Nationality*

Of the 310,050 persons enumerated in 1861, 303,808 were British, 2,291 French, 1,552 Chinese, 452 Malagasy, while only 305 claimed another nationality.[1]

TABLE 33. *Population by Nationality, Mauritius 1931 and 1944*[1]

Nationality	*1931*		*1944*	
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
British	196,174	191,453	206,028	206,887
Austrian	—	—	369	265
Belgian	3	1	1	1
Chilian	—	—	1	—
Chinese	4,313	991	3,454	1,165
Czech	—	—	111	82
Egyptian	1	—	—	—
Finnish	—	—	1	—
French	106	180	86	140
German	1	—	103	113
Greek	2	2	—	—
Hungarian	—	—	3	2
Italian	—	2	—	4
Latvian	—	—	1	1
Polish	—	—	114	40
Portuguese	3	—	5	3
Rumanian	1	—	14	3
Russian	—	—	11	3
Spanish	1	—	—	—
Swiss	4	—	6	2
Syrian	—	—	1	2
Turkish	—	—	1	4
U.S.A. citizen	—	—	2	1
Stateless	—	—	14	141
Total	200,609	192,629	210,326	208,859

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 14; *1944*, p. 15.

The census reports for 1871, 1881, 1891, and 1901 all gave wrong figures for nationalities, counting the persons born in British possessions as British, the persons born in French possessions as French, &c.[2] None of the compilers seems to have noted this mistake, which was discovered by the Commissioner for the 1911 census. He wrote:

> The question of nationality in this as in former Census returns is not altogether satisfactory, and judging from the returns in Table VI of the 1901 Census report, the nationalities appear to have been determined by the compilers from the place of birth. An examination of the Table (1901) will show that the publication of the returns in the extended form there adopted is redundant and it has been considered

[1] See *Census Report 1861*, Appendix No. 7.

[2] See ibid. *1871*, Part i, Appendixes, pp. 97–119; *1881*, Appendixes, pp. 445–65; *1891*, Appendices, pp. 300–54; *1901*, pp. 82–102.

more rational to collect them for the whole Island under class and sex. The results in this form are easier of interpretation.

A large number of the Chinese as well as all French priests of the Civil Establishment are naturalised British subjects.[1]

But his report does not contain a single figure concerning nationality, and the same is true of his report on the 1921 census.

According to the 1931 census, the British subjects numbered 387,627. Of the 5,611 foreigners 5,304 were Chinese and 286 French,[2] while only 21 had another nationality.

By 1944 the number of British had increased to 412,915, while the number of Chinese had decreased to 4,619 and the number of French to 226. There were in addition 634 Austrians, 216 Germans, 193 Czechs, 154 Poles, 73 of another nationality, and 155 stateless persons.[3]

4. *Sex*

The number of males has always exceeded the number of females. After the abolition of the slave trade the preponderance of males decreased slightly, but it increased enormously when masses of Indian coolies were imported. The censuses of 1846, 1851, and 1861 showed nearly twice as many males as females. But in 1891 there were 4 females for each 5 males, and at the censuses of 1901–44 the ratios of females to 100 males were 85·9, 90·0, 94·0, 96·0, and 99·3. The latter figure, however, was swelled through the absence of numerous Mauritians in the Forces. Correcting for the military, the ratio in 1944 was only slightly higher then in 1931.

TABLE 34. *Population by Sex, Mauritius 1861–1944*[1]

	General Population excl. Chinese		*Indo-Mauritians*		*Other Indians*		*Chinese*	
Year	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
1861	59,796	56,068	13,178	7,031	128,437	43,988	1,550	2
1871	49,487	48,010	31,387	29,504	110,417	44,950	2,284	3
1881	53,754	53,569	57,608	55,790	93,744	41,851	3,549	9
1891	55,397	56,120	80,653	75,938	66,846	32,483	3,142	9
1901	52,995	55,427	102,970	95,908	40,130	20,078	3,457	58
1911	51,808	55,624	115,216	107,085	23,758	11,638	3,313	349
1921	49,725	54,491	127,843	120,625	11,307	5,749	5,233	1,512
1931	54,733	60,933	134,845	126,760	4,688	2,356	6,343	2,580
1944	67,136	75,920	135,580	128,454	802	411	6,808	4,074

[1] See *Census Report 1861*, p. 8, Appendix No. 7; *1871*, Part i, p. 20; *1881*, p. 33; *1891*, p. 13; *1901*, p. 9; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, p. iv; *1921*, Appendixes, p. lxxix; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, pp. 5, 14.

Among the General Population (excluding Chinese) the excess of males over females which had still been considerable in the 1850s changed into a slight excess of females in the 1880s. In 1891–1944 the ratios of females

[1] *Census Report 1911*, p. xiv.

[2] '. . . those under the head French comprize natives of Réunion and Madagascar who have returned themselves as French citizens together with a few Mauritians of French descent, who have preserved their French nationality' (ibid. *1931*, p. 13).

[3] See also in this connexion *Interim Report on the Detainment Camp 1940–1*, pp. 1, 9; *1941–2*, pp. 1, 10; *1943–4*, pp. 1–2.

to 100 males were 101·3, 104·6, 107·4, 109·6, 111·3, and 113·1. Correcting for the military, there were in 1944 only 104 females to 100 males. I do not know of any satisfactory explanation for the great decline in the excess of females between 1931 and 1944.[1]

Among the Indian population there were at first very few women, and in 1871 there were still only 52·5 females to 100 males. In 1891–1944 the ratios were 73·5, 81·1, 85·4, 90·8, 92·5, and 94·5 respectively.

Among the Chinese there were hardly any women before the end of the last century. In 1911–44 the ratios of females to 100 males were 10·5, 28·9, 40·7, and 59·8. The large increase in the proportion of females between 1931 and 1944 was due mainly to the birth of numerous Chinese children in Mauritius. While the number of females born in Asia increased from 1,051 to 1,170 the number of Colony-born rose from 1,511 to 2,897.

5. *Age*

Introduction. A characteristic trait of the population of Mauritius, for long periods, was the large preponderance of adults.

During the first occupation by the Dutch (1638–58) there were probably never more than a couple of children in the island. But when the Dutch had retaken possession (1664) and new settlers arrived, the position changed. In 1679 there were 22 children among a total population of 153, and in 1706 about 75 among a total population of nearly 400.[2]

Under the French régime children at first were again scarce. In 1725 there were probably not more than 13 among a total population of 213.[3] But the arrival of settlers and of numerous female slaves altered the situation. In 1735 there were 226 children among a population of 838, and in 1740, 896 children among a population of 2,991.[4] Nothing seems to be known about the age composition of the population between 1740 and 1785, but the available data are more ample for the last 25 years of the French administration.[5] The numbers and percentages of children in the island appear to have been as follows:

	Numbers				*Per cent.*			
Year	*Whites*	*Free Coloured*	*Slaves*	*Total*	*Whites*	*Free Coloured*	*Slaves*	*Total*
1785	1,363	973	6,420	8,756	40	46	20	23
1788	1,839	1,295	7,798	10,932	41	53	21	24
1806[1]	2,785	4,001	13,937	20,723	41	56	23	28

[1] Figures for slaves refer to 1809.

It appears that the proportion of children was large among the Whites and enormous among the Free Coloured, but there were then probably

[1] See p. 808 above.
[2] See p. 745 above. The 'free settlers' comprised 33 men, 25 women, and 70 children.
[3] See p. 751 above.
[4] The population figures for 1735 and 1740 apparently exclude the military and civilian employees of the Company; see p. 755 above. But even including those employees, the proportion of children would have been nearly one-quarter in 1735 and about two-sevenths in 1740.
[5] See Tables 3–6, 8 above.

few white women past child-bearing age, and the difference between the proportion of children among the Free Coloured and the Whites was due entirely to the great preponderance of females among the adult Free Coloured.[1] The proportion of children among the slaves was small, even considering the vast excess of men over women. Since the slaves constituted the bulk of the population, the proportion of children was small also among the total population. It should be realized, however, that the data for slaves seem to have been particularly defective as regards children.

The returns for the first 25 years of British administration[2] may be summarized as follows:

	Numbers				*Per cent.*			
Year	*Whites*	*Free Coloured*	*Slaves*	*Total*	*Whites*	*Free Coloured*	*Slaves*	*Total*
1814	3,105	4,892	14,395	22,392	44	52	18	24
1816	2,800	4,705	..	..	39	47	..	..
1817	3,288	6,111	14,660	24,059	44	56	18	25
1819	3,595	7,200	..	..	45	62	..	..
1821	..	7,635	7,528	..	..	58	11	..
1822	..	7,988	7,221	..	..	59	11	..
1823	..	8,356	7,456	..	..	59	12	..
1824	..	8,745	7,903	..	..	60	12	..
1825	3,569	9,063	12,644	25,276	45	61	20	29
1826	..	9,178	8,906	..	..	59	14	..
1830	2,596	7,818	..	..	32	43	..	..

The children of Whites and of Free Coloured comprise apparently in each year the persons under 15 years of age. The children of slaves comprise in 1817 and 1825 (and probably also in 1814) all persons under 15 and in 1821–4 (and probably also in 1826) the children under 7. It seems that, at least between 1810 and 1825, the proportion of children did not change essentially for any of the three groups. It remained large for the Whites, enormous for the Free Coloured, and small for the Slaves.[3]

Censuses 1846–1944. In 1846 the total population was apparently subdivided into those under 1, 1 to 9, 10 to 14, 15 to 19, 20 to 39, 40 to 59, 60 to 79, 80 to 99, and 100 or more. For 1851 and 1861 the total males and females are subdivided into those under 1, 1 to 4, 5 to 9, 10 to 14, &c. From 1871 to 1891 the classification is the same, but separate figures are given for the General and the Indian Population (in 1891 also for Indo-Mauritians). For 1901 the males and females are sub-divided into those under 1, 1 to 5, 6 to 10, &c., 96–99, 100, and 'over 100', separate figures being given for the General Population (excluding pure Africans and Chinese), pure Africans, Indo-Mauritians, Other Indians, and Chinese. The figures are not comparable with those of the other censuses as the age

[1] The ratio of children to women was in fact smaller among the Free Coloured than among the Whites.

[2] See Tables 12–14, 16, 18 above.

[3] Governor Farquhar, in an address to the inhabitants of the Colony (3 July 1822), said that on a recent journey he had found a 'quite remarkable number of children in that class' (*Recueil des Lois 1822*, p. 67). But there is no statistical evidence to support this impression.

classification had been changed.[1] For 1911–31 the males and females were given for each year of age, distinguishing the General Population, Indo-Mauritians, Other Indians, and Chinese. For 1944 the classification was the same, but no distinction was made between Indo-Mauritians and Other Indians. The results for 1851–1944 are summarized in Tables 35–42.[2]

The age returns have been inaccurate in three respects:

(1) A considerable number of infants were omitted or entered as over 1 year old. A comparison of the numbers of births in the year preceding the census[3] and the numbers of children returned as under 1 year yields the following results:

	1871	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
				General Population				
Births	4,276	4,316	4,222	3,920	4,010	4,107	4,633	4,704
Under 1	3,694	3,682	3,258	3,129	3,108	3,155	3,362	3,734
Per cent.	86	85	77	80	78	77	73	79
				Indian Population				
Births	7,096	8,942	9,273	10,043	9,737	9,469	7,805	11,227
Under 1	5,654	7,341	6,744	6,691	6,756	7,283	5,542	8,405
Per cent.	80	82	73	67	69	77	71	75

In every single case from 1891 onwards, the number of infants enumerated at the census was much smaller than the number of children born in the preceding year and presumably surviving on census date. In 1891 the infants enumerated were considerably less than in 1881, although the number of births among the General Population had declined very little while it had increased among the Indians. The increases in the numbers of infant deaths were not so large as to offer a satisfactory explanation. In 1901 the numbers of enumerated infants were smaller still. The explanation in the case of the General Population is that the number of births had decreased and the number of infant deaths had increased. As regards the Indian Population the Census Commissioner said:

> A comparison of these age-figures shows that again the number of children under one year has decreased, the only deduction to be drawn from which is, that the twelve months embraced in the period April 1900 to April 1901 was deadly to infantile life.[4]

He then showed that the proportion of infants among the Indian

[1] The Registrar-General who was Census Commissioner did not notice the change and made detailed comparison with the results of the earlier censuses (see *Census Report 1901*, pp. 21–4). He was not aware of the fact that the age-group 1 to 5 comprised 5 years while the age-group 1 to 4 included only 4.

[2] *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, pp. 7–9, shows for each year from 1871 to 1911 the estimated number of males and females among the General and the Indian Population, subdivided into those under 5, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–4, 25–34, 35–44, &c. I have used some of the figures in computing reproduction rates.

[3] I have assumed that this number was equal (1) in 1871–1911 to two-thirds of the births registered in the calendar year preceding the census plus one-third of the births registered in the census year, (2) in 1921 and 1944 to one-half plus one-half, (3) in 1931 to seven-twelfths plus five-twelfths respectively.

[4] *Census Report 1901*, p. 23.

TABLE 36. *Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1851–1911*[1]

Age Years	*1851*	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*
			MALES			
Under 1	1,827	3,691	4,691	5,693	5,114	4,947
1–4	7,616	13,110	13,387	17,825	19,534	18,296
5–9	8,351	14,247	17,672	19,424	21,838	22,401
10–14	6,729	13,924	15,595	16,832	20,784	21,750
15–19	7,720	15,741	13,443	15,595	18,405	18,779
20–4	13,742	22,178	15,728	16,583	17,415	18,682
25–9	17,878	26,964	19,417	18,602	16,938	17,839
30–4	15,875	29,103	22,741	18,927	15,209	15,835
35–9	11,525	22,603	22,339	18,865	14,658	13,844
40–4	8,424	14,786	20,058	18,538	13,598	11,145
45–9	5,358	8,724	12,164	14,783	12,149	8,764
50–4	4,973	6,024	6,681	12,046	11,332	7,044
55–9	2,581	3,105	3,106	6,916	7,506	4,736
60–4	2,317	2,984	2,138	3,491	6,164	4,084
65–9	889	1,213	820	1,622	2,693	2,204
70 and more	1,412	1,583	1,328	1,520	2,183	2,903
Not stated	2,124	2,981	2,267	1.393	518	842
Total	119,341	202,961	193,575	208,655	206,038	194,095
			FEMALES			
Under 1	1,865	3,891	4,657	5,330	4,888	4,917
1–4	7,585	13,231	12,967	17,367	18,672	18,158
5–9	7,939	12,968	16,233	18,719	21,428	21,570
10–14	5,785	10,372	13,722	15,426	19,319	20,231
15–19	5,710	10,124	11,713	15,499	17,776	18,695
20–4	6,194	11,196	11,124	14,482	15,056	17,932
25–9	5,981	11,792	10,898	13,106	13,867	15,966
30–4	4,991	9,808	10,419	11,128	11,500	13,060
35–9	3,650	6,760	9,018	9,790	9,821	10,850
40–4	3,223	5,084	7,226	8,595	7,892	8,318
45–9	2,408	3,167	4,541	7,167	6,807	6,940
50–4	2,339	2,747	3,426	5,353	6,056	5,844
55–9	1,163	1,531	1,670	3,381	4,030	3,666
60–4	1,061	1,617	1,575	2,153	3,252	3,246
65–9	439	685	761	1,171	1,698	1,833
70 and more	873	969	1,236	1,527	2,083	2,826
Not stated	276	1,147	1,281	1,025	405	644
Total	61,482	107,089	122,467	151,219	164,550	174,696

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, Appendices, pp. 206–7; *1911*, pp. viii–ix, Statistical Abstracts, pp. xliv–lii.

The proportion of males between 15 and 50 among the total population has always been rather high, since neither children, nor women, nor old men were very numerous. It was enormous when the importation of coolies had got in full swing, and amounted according to the censuses of 1851 and 1861 to about 45 per cent. By 1871 it had declined to 40 per cent., and has been below 30 per cent. at every census from 1891 onwards. In 1861, when Mauritius had 310,000 inhabitants, there were 142,000 men between 15 and 50 in the island.[1] At the outbreak of the epidemic of 1867

[1] Some figures in the text are higher than those in the tables because I take account in the text of the persons whose ages were not stated.

their number may have been nearly 155,000. But in 1871 there were only 127,000, and their number declined still further until in 1931 there were only 103,000 men between 15 and 50 among a total population of 393,000. In recent years the number increased again and was 118,000 in 1944.

The proportion of females between 15 and 50 has always been rather low. It amounted to only 18 per cent. in 1851, but increased gradually to 25 per cent. in 1891, from when on it has remained constant. While the number of males at that age is much lower now than it was in 1861 the number of females is nearly twice as large.

TABLE 37. *Indian Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1871–1911*[1]

Age Years	*Males*				*Females*			
	1871	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*
Under 1	2,813	3,819	3,449	3,392	2,841	3,522	3,295	3,364
1–4	8,814	12,351	14,079	13,246	8,561	11,846	13,134	13,109
5–9	11,459	13,127	15,468	16,327	10,230	12,462	14,891	15,793
10–14	9,576	11,525	14,438	16,013	7,847	10,136	12,848	14,624
15–19	8,602	10,350	12,540	13,687	6,152	9,784	11,447	13,100
20–4	10,564	11,101	11,875	13,390	6,049	9,061	9,738	12,235
25–9	14,225	13,196	11,596	12,728	6,519	8,182	8,818	10,706
30–4	18,756	13,908	10,624	11,511	7,281	7,064	7,454	8,786
35 9	19,021	14,250	10,482	9,834	6,392	6,172	6,132	6,950
40–4	17,326	15,089	9,852	7,920	4,957	5,934	5,034	5,493
45–9	9,840	11,980	8,970	5,992	2,759	4,925	4,341	4,225
50–4	4,956	9,921	9,155	4,831	1,948	3,537	4,181	3,495
55-9	2,077	5,533	6,163	3,139	807	2,025	2,768	2,034
60–4	1,188	2,467	5,051	2,854	630	1,152	2,126	1,910
65–9	322	1,001	2,056	1,470	190	531	971	941
70 and more	275	610	1,258	2,049	223	454	916	1,574
Not stated	1,990	1,124	443	591	1,068	854	327	384
Total	141,804	151,352	147,499	138,974	74,454	97,641	108,421	118,723

[1] See *Census Report 1871*, Part i, Appendices, p. 49; *1881*, Appendices, pp. 404–11; *1891*, Appendices, pp. 196–205; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. xliv–lii.

The proportion of persons aged 50 years or more fluctuated at the censuses taken from 1851 to 1944 between 7·3 per cent. (1861 and 1871) and 12·7 per cent. (1891). The number of such elderly people increased from 18,000 in 1851 to 47,000 in 1891, but was smaller in 1911, 1921, and 1931. In 1944 it amounted to 52,000. I shall discuss this phenomenon in dealing with the Indian population.

General Population. The proportion of children among the General Population decreased from 37 per cent. in 1871 to 33 per cent. in 1911–21. It increased to 35 per cent. in 1931 but dropped again to 33 per cent. in 1944. The main cause for these changes was the changing birth-rate.

The percentage of males aged 15–49 rose from 27·8 in 1871 to 29·0 in 1881. It decreased to 27·0 in 1911–21 and to 25·4 in 1931, but rose to 27·7 in 1944. The decrease from 1871 to 1911, which occurred in spite of a considerable decrease in the proportion of children, was due mainly to a large increase in the number of young and old women. The decline in

1931 and the rise in 1944 can be explained in part by changes in the birth-rate which affected the proportion of children. But another important cause must have been operative at least in 1931–44, since the number of men aged 15–49, which had oscillated at the censuses of 1881–1931 between 30,000 and 32,500, leapt to about 44,000 in 1944. Excluding Chinese, it rose from 27,500 in 1931 to about 40,500 in 1944. The number of males aged 2 to 36 years among the General Population (excluding Chinese) was 37,500 in 1931. Only if the net immigrants had exceeded the deceased by about 3,000, could the number of men aged 15–49 in 1944 have been

TABLE 38. *General Population (including Chinese) by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1871–1911*[1]

Age Years	*Males*				*Females*			
	1871	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*
Under 1	1,878	1,874	1,665	1,555	1,816	1,808	1,593	1,553
1–4	4,573	5,474	5,455	5,050	4,406	5,521	5,538	5,049
5–9	6,213	6,297	6,370	6,074	6,003	6,257	6,537	5,777
10–14	6,019	5,307	6,346	5,737	5,875	5,290	6,471	5,607
15–19	4,841	5,244	5,865	5,092	5,561	5,715	6,329	5,595
20–4	5,164	5,482	5,540	5,292	5,075	5,421	5,318	5,697
25–9	5,192	5,406	5,342	5,111	4,379	4,924	5,049	5,260
30–4	3,985	5,020	4,585	4,324	3,138	4,064	4,046	4,274
35–9	3,318	4,615	4,176	4,010	2,626	3,618	3,689	3,900
40–4	2,732	3,449	3,746	3,225	2,269	2,661	2,858	2,825
45–9	2,324	2,803	3,179	2,772	1,782	2,242	2,466	2,715
50–4	1,725	2,125	2,177	2,213	1,478	1,816	1,875	2,349
55–9	1,029	1,383	1,343	1,597	863	1,356	1,262	1,632
60–4	950	1,025	1,113	1,230	945	1,001	1,126	1,336
65–9	498	620	637	734	571	641	727	892
70 and more	1,053	910	925	854	1,013	1,072	1,167	1,252
Not stated	277	269	75	251	213	171	78	260
Total	51,771	57,303	58,539	55,121	48,013	53,578	56,129	55,973

[1] See *Census Report 1871*, Part i, Appendices, p. 49; *1881*, Appendices, pp. 404–11; *1891*, Appendices, pp. 196–205; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. xliv–lii.

as high as 40,500. But net immigration was negligible. The total number of males belonging to the General Population (excluding Chinese) and born outside Mauritius was only 1,900 (including those who had arrived prior to the 1931 census). Even if none of those aged 2 to 36 in 1931 had died between 1931 and 1944, the number of those aged 15 to 49 in 1944 would have been 39,000 at the utmost. Assuming that something like 5,000 of the males aged 2 to 36 in 1931 died in the subsequent 13 years, about one-half of the intercensal increase in the number of males aged 15 to 49 would have to be attributed to the transfer in 1944 of Indians to the General Population. But it is hard to believe that the transfer was actually as large.

The percentage of females aged 15–49 rose from 25·0 in 1871 to 27·4 in 1911, but decreased to 25·6 in 1944. The changes up to 1931 were mainly due to changes in the birth-rate in as much as they affected the proportion of children. The (slight) decline between 1931 and 1944 occurred in spite of the fact that the number of women of that age-group increased from

TABLE 39. *Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1921, 1931, and 1944*[1]

Age Years	1921		1931		1944		Age Years	1921		1931		1944	
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.		M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
0	5,214	5,224	4,445	4,459	6,092	6,047	60	1,968	2,065	2,636	2,981	1,887	2,645
1	3,490	3,467	3,715	3,745	4,008	4,080	61	471	451	366	335	498	513
2	4,749	4,778	5,043	4,986	5,053	4,978	62	547	517	500	482	688	875
3	4,597	4,734	5,571	5,579	4,956	5,164	63	453	459	399	407	673	722
4	4,709	4,785	5,317	5,297	5,296	5,136	64	364	417	310	328	611	642
5	5,058	4,771	6,444	5,806	5,294	4,950	65	732	807	964	1,034	877	1,200
6	4,751	4,668	5,823	5,358	4,980	4,819	66	369	365	307	357	436	613
7	5,344	5,519	5,799	6,010	5,008	5,034	67	349	351	307	358	451	561
8	4,865	4,930	5,448	5,528	5,116	5,191	68	314	344	346	371	425	544
9	4,095	4,123	4,474	4,335	4,625	4,663	69	233	253	204	268	301	442
10	5,009	4,738	5,490	5,286	5,293	5,055	70	735	798	937	1,195	690	1,017
11	3,820	3,833	3,575	3,452	4,193	4,060	71	158	168	140	189	180	276
12	4,788	4,479	5,306	4,886	5,035	4,792	72	208	223	242	301	254	425
13	4,045	3,883	3,705	3,749	4,118	4,240	73	126	142	133	157	175	293
14	4,085	3,819	3,845	3,900	4,697	4,658	74	113	129	135	132	158	247
15	3,815	3,933	4,569	4,421	4,663	4,756	75	273	300	323	442	256	440
16	3,970	3,973	4,013	4,277	4,657	4,768	76	88	123	108	155	114	174
17	3,498	3,241	3,612	3,633	4,401	4,651	77	75	93	79	109	87	146
18	4,350	4,368	4,529	4,566	5,370	5,495	78	83	99	69	121	103	190
19	3,504	3,092	3,638	2,970	4,631	4,328	79	56	71	48	63	49	106
20	4,763	5,091	5,264	5,849	5,127	5,886	80	250	328	316	406	173	393
21	3,540	2,930	3,218	2,684	3,795	3,460	81	30	43	28	45	22	64
22	3,962	3,604	4,004	3,591	4,375	4,356	82	34	40	35	67	50	101
23	3,442	3,130	3,405	3,073	3,692	3,718	83	28	41	29	50	30	76
24	2,977	2,776	2,722	2,546	3,431	3,267	84	22	37	36	38	30	79
25	4,252	4,225	5,123	5,288	3,949	4,244	85	48	69	69	64	42	91
26	3,028	2,843	2,774	2,600	2,932	2,986	86	15	37	16	26	16	34
27	2,897	2,714	2,929	2,656	3,285	3,279	87	18	25	18	26	18	42
28	3,237	3,030	3,183	3,087	3,420	3,502	88	11	24	16	17	4	28
29	2,993	2,494	2,094	1,686	2,810	2,649	89	9	11	7	20	6	30
30	4,995	4,909	6,238	6,282	4,742	5,037	90	63	93	57	104	36	60
31	2,124	1,748	1,882	1,401	2,292	1,988	91	3	5	11	8	6	7
32	2,961	2,576	2,675	2,341	3,074	2,815	92	7	9	13	10	8	19
33	2,513	2,029	1,918	1,597	2,717	2,319	93	4	11	9	8	4	5
34	2,269	1,867	1,529	1,325	2,591	2,141	94	3	10	3	5	2	13
35	4,266	3,724	4,656	4,602	3,622	3,806	95	17	21	16	26	5	20
36	2,394	2,113	1,808	1,660	2,503	2,106	96	8	12	5	8	5	10
37	2,272	1,923	1,765	1,552	2,456	2,061	97	4	10	8	8	3	6
38	2,565	2,226	2,435	2,160	2,571	2,307	98	4	12	4	11	3	8
39	2,131	1,663	2,028	1,661	2,415	1,880	99	1	7	6	4	—	6
40	4,487	4,334	5,520	5,679	3,745	4,224	100	12	18	19	35	9	14
41	1,653	1,242	1,071	805	1,691	1,389	101	—	3	1	1	—	1
42	2,249	1,748	1,928	1,707	2,318	1,960	102	5	4	2	4	—	2
43	1,814	1,464	1,463	1,191	2,190	1,728	103	4	1	1	1	—	—
44	1,663	1,405	1,201	1,031	2,396	1,721	104	2	3	1	1	—	1
45	3,436	2,939	3,758	3,450	2,840	2,807	105	6	5	3	6	—	4
46	1,737	1,325	1,231	1,109	1,703	1,367	106	1	1	1	—	—	2
47	1,571	1,193	1,381	1,089	1,755	1,500	107	1	3	—	1	—	—
48	1,947	1,555	1,635	1,519	1,926	1,740	108	—	3	—	2	—	—
49	1,349	1,043	1,124	980	1,658	1,317	109	—	—	1	3	—	1
50	3,114	3,002	4,037	4,184	2,887	3,361	110	—	3	4	1	—	1
51	994	738	823	595	1,253	952	111	2	1	—	1	—	—
52	1,176	984	1,357	1,104	1,995	1,768	112	1	4	—	2	—	—
53	930	740	976	806	1,418	1,232	114	2	—	—	—	—	—
54	915	773	853	810	1,382	1,217	115	2	2	—	—	—	—
55	1,685	1,542	2,114	1,973	1,787	1,913	116	—	—	1	—	—	—
56	880	847	819	705	1,166	1,064	117	1	—	—	—	—	—
57	810	660	746	623	1,036	940	120 and						
58	832	736	709	731	1,002	1,060	more	—	4	3[2]	1[3]	—	1[3]
59	699	593	533	502	812	878	Not						
							stated	598	466	2,027	1,356	751	859

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendices, pp. lxxvii–lxxix; *1931*, pp. 7–8; *1944*, pp. 6–7.
[2] One 120, one 124, one 133. [3] One 120.

TABLE 40. *Population by Sex, Age, and Race, Mauritius 1921 and 1931*[1]

Age Years	General Population		Indo-Mauritians		Other Indians		Chinese		Total		
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	Total
1921											
Under 1	1,464	1,527	3,654	3,626	1	2	95	69	5,214	5,224	10,438
1–4	4,373	4,346	12,850	13,161	36	42	286	215	17,545	17,764	35,309
5–9	6,027	6,166	17,761	17,527	58	59	267	259	24,113	24,011	48,124
10–14	5,619	5,489	15,881	15,065	69	74	178	124	21,747	20,752	42,499
15–19	4,917	5,198	13,750	13,245	142	76	328	88	19,137	18,607	37,744
20–4	4,480	4,940	13,242	12,292	287	163	675	136	18,684	17,531	36,215
25–9	4,044	4,567	11,265	10,422	388	168	710	149	16,407	15,306	31,713
30–4	3,555	3,904	9,890	8,732	738	344	678	149	14,861	13,129	27,990
35–9	3,343	3,965	8,291	7,121	1,279	436	715	127	13,628	11,649	25,277
40–4	2,901	3,285	6,946	6,248	1,526	583	493	77	11,866	10,193	22,059
45–9	2,699	2,924	5,439	4,542	1,450	545	352	44	9,940	8,055	17,995
50–4	1,908	2,159	3,751	3,469	1,281	581	189	28	7,129	6,237	13,366
55–9	1,494	1,799	2,281	2,067	1,014	496	117	16	4,906	4,378	9,284
60–4	1,125	1,541	1,535	1,644	1,082	715	61	9	3,803	3,909	7,712
65–9	735	1,103	521	559	724	449	17	9	1,997	2,120	4,117
70–4	466	685	303	347	553	423	18	5	1,340	1,460	2,800
75–9	244	386	78	111	249	188	4	1	575	686	1,261
80–4	103	203	58	112	201	173	2	1	364	489	853
85–9	39	82	17	14	44	70	1	—	101	166	267
90–4	17	42	9	28	54	58	—	—	80	128	208
95–9	8	28	6	9	20	25	—	—	34	62	96
100–4	7	5	4	7	12	17	—	—	23	29	52
105–9	4	2	2	1	2	9	—	—	8	12	20
110–14	3	3	1	1	1	4	—	—	5	8	13
115–19	2	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	3	2	5
120 and more	—	—	—	1	—	3	—	—	—	4	4
Not stated	148	142	308	274	95	44	47	6	598	466	1,064
Total	49,725	54,491	127,843	120,625	11,307	5,749	5,233	1,512	194,108	182,377	376,485
1931											
Under 1	1,565	1,580	2,771	2,767	1	3	108	109	4,445	4,459	8,904
1–4	5,549	5,469	13,606	13,699	17	15	474	424	19,646	19,607	39,253
5–9	7,636	7,310	19,752	19,297	46	38	554	392	27,988	27,037	55,025
10–14	5,781	5,813	15,704	15,232	53	47	383	181	21,921	21,273	43,194
15–19	5,407	6,331	14,358	13,320	80	49	516	167	20,361	19,867	40,228
20–4	4,710	5,429	12,973	12,000	131	69	799	245	18,613	17,743	36,356
25–9	4,277	4,726	10,895	10,254	172	72	759	265	16,103	15,317	31,420
30–4	3,578	3,952	9,770	8,633	182	101	712	260	14,242	12,946	27,188
35–9	3,430	3,981	8,499	7,351	226	117	537	186	12,692	11,635	24,327
40–4	3,001	3,419	7,259	6,635	440	211	483	148	11,183	10,413	21,596
45–9	2,689	3,039	5,505	4,788	540	224	395	96	9,129	8,147	17,276
50–4	2,140	2,722	4,943	4,436	647	298	316	43	8,046	7,499	15,545
55–9	1,475	1,924	2,872	2,443	458	142	116	25	4,921	4,534	9,455
60–4	1,117	1,600	2,436	2,614	585	308	73	11	4,211	4,533	8,744
65–9	714	1,232	1,131	1,012	263	140	20	4	2,128	2,388	4,516
70–4	487	907	770	874	318	188	12	5	1,587	1,974	3,561
75–9	262	546	220	247	138	93	7	4	627	890	1,517
80–4	125	266	170	222	145	118	4	—	444	606	1,050
85–9	45	100	34	36	46	17	1	--	126	153	279
90–4	22	48	28	44	43	43	—	—	93	135	228
95–9	13	14	12	24	14	20	---	—	39	58	97
100–4	5	8	13	24	6	10	—	—	24	42	66
105–9	1	2	—	2	4	6	—	—	5	12	17
110–14	2	1	—	2	2	3	—	—	4	4	8
115–19	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	1
120 and more	2	1	—	—	1	-	—	—	3	1	4
Not stated	700	513	1,124	804	129	24	74	15	2,027	1,356	3,383
Total	54,733	60,933	134,845	126,760	4,688	2,356	6,343	2,580	200,609	192,629	393,238

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendices, pp. lxxvii–lxxix; *1931*, pp. 7–9.

32,500 to nearly 41,000. But the excess of Indian men allocated to the General Population in 1944 was so large that the *proportion* of women aged 15 to 49 decreased.[1]

TABLE 41. *Population by Sex, Age, and Race, Mauritius 1944*[1]

Age Years	General Population		Indians		Chinese		Total		
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total
Under 1	1,728	1,722	4,241	4,164	123	161	6,092	6,047	12,139
1–4	6,204	6,157	12,395	12,499	714	702	19,313	19,358	38,671
5–9	8,115	8,153	16,066	15,786	842	718	25,023	24,657	49,680
10–14	7,910	7,806	14,804	14,492	622	507	23,336	22,805	46,141
15–19	7,658	8,194	15,651	15,491	413	313	23,722	23,998	47,720
20–4	6,026	7,077	13,952	13,362	442	248	20,420	20,687	41,107
25–9	4,705	6,061	11,030	10,339	661	260	16,396	16,660	33,056
30–4	4,538	5,244	10,227	8,765	651	291	15,416	14,300	29,716
35–9	4,304	4,755	8,682	7,136	581	269	13,567	12,160	25,727
40–4	3,957	4,132	7,858	6,684	525	206	12,340	11,022	23,362
45–9	3,190	3,487	6,265	5,092	427	152	9,882	8,731	18,613
50–4	2,863	3,407	5,708	5,029	314	94	8,885	8,530	17,415
55–9	2,194	2,756	3,394	3,038	215	61	5,803	5,855	11,658
60–4	1,483	2,250	2,723	3,105	146	42	4,352	5,397	9,749
65–9	945	1,780	1,466	1,555	79	25	2,490	3,360	5,850
70–4	552	1,240	882	1,011	23	7	1,457	2,258	3,715
75–9	245	624	357	426	7	6	609	1,056	1,665
80–4	115	385	190	326	—	2	305	713	1,018
85–9	35	157	49	65	2	3	86	225	311
90–4	22	54	32	49	2	1	56	104	160
95–9	5	27	11	23	—	—	18	50	68
100 and more	2	8	7	19	—	—	7	27	34
Not stated	340	444	392	409	19	6	751	859	1,610
Total	67,136	75,920	136,382	128,865	6,808	4,074	210,326	208,859	419,185

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 6–7.

The percentage of people aged 50 and over increased from 10·2 in 1871 to 13·9 in 1944. Part of this increase, to be sure, was due to the decrease in the birth-rate. But the proportion of persons 50 years and over among the adult population had actually increased from 16·2 to 20·7 per cent.

Indian Population. There were at first, of course, very few children among the Indian Population. But by 1871 the proportion had reached 29·2 per cent., and it rose further until in 1931 it amounted to 38·7 per cent. In 1944, however, it dropped to 35·7 per cent. While the adult Indians had increased in 1931–44 by about 5,500, the number of children had decreased by about 9,000. The actual increase of adults was in fact much larger, as will be explained presently. The decrease in the number of children occurred among those aged 3 to 9. There were 54,576 in 1931, but only 45,032 in 1944. This decline was due to the fact that the number of Indian births which had averaged 9,930 in 1919–26 averaged only 8,835 in 1934–41.

[1] The number of females aged 2 to 36 years among the General Population (excluding Chinese) was 39,900 in 1931. The number aged 15 to 49 in 1944 was 39,200. The total number of females belonging to the General Population (excluding Chinese) and born outside Mauritius was only 1,335. It is obvious, therefore, that a large number of females aged 15 to 49 who were counted as Indians in 1931 were allocated in 1944 to the General Population. But the number was smaller than that of men.

TABLE 42. *Age Distribution of the Population, Mauritius 1851–1944*

Year	Under 15	15 to 49 Males	15 to 49 Females	50 and more	Not stated	Under 15	15 to 49 Males	15 to 49 Females	50 and more
	Numbers					per cent.			
TOTAL POPULATION									
1851	47,697	80,522	32,157	18,047	2,400	26·7	45·2	18·0	10·1
1861	85,434	140,099	57,931	22,458	4,128	27·9	45·8	19·0	7·3
1871	98,924	125,890	64,939	22,741	3,548	31·6	40·3	20·8	7·3
1881	116,616	121,893	79,767	39,180	2,418	32·6	34·1	22·3	11·0
1891	131,577	108,372	82,719	46,997	923	35·6	29·3	22·4	12·7
1911	132,270	104,888	91,761	38,386	1,486	36·0	28·6	25·0	10·4
1921	136,370	104,523	94,470	40,058	1,064	36·3	27·8	25·2	10·7
1931	146,376	102,323	96,068	45,088	3,383	37·5	26·3	24·6	11·6
1944	146,631	111,743	107,558	51,643	1,610	35·1	26·8	25·7	12·4
1944[1]	146,631	117,743	107,558	51,643	1,610	34·6	27·8	25·4	12·2
INDIAN POPULATION									
1871	62,141	98,334	40,109	12,616	3,058	29·2	46·1	18·8	5·9
1881	78,788	89,874	51,122	27,231	1,978	31·9	36·4	20·7	11·0
1891	91,602	75,939	52,964	34,645	770	35·9	29·7	20·8	13·6
1911	95,868	75,062	61,495	24,297	975	37·3	29·2	24·0	9·5
1921	99,866	74,633	64,917	25,387	721	37·7	28·2	24·5	9·6
1931	103,048	71,030	63,824	28,666	2,081	38·7	26·6	23·9	10·8
1944	94,447	73,665	66,869	29,465	801	35·7	27·9	25·3	11·1
GENERAL POPULATION									
1871	36,783	27,556	24,830	10,125	490	37·0	27·8	25·0	10·2
1881	37,828	32,019	28,645	11,949	440	34·3	29·0	25·9	10·8
1891	39,975	32,433	29,755	12,352	153	34·9	28·3	26·0	10·8
1911	36,402	29,826	30,266	14,089	511	32·9	27·0	27·4	12·7
1921	36,504	29,890	29,553	14,671	343	33·0	27·0	26·7	13·3
1931	43,328	31,293	32,244	16,422	1,302	35·1	25·4	26·2	13·3
1944	52,184	38,078	40,689	22,178	809	34·1	24·8	26·6	14·5
1944[1]	52,184	44,078	40,689	22,178	809	32·8	27·7	25·6	13·9

[1] Adding 6,000 males 15 to 49 years old, absent in the Forces.

The proportion of males aged 15–49, who at first constituted the vast majority of the Indian population, had declined by 1871 to 46 per cent. It decreased further until it amounted in 1931 to 26·6 per cent. In 1944 it was 27·9 per cent., the increase being due to a decrease in the proportion of children. At the outbreak of the epidemic in 1867 the number of Indian men under 50 may have been as high as 120,000. It decreased to 100,000 in 1871 and to 76,000 in 1891, the decline being largely due to an ageing of the Indian population. Since 1891 the number of Indian men under 50 has changed very little, but the facts, especially since 1921, are obscured by the transfer of Indians to the General Population.

The proportion of females aged 15–49 was at first very small. By 1871 it had reached 18·8 per cent. and by 1921 24·5 per cent. It decreased to 23·9 per cent. in 1931 but rose in 1944 to 25·3 per cent. The number of Indian women under 50 increased from about 40,000 in 1871 to about 65,000 in 1921 and has not changed essentially since, but there was actually an increase masked by the allocation of Indian women to the General Population.

The changes in the number and proportion of Indians 50 years and over were remarkable. The number increased between 1871 and 1891 from about 13,000 to about 35,000 and the proportion from 5·9 to 13·6 per cent. The explanation is to be found in the enormous masses of young people imported in 1843–65. By 1911 the number of Indians over 50 had decreased to less than 25,000 and the proportion to 9·5 per cent. The decrease in the male Indian population from 147,500 in 1891 to 139,000 in 1911 can in fact be wholly attributed to the decrease in the number of men over 50 which dropped from nearly 24,000 to about 14,500. Many more of the old men had died off than could be replaced through the ageing of the younger ones. Since 1911 the number of Indian males over 50 has remained practically constant. The number of females, on the other hand, has increased from 10,000 in 1891 to nearly 15,000 in 1944. The percentage of all Indian people over 50 has risen from 9·5 in 1911 to 11·1 in 1944. It is still rather small.

6. *Conjugal Condition*

Introduction. No figures concerning conjugal condition seem to be available prior to 1861, and the returns for 1861 are most defective, the condition being 'not stated' for 54 per cent. of the population.[1] For 1871–1901 the males and females are subdivided into Unmarried, Married, and Widowed, separate figures being given in 1871 and 1881 for the General and the Indian Populations, in 1891 for the General Population, Indo-Mauritians, and Other Indians, in 1901 for the General Population (excluding pure Africans and Chinese), pure Africans, Indo-Mauritians, Other Indians, and Chinese. In 1911 the Unmarried, Married, and Widowed are shown by sex, age (12–19, 20–9, 30–9, &c.), and race (General Population, Indo-Mauritians, Other Indians, Chinese). In 1921, 1931, and 1944, the population was subdivided into (*a*) 'Unmarried', (*b*) Living as man and wife without legal or religious marriage, (*c*) Married only according to religious rites, (*d*) Legally married, (*e*) Widowed, (*f*) Divorced. Each of these groups was classified by sex, age (10–14, 15–19, 20–4, &c.), and race (in 1921 and 1931 General Population, Indo-Mauritians, Other Indians, Chinese; in 1944 General Population, Indian Hindus, Indian Mohammedans, Indian Christians, Chinese). The results are summarized in Tables 43–8.

In order to render the figures comparable it is necessary to add up the groups (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and (*f*) ascertained at the recent censuses. The percentage of 'Unmarried' (i.e. those neither legally married nor widowed) among the persons over 15 years appears then to have been as follows:

Population	*Sex*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
General	Males	66	69	62	59	64·3	57·9	62·1
	Females	54	60	51	47	51·9	47·3	52·8
Indian	Males	87	87	79	82	76·6	67·3	73·6
	Females	65	74	66	74	65·3	55·7	60·1

[1] See *Census Report 1861*, p. 7, and Appendix No. 13.

But the term 'Unmarried' was used arbitrarily in earlier times and is to-day still misleading. When the proportion of 'unmarried' adults had notably increased among both sexes of the General Population and among Indian females, Census Commissioner Kyshe commented in 1881:

I do not believe that, from a legal point of view, there is less concubinage now than in former times; but, if the civil law is set at nought, the moral law is respected, inasmuch as nine-tenths of the Indians who apply for the extracts of birth of their children, declared illegitimate, inform me on being questioned that they are married according to the rites and ceremonies of their country, and that they are exactly in the same position and have gone through the same ordeal as their comrades who have arrived in this Colony with their wives; that the latter were simply privileged and recognized as having *legal wives* because they had told the Emigration authorities in India that they were married; but that otherwise these had done nothing more than they to obtain such a privilege.[1] A great obstacle to marriages formerly were the fees levied for their celebration; but Ordinance No. 12 of 1880 having abolished all fees, I anticipate a great increase in the number of marriages from the passing of such a liberal measure.[2]

The abolition of the fees had not much effect, but Ordinance No. 25 of 1882 'encouraged matrimony by removing certain troublesome and unnecessary formalities. The immediate effect of the law was to induce a great number of couples who had been living in concubinage to take advantage of its provisions and legitimate their children.'[3]

Regarding the small proportion of legally married people among the General Population the Commissioner of the 1911 census said:

. . . it should be remembered that under the *régime* of forced labour, before the Edict of Emancipation, the slaves were not permitted to contract legal marriage. The Catholic clergy under these circumstances rendered inestimable service in regularising, if not in legalising, the unions of the slaves and these ideas have to a great extent survived to the present day.[4]

The censuses taken from 1921 onwards threw much more light on the actual conjugal condition of the population. I shall deal firstly with conditions as they prevailed between the two World Wars, and secondly with the absolutely different position revealed by the war census.

1919–39. Of the males 15 years and over for whom the conjugal condition was ascertained in 1931, 64·1 per cent. were bachelors (General

[1] See also *Census Report 1901*, p. 14: 'In this respect, an unusual legal anomaly exists: Indians arriving from India as Immigrants under contract of labour by simply declaring that they are married, according to their rites, to the woman who accompanies them, obtain a marriage certificate from the Emigration Agent, which is recognised as a legal marriage. But any Indians locally (i.e. in Mauritius), who contract marriage according to their religion, are not legally married and are considered to be living in concubinage, and their children are recorded as illegitimate.' But see also ibid. *1911*, p. x: 'In the eyes of their co-religionists, however, their condition is perfectly legitimate . . . .'

[2] Ibid. *1881*, pp. 17–18.

[3] Ibid. *1891*, p. 14. The number of marriages developed as follows (see *Mauritius Almanac 1888*, p. 21; *1920*, Section E, p. 17):

Population	*1877–80 average*	*1881*	*1882*	*1883*	*1884*	*1885*	*1886–90 average*
General . .	624	723	927	1,343	1,103	857	787
Indian . .	759	1,051	1,134	3,160	1,314	757	656

[4] *Census Report 1911*, p. x.

Population including Chinese, 57·6 per cent., Indian Population 67·0 per cent.), 30·9 per cent. were husbands (37·9 and 27·8 per cent.), and 5·0 per cent. were widowers or divorced (4·5 and 5·2 per cent.). Of the females 15 years and over, 52·4 per cent. were spinsters (46·9 and 55·4 per cent.), 32·1 per cent. wives (35·7 and 30·1 per cent.), and 15·5 per cent. widows or divorced (17·5 and 14·5 per cent.).

The proportion of persons legally married by civil status officers was low, particularly among the Indians. But the difference between the Indian and the General Population was due to the fact that many Indian couples were married only according to religious rites and not before a civil status officer. Considering as husbands and wives all persons who are married religiously or civilly, the proportion of husbands among the adult male General Population was 39·2 per cent., and among the Indian Population 36·7 per cent.; the corresponding percentages for wives were 36·9 and 40·1 respectively. It is interesting, furthermore, to note that between 1921 and 1931 the proportion of couples legally married increased very much among the Indian Population, while the proportion of couples married only according to religious rites decreased considerably. The husbands legally married constituted only 19·2 per cent. of the adult Indian males in 1921 but 27·8 per cent. in 1931. The percentages of husbands married only religiously were 15·7 and 9·0 respectively. The proportion of wives legally married increased from 22·6 to 30·1 per cent., while that of wives married only religiously dropped from 17·6 to 9·9 per cent. Conditions were different among the General Population. The proportion of husbands legally married increased here from 31·0 to 37·9 per cent. and that of wives legally married from 31·3 to 35·7 per cent.; the proportion of husbands married only religiously dropped from 2·5 to 1·3 per cent. and that of wives only religiously married from 2·4 to 1·2 per cent. While the percentage of husbands (married civilly or religiously) among the Indian Population increased only from 34·9 to 36·7 and that of wives decreased from 40·2 to 40·1, the proportion of husbands among the General Population increased from 33·5 to 39·2 per cent. and that of wives from 33·7 to 36·9 per cent.

The large increase in the proportion of couples married civilly or religiously among the General Population was due in part to a decrease in the proportion of people living together as man and wife without being married either civilly or religiously. It dropped between 1921 and 1931 for males from 13·7 to 10·0 per cent. and for females from 12·9 to 9·8 per cent. These couples were much more numerous among the Indian Population, the proportion among the adult males being 25·1 per cent. in 1921 and 19·6 in 1931 and the proportion among adult females 28·8 and 23·2 per cent. respectively.[1] While the proportion of people living together as man and wife, whether married or not, increased slightly among the

[1] However, the 1921 census report very much overstates the difference between the General and the Indian Population by saying (p. 20) that 'the number of persons—either males or females—in the general population living in concubinage is relatively small and less than 10% of the total General Population, whereas in the case of the Indian class it amounts to about 40%'. The actual percentage was 9 for the General and 17 for the Indian Populations.

General Population—from 47·2 to 49·2 per cent. for males and from 46·6 to 46·7 per cent. for females—it decreased considerably among the Indian Population, namely, from 59·9 to 56·4 per cent. for males and from 68·9 to 63·2 per cent. for females.

The Commissioner for the 1921 census made the following comment:

> A crude classification of non-married and married—if limited to civil marriage—gives no real information concerning the habits and customs of an Eastern community.[1]
>
> The large number of persons living in concubinage are not to be considered as living immoral lives according to their Eastern Standards: the unions are, to all intents and purposes, permanent ones, large families being born from them.
>
> In the case of the General Population it arises very frequently from the difficulties of obtaining the necessary documents, birth certificates, &c., and the general annoyance of official proceedings, as well as from an inheritance of indifference on the subject handed down from the days when legal marriage was forbidden under the slave regime.[2]

The Commissioner was certainly right in pointing out that the usual distinction between 'civilly married' and 'unmarried' conveys a wrong picture of the conjugal condition of the people in a colony such as Mauritius, and it is gratifying that, unlike so many census compilers, registrars, and medical officers in the West Indies, he does not attribute the large proportion of couples living in concubinage to immorality and irresponsibility. But in order rightly to appraise the situation it would be necessary to analyse thoroughly both the census statistics and the statistics of marriages and births. I must confine myself here to submitting the most relevant figures and to drawing a few tentative conclusions:

(1) Considering the large proportion of unmarried adult females, the marriage-rate of the General Population was rather low. But it was very much higher than that of the Indian Population. The extremely low marriage-rate of the Indians cannot be explained by the fact that Indian widows, as a rule, do not re-marry. The number of widows, it is true, was large in comparison with the number of wives, but, owing to low nuptiality of the Indians, the proportion of widows among the adult female Indian Population was smaller than among the General Population. 'An Ordinance to make better provision for the registration of Indian Marriages',[3] which came into force on 1 May 1914 and which enabled the Governor to appoint Mohammedan and Hindu priests as unpaid civil status officers for the celebration of marriages between Mohammedans or Hindus of the same religion, had very little effect. The number of marriages celebrated under this Ordinance averaged 113 in 1919–39.

(2) The proportion of illegitimate births in 1919–39 was 39 per cent. among the General Population and 75 per cent. among the Indians. Since of the 1931 female Indian Population between 15 and 45 years 31·4 per cent. were married civilly, while 36·5 per cent. were married only religiously or lived in concubinage (and 32·1 were counted as spinsters, widows, or divorced), a considerable proportion of illegitimate children must have been born to women who were neither married nor counted as living in

[1] *Census Report 1921*, p. 11.
[2] Ibid., pp. 18–20.
[3] No. 28 of 1912, reprinted in *Laws of Mauritius (Revised to 1920)*, vol. ii, pp. 573–5.

concubinage. Many even of these children must have been the issue of more or less stable unions since only 3·0 per cent. of all illegitimate Indian children born in 1919–33[1] were not acknowledged at birth by their father.

(3) The proportion of young couples was much larger among those living in concubinage and those married only religiously than among those who had married civilly. Moreover, marriages by which children were legitimated were very frequent. Both these facts indicate that many of the couples who were married civilly had lived a considerable time as husbands and wives before concluding a legal marriage. The proportion was much larger for the Indian than for the General Population. In 1919–39 the percentage of marriages by which children were legitimated was 23·4 among the General Population and 59·0 among the Indians, and the average number of children legitimated per marriage was 2·0 and 2·9 respectively. Yet only a small proportion of all illegitimate children were legitimated by subsequent marriage.

1944. Of the males 15 years and over, 61·5 (1931: 57·6) per cent. were bachelors among the General Population, including Chinese, and 73·1 (67·0) per cent. among Indians. The corresponding percentages for husbands were 34·4 (37·9) and 21·4 (27·8), for widowers and divorced 4·1 (4·5) and 5·5 (5·2). Of the females 15 years and over, 52·0 (46·9) per cent. were spinsters among the General Population and 59·3 (55·4) per cent. among Indians. The corresponding percentages for wives were 32·5 (35·7) and 23·0 (30·1), for widows and divorced 15·5 (17·5) and 17·7 (14·5). The most startling change is the large decrease in the proportion of legally married persons among Indians. Their number had in fact declined between the two censuses from 47,748 to 37,958, while the number of bachelors and spinsters had increased from 101,101 to 113,497 (and that of widowed and divorced persons from 15,825 to 19,433). There was also a decrease in the proportion of legally married persons among the General Population, but their number had increased from 29,474 to 33,990 or by 15 per cent. (while the number of adults not legally married had increased from 50,718 to 67,775 or by 34 per cent.).[2]

I have no explanation for the decrease in the number of Indian persons who were or had been legally married. The average number of Indian marriages celebrated by public officers or by Hindu and Mohammedan priests averaged 919 in 1919–31 and 1,222 in 1931–44. In the course of the three years 1941–3 alone no fewer than 14,292 Indians were married. Even a considerable increase in the number of Indians legally married would not have been surprising[3] in spite of the transfer of Indians to the General Population.

[1] No figures seem to be available for recent years.

[2] It should be realized, of course, that these figures overstate the increases among the General Population, owing to the transfer of Indians to this group. It should be kept in mind also that the figures are affected by the absence of numerous men in the Forces. Although most of them were bachelors, the excess of wives over husbands among the General Population rose from 378 in 1931 to 1,220 in 1944.

[3] The number of Indians legally married had increased between 1921 and 1931 from 34,757 to 47,748.

TABLE 43. *Population by Conjugal Condition, Sex, and Race, Mauritius 1871–1944*[1]

Year	Males						Females					
	Single	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*	*Single*	*Married*	*Widowed*	*Divorced*	*Not stated*	*Total*
						GENERAL POPULATION						
1871	39,538	9,036	1,758	..	1,439	51,771	33,437	9,013	4,201	..	1,362	48,013
1881	45,149	9,826	1,769	..	559	57,303	39,358	9,724	4,110	..	386	53,578
1891	43,027	12,562	1,966	..	984	58,539	37,884	12,018	5,088	..	1,139	56,129
1901	41,336	12,718	1,908	..	490	56,452	37,207	12,684	5,153	..	441	55,485
1911	35,231	11,606	1,710	..	6,574	55,121	32,997	11,871	5,811	..	5,294	55,973
1921	41,777	11,378	1,712	91	—	54,958	37,715	11,814	6,348	126	30	56,033
1931	44,061	14,548	1,604	135	728	61,076	40,830	14,926	7,124	182	451	63,513
1944	55,598	16,382	1,664	300	—	73,944	54,061	17,602	7,922	409	—	79,994
						INDIAN POPULATION						
1871	122,510	13,077	1,114	..	5,103	141,804	57,050	12,368	2,581	..	2,455	74,454
1881	135,784	12,932	1,313	..	1,323	151,352	81,716	12,261	3,036	..	628	97,641
1891	124,856	18,200	2,498	..	1,945	147,499	85,562	16,986	4,584	..	1,289	108,421
1901	125,384	14,590	2,420	..	706	143,100	96,889	13,726	4,801	..	570	115,986
1911	109,654	12,353	2,252	..	14,715	138,974	92,442	12,008	5,255	..	9,018	118,723
1921	118,201	17,083	3,771	94	1	139,150	99,256	17,674	9,340	105	—	126,374[2]
1931	109,464	24,088	4,234	302	1,445	139,533	92,971	23,660	11,017	272	1,196	129,116
1944	112,376	19,052	4,488	466	—	136,382	95,480	18,906	13,824	655	—	128,865

[1] See *Census Report 1881*, Appendixes, p. 156; *1901*, pp. 16–17; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, p. lv; *1921*, Appendixes, pp. lxxvii, ciii–cv; *1931*, pp. 9–12; *1944*, pp. 8–9.

[2] Total does not tally with items.

TABLE 44. *Population by Conjugal Condition, Sex, and Race, Mauritius 1921, 1931, and 1944*[1]

Population	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced	
	Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly					
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1921												
General	31,725	31,081	4,740	4,771	813	864	10,686	11,394	1,672	6,255	89	126
Indo-Mauritian	78,642	61,251	19,136	21,389	12,770	13,827	14,460	16,432	2,755	7,623	79	104
Other Indian	3,302	1,117	3,143	1,235	1,208	437	2,623	1,242	1,016	1,717	15	1
Chinese	4,118	835	287	117	94	47	692	420	40	93	2	—
Total	117,787	94,284	27,306	27,512	14,885	15,175	28,461	29,488	5,483	15,688	185	231
1931												
General	35,139	34,834	3,501	3,886	448	463	13,354	14,103	1,561	7,035	134	181
Indo-Mauritian	83,428	66,610	15,895	17,673	7,541	7,738	22,499	23,053	3,767	10,232	283	270
Other Indian	1,204	391	1,134	473	262	86	1,589	607	467	785	19	2
Chinese	4,586	1,384	331	229	56	34	1,194	823	43	89	1	1
Total	124,357	103,219	20,861	22,261	8,307	8,321	38,636	38,586	5,838	18,141	437	454
1944												
General	44,560	44,947	2,213	2,422	3,273	3,672	15,213	16,690	1,586	7,780	291	409
Indian	78,005	60,406	2,386	2,466	31,985	32,608	19,052	18,906	4,488	13,824	466	655
Chinese	4,870	2,608	146	83	536	329	1,169	912	78	142	9	—
Total	127,435	107,961	4,745	4,971	35,794	36,609	35,434	36,508	6,152	21,746	766	1,064

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, pp. lxxvii, ciii-cv; *1931*, pp. 9–12; *1944*, pp. 8–9.

TABLE 45. *Indian Population by Conjugal Condition, Sex, and Religion, Mauritius 1944*[1]

Religion	*Unmarried*				*Married*				*Widowed*		*Divorced*	
	Single		*Concubinage*		*Religiously*		*Civilly*					
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
Hindus . .	58,409	45,052	2,054	2,114	25,493	26,027	14,505	14,373	3,767	11,034	378	503
Mohammedans .	18,393	14,368	286	288	6,303	6,363	4,182	4,141	650	2,611	82	146
Christians .	1,203	986	46	64	189	218	365	392	71	179	6	6

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 10–12.

TABLE 46. *Population by Conjugal Condition, Sex, Race, and Age, Mauritius 1931*[1]

Age Years	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced	
	Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly					
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
General Population (incl. Chinese)												
0-9	15,886	15,284	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10-14	6,095	5,946	—	5	—	—	2	10	—	2	—	—
15-19	5,830	5,749	9	301	2	30	39	351	5	21	—	4
20-4	4,702	3,085	290	767	33	84	438	1,628	20	75	—	12
25-9	2,694	1,522	660	758	71	86	1,512	2,418	59	164	7	28
30-4	1,363	928	622	609	81	73	2,116	2,297	83	284	13	28
35-9	873	787	605	572	71	64	2,260	2,257	110	460	23	21
40-4	621	598	502	413	61	54	2,110	1,823	158	648	19	27
45-9	487	504	422	294	58	33	1,908	1,483	179	809	18	25
50-4	400	462	286	176	61	31	1,488	1,075	193	993	18	16
55-9	233	343	179	93	23	14	956	665	178	811	18	8
60-4	149	279	106	57	23	10	736	381	170	859	3	8
65-9	93	255	65	33	7	9	421	209	138	719	7	2
70 and more	125	361	68	23	13	9	469	242	299	1,223	4	2
Not stated	174	115	16	14	—	—	93	87	12	56	5	1
Total	39,725	36,218	3,832	4,115	504	497	14,548	14,926	1,604	7,124	135	182
Indian Population												
0-9	36,193	35,819	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10-14	15,184	13,855	10	143	6	124	46	219	1	4	—	1
15-19	13,529	7,757	158	2,071	157	1,166	274	2,190	12	92	7	47
20-4	8,491	3,051	1,505	3,358	970	1,657	1,967	3,643	119	288	51	49
25-9	3,783	1,632	2,683	3,188	1,388	1,318	2,881	3,705	256	446	50	34
30-4	2,009	1,103	2,817	2,512	1,386	1,076	3,358	3,322	340	677	37	30
35-9	1,317	757	2,480	2,046	1,069	784	3,389	3,002	381	849	47	26
40-4	1,041	642	2,178	1,630	852	631	3,151	2,543	450	1,367	31	27
45-9	644	451	1,657	1,097	671	391	2,611	1,856	429	1,190	28	25
50-4	635	484	1,401	859	553	320	2,425	1,394	556	1,668	19	4
55-9	403	325	755	414	310	149	1,425	677	425	1,015	9	4
60-4	436	371	662	411	223	112	1,174	530	470	1,485	3	11
65-9	189	150	313	134	89	39	508	175	288	652	6	4
70 and more	299	240	337	191	108	44	734	253	471	1,230	12	6
Not stated	479	364	73	92	21	13	145	151	36	54	2	4
Total	84,632	67,001	17,029	18,146	7,803	7,824	24,088	23,660	4,234	11,017	302	272

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 9–12.

TABLE 47. *Population by Conjugal Condition, Sex, Race, and Age, Mauritius 1944*[1]

Age Years	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced	
	Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly					
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
GENERAL POPULATION (incl. Chinese)												
0–9	17,726	17,613	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10–14	8,528	8,306	—	2	2	2	2	3	—	—	—	—
15–19	8,012	7,604	18	217	8	138	32	524	1	16	—	8
20–4	5,593	4,396	215	453	158	478	491	2,010	5	63	6	25
25–9	3,025	2,350	414	441	323	555	1,555	2,784	38	141	11	50
30–4	1,762	1,542	356	362	544	596	2,414	2,734	79	252	34	49
35–9	1,279	1,180	390	340	550	535	2,575	2,496	100	411	51	62
40–4	931	982	307	231	578	486	2,465	2,058	162	527	39	54
45–9	740	773	238	171	479	387	1,972	1,600	145	662	43	46
50–4	577	687	196	138	401	319	1,759	1,290	205	1,028	39	39
55–9	444	575	125	59	286	194	1,279	895	239	1,065	36	29
60–4	284	474	71	45	211	132	810	516	235	1,103	18	22
65–9	156	354	46	25	131	82	510	314	174	1,018	7	12
70 and more	161	556	31	12	108	72	423	280	274	1,585	13	9
Not stated	212	263	12	9	30	25	95	98	7	51	3	4
Total	49,430	47,555	2,359	2,505	3,809	4,001	16,382	17,602	1,664	7,922	300	409
INDIAN POPULATION												
0–9	32,702	32,449	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10–14	14,777	13,916	4	12	15	484	5	71	1	4	2	5
15–19	14,842	7,450	51	246	608	6,147	122	1,344	11	171	17	133
20–4	7,681	2,243	212	398	4,488	7,394	1,192	2,806	115	371	64	150
25–9	2,806	1,079	306	406	5,505	5,179	2,146	3,028	181	552	86	95
30–4	1,480	754	336	342	5,407	3,910	2,711	2,941	222	741	71	77
35–9	895	574	323	318	4,299	2,924	2,776	2,383	328	879	61	58
40–4	679	497	310	277	3,605	2,352	2,703	2,062	512	1,435	49	41
45–9	479	322	243	169	2,760	1,586	2,192	1,465	556	1,521	35	29
50–4	494	307	257	122	2,288	1,156	1,974	1,243	664	2,178	31	23
55–9	249	200	109	80	1,237	562	1,274	685	503	1,498	22	13
60–4	205	197	103	54	887	474	984	468	533	1,899	11	13
65–9	110	89	66	15	433	168	489	194	359	1,086	9	3
70 and more	163	121	56	18	383	183	432	140	488	1,449	6	8
Not stated	243	208	10	9	70	89	52	56	15	40	2	7
Total	78,005	60,406	2,386	2,466	31,985	32,608	19,052	18,906	4,488	13,824	466	655

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 8–9.

TABLE 48. *Population over 15 by Conjugal Condition, Sex, and Race, Mauritius 1921, 1931, and 1944*

Year	Population	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced	
		Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly					
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1921	General . .	17,534	13,725	5,027	4,885	907	911	11,378	11,812	1,712	6,348	91	126
	Indian . .	31,740	14,422	22,254	22,098	13,929	13,524	17,053	17,338	3,769	9,330	94	105
		Per cent.											
	General . .	47·9	36·3	13·7	12·9	2·5	2·4	31·0	31·3	4·7	16·8	0·2	0·3
	Indian . .	35·7	18·8	25·1	28·8	15·7	17·6	19·2	22·6	4·2	12·1	0·1	0·1
1931	General . .	17,744	14,988	3,832	4,110	504	497	14,546	14,916	1,604	7,122	135	182
	Indian . .	33,255	17,327	17,019	18,003	7,797	7,700	24,042	23,441	4,233	11,013	302	271
		Per cent.											
	General . .	46·2	35·9	10·0	9·8	1·3	1·2	37·9	35·7	4·2	17·0	0·4	0·4
	Indian . .	38·4	22·3	19·6	23·2	9·0	9·9	27·8	30·1	4·9	14·2	0·3	0·3
1944	General . .	23,176	21,636	2,359	2,503	3,807	3,999	16,387	17,599	1,664	7,992	300	409
	Indian:												
	Hindus . .	22,995	10,212	2,052	2,104	25,480	25,612	14,051	14,313	3,766	11,031	376	499
	Mohammedans	7,028	3,518	284	286	6,301	6,295	4,181	4,131	650	2,610	82	145
	Christians .	503	311	46	64	189	217	365	391	71	179	6	6
	Indian Total .	30,526	14,041	2,382	2,454	31,970	32,124	19,047	18,835	4,487	13,820	464	650
		Per cent.											
	General . .	48·6	40·0	4·9	4·6	8·0	7·4	34·4	32·5	3·5	14·7	0·6	0·8
	Indian:												
	Hindus . .	33·3	16·0	3·0	3·3	36·8	40·2	21·0	22·4	5·4	17·3	0·5	0·8
	Mohammedans	38·0	20·7	1·5	1·7	34·0	37·0	22·6	24·3	3·5	15·4	0·4	0·9
	Christians .	42·6	26·6	3·9	5·5	16·0	18·6	31·0	33·5	6·0	15·3	0·5	0·5
	Indian Total .	34·4	17·1	2·7	3·0	36·0	39·2	21·4	23·0	5·0	16·9	0·5	0·8

TABLE 49. *Illegitimate Births and Marriages, Mauritius 1919–46*[1]

	Indian Population							*General Population*						
	Illegitimate Births			*Marriages*		*Legitimations*		*Illegitimate Births*			*Marriages*		*Legitimations*	
Year	*Number*	*Per cent.*	*Not acknowledged*	*Number*[2]	*Rate*	*(a)*[3]	*(b)*[4]	*Number*	*Per cent.*	*Not acknowledged*	*Number*	*Rate*	*(a)*[3]	*(b)*[4]
1919	7,285	77·9	254	962	7·2	663	2,001	1,586	40·6	244	601	10·6	99	180
1920	6,925	76·9	190	1,231	9·3	825	2,552	1,566	41·3	218	895	16·1	162	351
1921	7,650	76·9	249	1,360	10·3	883	2,648	1,853	41·9	218	991	17·8	210	386
1922	7,062	74·5	258	1,008	7·6	636	1,889	1,739	39·0	217	876	15·6	187	389
1923	6,883	74·3	229	1,135	8·5	701	2,056	1,842	39·8	252	940	16·6	208	387
1924	7,888	74·5	245	1,153	8·6	699	2,032	1,935	39·9	252	991	17·3	233	455
1925	8,437	74·9	307	947	7·0	552	1,496	2,150	40·7	245	886	15·2	229	417
1926	8,104	76·9	230	762	5·6	423	1,322	1,939	38·9	289	717	12·0	164	305
1927	6,895	73·9	182	744	5·3	413	1,146	1,718	38·9	276	687	11·4	161	283
1928	7,679	75·4	225	755	5·4	412	1,216	1,976	39·3	330	811	13·3	193	387
1929	6,855	75·0	220	714	5·1	428	1,280	1,815	39·1	236	807	13·0	206	428
1930	5,401	66·2	150	605	4·3	355	932	1,780	38·4	196	672	10·8	165	327
1931	5,259	71·9	111	568	4·2	325	942	1,843	39·8	190	668	10·8	147	264
1932	4,550	72·8	102	579	4·3	302	1,019	1,574	39·1	138	692	11·0	153	322
1933	6,621	74·3	138	742	5·7	405	1,151	1,867	40·8	177	779	12·4	182	348
1934	6,599	74·1	..	812	6·1	427	1,296	1,845	40·0	..	955	15·0	250	515
1935	6,526	74·5	..	786	5·9	414	1,124	1,683	37·4	..	865	13·4	217	461
1936	6,790	74·5	..	876	6·6	462	1,344	1,836	38·6	..	1,115	17·1	281	548
1937	7,041	75·5	..	890	6·6	518	1,502	1,734	36·3	..	1,061	16·1	267	504
1938	6,430	74·5	..	1,007	8·2	571	1,635	1,765	36·8	..	1,106	16·6	273	549
1939	7,127	75·8	..	916	6·8	528	1,580	1,822	35·2	..	1,068	15·8	259	528
1940	5,802	74·7	..	1,095	8·1	649	1,867	1,530	35·0	..	1,329	19·6	335	765
1941	6,360	72·3	..	3,159	23·3	2,129	5,835	1,534	33·1	..	1,582	23·3	435	916
1942	5,993	66·0	..	2,123	15·6	1,254	3,407	1,419	31·0	..	1,428	21·1	302	628
1943	6,165	68·3	..	1,864	13·6	1,016	2,743	1,402	30·6	..	1,223	17·9	195	447
1944	9,306	69·3	..	1,695	12·8	985	2,788	1,447	30·0	..	1,042	13·5	163	373
1945	7,359	64·9	..	1,488	11·1	894	2,526	1,502	30·3	..	1,060	13·7	153	321
1946	7,287	65·0	..	2,280	17·0	1,234	3,123	1,357	26·0	..	1,552	19·9	205	401

[1] See *Report of the Registrar General 1919*, pp. 2–3; *1920*, p. 3; *1921*, p. 3; *1922*, pp. 2–3; *1923*, pp. 2–3; *1924*, pp. 2–3; *1925*, pp. 2–3; *1926*, pp. 2–3; *1927*, pp. 2–3; *1928*, pp. 2–3; *1929*, p. 3; *1930*, p. 3; *1931*, p. 4; *1932*, p. 6; *1933*, pp. 4, 7; *1938*, pp. 4, 6–7; *1939*, pp. 3, 9; *1945*, pp. 2, 4; *1946*, pp. 2, 4; *Blue Book 1940*, Section N, p. 2. (Some for 1940–6 were kindly provided by Mr. M. Herchenroder, Director of Statistics, Mauritius.) I revised the official marriage-rates for 1919 and 1920 on the basis of the census results.

[2] Of these marriages there were celebrated by Mohammedan or Hindu priests appointed as unpaid civil status officers 80, 69, 94, 100, 76, 105, 100, 87, 90, 121, 97, 79, 84, 99, 126, 122, 128, 140, 168, 209, 196, 239, 1,075, 767, 736, 718, 646, and 1,231 respectively.

[3] Number of marriages by which children were legitimated.

[4] Number of children legitimated.

The decrease in the proportion of legally married people was by no means due to an increase in the proportion of couples living in concubinage. This proportion, which had decreased among the adult males of the General Population from 13·7 per cent. in 1921 to 10·0 per cent. in 1931, dropped to 4·9 per cent. in 1944. The corresponding percentages for females among the General Population were 12·9, 9·8, and 4·6; for Indian men 25·1, 19·6, and 2·7; and for Indian women 28·8, 23·2, and 3·0. While in 1931 35,175 Indians were reported to live in concubinage the number had dwindled to 4,852 in 1944. This enormous decrease for Indians is the more remarkable as at the same time both the number and the proportion of Indians neither living in concubinage nor religiously or legally married, and also of Indians legally married, had likewise declined. The explanation is to be found in the fantastic increase of Indian husbands and wives who were only religiously married. The proportion among adults, which for males had decreased between 1921 and 1931 from 15·7 to 9·0 per cent. and for females from 17·6 to 9·9 per cent., leapt in 1944 for males to 36·0 and for females to 39·2 per cent. The Indian husbands and wives who were only religiously married numbered in 1944 64,593 as against 15,627 in 1931. If the figures can be trusted, most people who formerly lived in concubinage are now religiously married, and religious marriage has become also to an appreciable extent a substitute for legal marriage. Among the Indians who lived in concubinage or were married, the percentage of those living in concubinage dropped from 35·7 to 4·5 and the percentage of those legally married from 48·5 to 35·4, while the percentage of those only religiously married leapt from 15·8 to 60·1.

There was also a notable increase in the proportion of couples only religiously married within the General Population. Among the persons allocated to this group who lived in concubinage or were married, the percentage of those who lived in concubinage decreased from 20·8 to 10·4 and the percentage of those legally married from 76·6 to 72·9, while the percentage of those only religiously married rose from 2·6 to 16·7.

V. Birth and Death Registration

1. *1736–1810*

The keeping of registers of baptisms, marriages, and burials in the Isle of France was regulated by the King's Declaration of 9 April 1736,[1] which applied to the whole of the French Empire. Two registers were to be kept in every parish as evidence of the civil status of the persons concerned, one to be retained by the clergyman and the other to be delivered within six weeks after the end of each year to the local record office. After the retrocession of the Isles of France and Bourbon to the King, he issued on 15 September 1766 an Ordinance,[2] which stipulated among other things

[1] French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 40–55. See also L. H. de Froberville, 'Le premier Apôtre de l'Île de France', p. 134. The first register, kept before the issue of this Declaration, starts with the entry of a marriage of 9 Aug. 1728; see Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 158.

[2] French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 26–33. See also Edict of the King, June 1776 (ibid., pp. 146–63), and Proclamation of 16 Mar. 1824 (English text *Recueil des Lois 1824*, pp. 40–3).

that in both islands three registers be kept, one to be retained in the parish, another to be deposited in the local record office, and the third to be sent to the Secretary of State for the Navy in France. A Decree, embodying Regulations made in the Isle of France on 18 November 1778,[1] provided that only the first two registers should be kept for the entries of baptisms, marriages, and burials of negroes, whether free or slaves.

Civil registration of births, marriages, and deaths was introduced in the Isle of France by a Decree of 20 March 1793,[2] which deprived the clergy of the privilege of keeping the official registers of civil status and substituted as registrars the mayors.[3] Decaen, upon his arrival in the Isle of France, issued on 2 October 1803 a Decree,[4] which stipulated that 'there shall be in each district of the Isles of France and Reunion a civil commissary', who 'shall be entrusted with the keeping of the registers of births, marriages, and deaths'.[5] Another Decree issued a week later[6] provided:

> The law of the Republic of the 10th Ventose Year XI [28 February 1803] on the civil status shall be promulgated in the Isles of France, of Bourbon, and Dependencies in the following manner:
>
> VII. The acts of civil status shall be inscribed in each district in three registers kept in triplicate for the white population and in three likewise kept in triplicate for the free negroes.
>
> X. The registers shall be closed and stopped by the civil commissary at the end of each year; and one of the triplicates concerning the citizens and the free persons shall be deposited in the registry of the court of first instance, the second shall remain in the commissariat, and the third shall be delivered to the colonial prefect in order to be sent to the Minister of the Navy and the Colonies.

On 18 July 1805 Decaen issued another Decree[7] which provided for the registration of births and deaths of slaves. The owners had to register such events with the civil commissary.

In the meantime, on 8 March 1805, the minister had forwarded to Mauritius the Civil Code[8] which contained new regulations concerning the civil status. Decaen promulgated the Code by a Decree of 17 October 1805,[9] and issued on 23 October a Supplementary Decree.[10]

[1] French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. i, pp. 34–9.

[2] A Decree on the mode of registering births, deaths, and marriages, listed ibid., p. 485.

[3] See Prentout, p. 113. Another Decree of 2 Vendémiaire Year III (23 Sept. 1794) provided that the registers kept by the clergy in the vestries be deposited in the municipalities. See Bonnefoy, pp. 197, 400. (D'Epinay, p. 387, gives as date 25 Sept. 1795; Rouillard does not list this decree.)

[4] Decree of 9 Vendémiaire Year XII, French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. ii, pp. 18–21.

[5] A Decree of 3 Brumaire (26 Oct., *Code Decaen*, pp. 13–14, No. 22) fixed the registration fees payable to the Civil Commissaries.

[6] Decree of 16 Vendémiaire (9 Oct., ibid., pp. 7–8, No. 14).

[7] Decree of 29 Messidor Year XIII, ibid., pp. 126–7, No. 100.

[8] See Prentout, p. 257.

[9] Decree of 25 Vendémiaire Year XIV, French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. ii, pp. 324–9.

[10] Decree of 1 Brumaire, *Code Decaen*, pp. 131–8, No. 109. This Supplementary Decree stipulated among many other things: 'The period of three days fixed in Article 55 of the Code for the declarations of births and the presentation of the child to the civil status officer is increased and brought to 15 days.' A Decree of 7 Aug. 1807 (French text and English translation, Rouillard, vol. ii, pp. 438–41) promulgated an Imperial Decree of 4 July 1806 concerning registration in case 'the dead body of a child whose birth has not been declared shall be presented to the Officer of the Civil Status'.

Finally, it should be noted that some decrees concerning slave censuses requested that the deaths of slaves which occurred in the period immediately preceding the census should be entered on the census forms.[1]

Civil registration of births and deaths was actually carried out (although somewhat defectively) for the free population, at least from 1804 on, but there is no evidence that it became effective for the slave population.

2. *1810–34*

The only change in the registration of births and deaths among the free population that occurred during the first 25 years of British Administration was inaugurated by the King's Order in Council of 22 June 1829, which prescribed that all legal distinctions between persons of European birth and descent and free persons of African or Indian birth or descent be abolished in the Island of Mauritius and its Dependencies.[2] In execution of this Order an Ordinance of the Governor in Council of 16 December[3] provided:

> The Registers kept by the Civil Commissaries for the purpose of entering thereon declarations of births, marriages, & deaths, are hereafter to bear only two different Titles, the one for Persons of free condition, whether by birth or enfranchisement, and the other, for individuals of the Slave Population.

But the legislation concerning slaves was ample. I shall summarize it briefly.

A Proclamation issued by Governor Farquhar on 4 February 1812,[4] similar to Decaen's Decree of 18 July 1805, regulated registration of births and deaths among the slave population and requested the inhabitants and proprietors of slaves 'to note accurately in the *recensements* for the year 1812 the births and deaths which occurred among their slaves in the preceding years and which they may have failed to register'.

The Proclamation of 11 April 1814[5] concerning the slave census to be taken in that year asked that 'an exact and precise mention shall be made in the said census of the negroes who may have died, and of those born since the date of the last census'.[6]

The King's Order in Council of 24 September 1814 concerning the Slave Registry prescribed that 'The Annual Return of Slaves' to be made by slave-owners in Mauritius should contain 'a true and particular account of all births and deaths' of slaves 'within the year preceding'.[7] The Registrar had, on or before 1 March in each year, to 'make out a general account or abstract of all the annual returns', showing among other things 'the numbers of births and deaths of slaves, with their names and descriptions'.[8]

[1] It is possible that such a request was already made in the 1760s (see p. 709 above). The Ordinance of 12 Dec. 1786 which provided for censuses to be taken every year on 1 Jan. (see p. 711 above) said that every slave-owner should declare the slaves who died in the preceding year. Decaen's Decree on annual slave censuses of 22 Jan. 1804 (see footnote p. 708 above) provided likewise for a declaration of the slaves deceased since the last census. [2] See p. 799 above.

[3] No. 57, English text *Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 316–18.

[4] French text *Code Farquhar*, p. 34, No. 82. [5] Reproduced pp. 814–15 above.

[6] See also Proclamation of 10 Mar. 1815, mentioned p. 715 above.

[7] See p. 719 above. [8] See p. 720 above.

A Proclamation of 1 August 1825[1] renewed 'the dispositions of the Proclamation of the 4th February 1812, which directs the Inhabitants, within the delay therein prescribed, to make the declaration of the births and deaths of their Slaves' and provided that the Proprietors of Slaves 'shall nevertheless be bound to continue to mention, in their Triennial Return, the births and deaths happening amongst their Slaves since their last Return'.

The King's Order in Council of 30 January 1826[2] provided that every person in possession of any Slaves in Mauritius or its Dependencies shall within one calendar month after the birth or death of any such Slave transmit or deliver to the registrar or assistant registrar of Slaves of the quarter in which he may be resident, a note or memorandum of every such birth or death.[3]

An Ordinance of 26 January 1835[4] stipulated in consequence of 'the change which has taken place with regard to the condition of those persons who become apprentices under the Act for the Abolition of Slavery' that births and deaths among apprentices 'shall be inserted, in every District, in a book to be kept by the Civil Officer for that purpose'. The Ordinance provided furthermore that 'for the future, the Register for the insertion of Acts before the Civil authorities shall be kept in Duplicate only, one of which shall remain at the office of the Civil Commissary and the other shall be deposited at the Registry of the Court of First Instance'.[5]

It is possible that in the first years of the British administration a considerable number of births and deaths among the slave population were actually recorded, but this was certainly no longer true after the Order in Council of 1814 had come into operation. Governor Farquhar, on 7 November 1822, wrote to Earl Bathurst:

> The Returns required of Births and Deaths of the Slave Population, distinguishing the sexes also, cannot be accurately procured, as the annual census taken by the civil commissaries, from which this information could be drawn, having been suspended agreeably to law by the registration order in council, there are no authentic documents on the subject to refer to.[6]

The numbers of births and deaths registered by the slave owners were indeed most defective. On 21 March 1827 the Registrar of Slaves submitted the following figures to the Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry:[7]

	Births			*Deaths*		
Period	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1816–18	1,278	1,065	2,343	2,773	1,512	4,285
1819–21	909	998	1,907	1,127	884	2,011
1822–4	884	846	1,730	1,743	716	2,459

[1] English text *Recueil des Lois 1825*, pp. 181–2. [2] See p. 727 above.
[3] See also Ordinance No. 52 of 30 Sept. 1829, English text *Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 193–6.
[4] No. 4 of 1835, English text ibid. *1835*, pp. 17–18.
[5] This Ordinance was disallowed in view of the restrictions it imposed on marriages. See Dispatch from Lord Glenelg to Sir William Nicolay, 31 Mar. 1835 (*Papers relative to the Abolition of Slavery 1833–1835*, Part ii, Section i, pp. 212–13); Government Notice of 2 Mar. 1836, English text *Recueil des Lois 1836*, pp. 8–9.
[6] *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius*, p. 122. See also ibid., p. 127. [7] See *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 7.

The Commissioners apparently received no returns for 1825,[1] but they gave for each District figures for 1826, 'compiled from the several returns furnished to the Commissioners of Inquiry by the Chief Commissary of Police and by the Civil Commissaries of the respective Districts'.[2] The totals for the Island were 663 births and 1,436 deaths. The Commissioners made the following comment:[3]

The number of deaths declared in January 1819 for the three preceding years amounted to 4,285, averaging 1,428 per annum, and the number declared in 1822 for three years did not exceed 2,011 or 670 per annum; although the mortality of 1819–20 had intermediately occurred. The neglect also of the regulations of the French Government, which enjoined the civil commissaries of the quarters to keep a register of births and deaths, has prevented us from deriving any information on this subject from the very defective returns they have furnished.

From an account preserved in the police department of the number of burials at Port Louis, it has been ascertained that in the three months in which the sickness prevailed 795 slaves had died in the town alone; but in some of the districts the number of deaths recorded for the years 1819 and 1820 was less than in other years when no such malady prevailed. In the year 1826 the district registers were more correctly kept, and the total number of deaths recorded in that year throughout the island amounted to 1,436, nearly corresponding with the average number declared for the years 1816–17 and 1818. The number of births also in 1826 amounted to 663, and the average of the number declared from 1815 to 1825 is 600 per annum. It is deserving of remark, however, that these results do not correspond in any degree with those deduced from the inspection of the slaves; in 1826–27, 14,238 children in Mauritius alone having been returned under twelve years of age, or born since 1815; and which number does not include a large proportion that must have died within the same interval. . . .

The increased number of deaths declared, which in 1826 (a healthy year), exceeded the number declared in the year of the cholera morbus, would seem to have been in contemplation of an actual inspection of the slaves, as the omissions in 1819 may have been in the expectation of the means of replacing those who had died.[4]

The greater completeness of the records of births in 1826 was probably due to the Proclamation of 1 August 1825. But they were still defective.[5] From 1828 on, the figures both of births and deaths may have come near the truth.

3. *1837–1946*

In 1837 registration of births, marriages, and deaths was unified, 'Whereas the Abolition of Slavery has put an end to all distinctions among the population as to the exercise of civil rights'. The Ordinance passed on 2 August 1837[6] stipulated:

Art. 1. The declarations of Births, Deaths, and Marriages for the whole population

[1] The Blue Book for 1825 showed 357 births and 1,642 deaths; see Table 55 below.

[2] *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 9.

[3] *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius*, p. 26.

[4] See also, concerning the Seychelles, ibid., p. 24: From a return of the births and deaths of slaves, prepared in the Office of Slave Registry, it appears that 1,398 births were declared in ten years (from 1815 to 1825), and only 143 deaths within the same period; and it has been proved in some instances that the names being preserved in the returns gave occasion to the substitution of new negroes for those who had died.' See, furthermore, ibid., p. 29.

[5] See letter from the Acting Chief Commissioner of Police to the Commissioners of Inquiry, 9 May 1827, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 9.

[6] No. 10 of 1837, 'An Ordinance for the purpose of modifying in certain cases the formalities relative to the declaration of Births, Deaths, and marriages', English text *Recueil des Lois 1837*, pp. 55–7.

shall be entered in each District of the Colony upon the same Register which shall be kept in duplicate conformably to Article 40 of the Civil Code.

This Ordinance was repealed by an Ordinance of 20 April 1853,[1] which itself was repealed by an Ordinance of 28 July 1871.[2] Finally the latter Ordinance was repealed by the 'Civil Status Ordinance, 1890'.[3] This Ordinance replaced and repealed the provisions for birth and death registration contained in the Civil Code.[4] The Ordinance, which came into force on 19 January 1891,[5] has been amended 26 times.[6] The main pro-

[1] No. 21, 'An Ordinance for amending the Laws relating to the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages,' *Collection of Ordinances Enacted 1853*, pp. 65–77. This Ordinance was extended to the Seychelles by Proclamation of 22 Sept. 1855 (*Collection of Laws 1855*, pp. 111–12), and to Rodrigues by Proclamation of 19 Nov. 1856 (see Rouillard, vol. vi, p. 455). An Ordinance of 30 Aug. 1854 (No. 28, *Collection of Ordinances Enacted 1854*, p. 80) provided that 'Whereas in consequence of the prevailing disease [cholera] declarations of births and deaths have not been made in the time prescribed by law', the period for receiving declarations of births and deaths which happened between 1 and 31 July should be extended to 31 Oct. See, furthermore, Ordinance No. 14 of 15 Aug. 1855 'for explaining Article 5 of Ordinance No. 21 of 1853' (ibid., *1855*, pp. 30–1).

[2] No. 17, 'An Ordinance to amend and consolidate the Laws of the Colony relating to the Civil Status', ibid. *1871*, pp. 63–137. This Ordinance was amended as regards registration of births and deaths by Ordinance No. 14 of 1876 (19 May, ibid. *1876*, pp. 97–100).

[3] No. 26 of 1890 (30 Dec.), 'An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the Law relating to the Civil Status', reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1890*, pp. 133–206.

[4] For a comparison of the Civil Status Ordinance with the Civil Code, see Newton, *Modifications apportées au Code Civil Français par la législation de l'Île Maurice*, pp. 8–14.

[5] See Proclamation No. 4 of 1891 (16 Jan.), reprinted in *Collection of Proclamations Published 1891*, pp. 5–6.

[6] See Ordinances No. 2 of 1895 (21 June), 'The Civil Status Amendment Ordinance, 1895', reprinted in *Collection of Ordinances Passed 1895*, pp. 4–6; No. 4 of 1896 (26 June), 'The Rodrigues Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1896', reprinted ibid. *1896*, pp. 7–9; No. 9 of 1898 (2 Aug.), 'The Extension Ordinance 1898', reprinted ibid. *1898*, pp. 75–81; No. 15 of 1898 (2 Aug.), 'The Correction of Clerical Errors Ordinance 1898', reprinted ibid., pp. 94–6; No. 20 of 1898 (22 Sept.), 'Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance 1898', reprinted ibid., pp. 142–5; No. 29 of 1899 (30 Oct.), 'The Correction of Clerical Errors Ordinance, 1899', reprinted ibid. *1899*, pp. 77–8; No. 13 of 1902 (15 July), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance 1902', reprinted ibid. *1902*, pp. 46–7; No. 40 of 1902 (26 Dec.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1902 (No. 2)', reprinted ibid., pp. 175–6; No. 45 of 1902 (28 Jan. 1903), 'The Law Revision Ordinance, 1902', reprinted ibid., pp. 207–99; No. 46 of 1902 (28 Jan. 1903), 'The Law Amendment Ordinance 1902', reprinted ibid., pp. 300–47; No. 23 of 1903 (16 Oct.), 'The Municipality Ordinance, 1903', reprinted ibid. *1903*, pp. 76–170; No. 25 of 1903 (20 Oct.), 'The Promissory Oaths (Amendment) Ordinance, 1903', reprinted ibid., pp. 197–202; No. 13 of 1904 (5 Oct.), 'The Law Revision Ordinance, 1904', reprinted ibid. *1904*, pp. 58–63; No. 3 of 1912 (29 June), 'The Audit (Transfer of Powers) Amendment Ordinance, 1912', reprinted ibid. *1912*, pp. 4–6; No. 23 of 1912 (30 Nov.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1912', reprinted ibid., pp. 65–6; No. 28 of 1912 (17 Dec.), 'The Civil Status (Indian Marriages) Amendment Ordinance, 1912', reprinted ibid., pp. 75–81; No. 23 of 1913 (27 Sept.), 'The Bench Constitution and District Magistrates (Amendment) Ordinance, 1913', reprinted ibid. *1913*, pp. 106–110; No. 35 of 1914 (5 Dec.), 'The Civil Status (Christian Marriages) Amendment Ordinance, 1914', reprinted ibid. *1914*, pp. 110–15; No. 24 of 1915 (30 Nov.), 'The Civil Status (Validating) Ordinance, 1915', reprinted ibid. *1915*, pp. 67–8; No. 26 of 1915 (14 Dec.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1915', reprinted ibid., p. 70; No. 17 of 1920 (1 May), 'The Stamps (Amendment) Ordinance, 1920', reprinted ibid. *1920*, pp. 17–18; No. 9 of 1934 (29 Mar.), 'Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1934', reprinted ibid. *1934*, pp. 36–7; No. 39 of 1935 (10 Oct.), 'Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1935', reprinted ibid. *1935*, pp. 94–5; No. 18 of 1936 (10 June), 'Civil Status (Christian Marriages) Amendment Ordinance, 1936', reprinted ibid. *1936*, p. 50; No. 52 of 1946 (5 Oct.), 'Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1946'.

The Ordinance, as it stood after the enactment of 'The Stamps (Amendment) Ordinance, 1920', is reprinted in *Laws of Mauritius* (*Revised to 1920*), vol. ii, pp. 524–68.

visions for ensuring birth and death registration as they now stand are as follows:

Registration Offices and Officers

5. There shall be in Port Louis and in each district public offices where births, marriages and deaths and other matters concerning the civil status of persons shall be registered, which offices shall be called Civil Status Offices.

6. (1) The civil status office situated in Port Louis shall as heretofore be the Central Office of the Civil Status Department, and be called the Central Civil Status Office.

(2) In each district there shall be a branch office which shall be called the Civil Status Office of according to the district. Such district office shall be situated in the District Court House of the district. In every district where there are or may be hereafter two or more District Courts, there shall be a district office in every such Court, and the clerks attached to such Court shall be civil status officers in the same manner as if such Court was the only District Court for the district.

(3) The Governor in Executive Council may order that additional civil status offices be established in any district at such places, for such time and under such conditions as may seem fit,— and may appoint officers for such additional offices who shall receive such salaries as may be fixed by the Governor with the consent of the Council of Government. The Governor in Executive Council may abolish any such additional office.

8. The Central Civil Status Office, and any branch, additional or other civil status office existing at the commencement of this Ordinance shall be deemed the Central or a branch, additional or other civil status office referred to in this Ordinance.

Registration of Births and Deaths

In case of a birth the father or mother, any medical practitioner, mid-wife, or other person having been present at the birth, or the owner or occupier of the premises in which the birth occurred shall within 45 days make a declaration concerning the birth before a civil status officer of the District. The father or mother who shall fail within three months to declare the birth shall be liable to a fine not exceeding Rs 100.

The owner or occupier of any premises in which any death occurs shall within 24 hours give notice thereof to the civil status officer of his district and shall send two persons who have been present at the death, or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, to declare such death. (No penalty is provided for a neglect of this duty.)

Burials

Whoever shall bury or otherwise dispose of any human body without having obtained a permit from a civil status officer shall be liable to a fine not exceeding Rs.500 or to imprisonment not exceeding six months.

Headings of Registration Forms

Birth (Form I): No.; When born and where; Name and Surname; Sex; Natural or Legitimate; Name and surname of Father or Mother, profession and residence; Name and Surname of Informant, profession and residence; Name and Surname of witnesses, profession and residence; Marginal entries.

Death (Form II): No.; Date, Hour and Place of Death; Name and Surname; Age and Place of Birth; Sex; Profession and residence; Whether married, a widower or widow; Names and Surnames of witnesses; Names and Surnames of Father and Mother, residence and profession; Of what religious denomination; Marginal entries.

The Registrar General and the Assistant Registrar General are full-time officers, but the Registrar-General's Department has to deal not only with 'Civil Status' but also with 'Registration and Mortgage'. The salary of the 'Additional Civil Status Officers' (dispensers, postmasters, &c.) was as a rule Rs.300.[1] Registration of births and deaths and the search of registers are free of charge. Fees are to be paid only for every extract from or copy of an Act of the Civil Status (1.50 Rs.) and for registering any rectification of an Act of the Civil Status (1.50 Rs.). These fees are levied by means of stamps and accrue to the Treasury.

When plague broke out in 1899 there was enacted, on 2 August, an Ordinance prescribing the issue of medical certificates of causes of death in such districts as the Governor may by Proclamation declare.[2] The Governor, on 30 September, issued such a Proclamation covering Port Louis and five other townships.[3] The Ordinance was repealed by 'The Sanitation Consolidating Ordinance, 1900',[4] which was repealed by 'The Public Health Ordinance, 1925'.[5] The provisions of this Ordinance which concern the civil status officers read as follows:

Part IV (*b*).—*Certificates of death*

68. The Governor may by Proclamation declare the districts, townships or areas to which the provisions of the following articles other than article 75 and following shall apply.[6]

69. In all districts, townships or areas proclaimed by the Governor under the preceding article, there shall be Medical Officers specially appointed by the Governor on the recommendation of the Director, with power to enquire into and report on the causes of death occurring within such districts, townships or areas; and for such purpose the said Medical Officers may enter any house, premises, building or room, and examine or cause to be examined any dead body therein. . . .

70. Notwithstanding any of the provisions of articles 92 to 103 of the Civil Status Ordinance, 1890, no permit for burial shall be issued by any Civil Status Officer to whom the declaration is made of any death which has occurred in any district, township or area proclaimed as aforesaid, until a certificate, signed by a medical practitioner stating the cause or probable cause of death, has been deposited by the witnesses declaring the said death with the said Civil Status Officer. . . .

[1] See *Blue Book 1935* K, pp. 12–15; *1936* K, pp. 12–15; *1937* K, pp. 13–16; *1938* K, pp. 14–17.

[2] No. 12, 'The Certificates of Death Ordinance, 1899', reprinted in *Ordinances Passed 1899*, pp. 30–3. This Ordinance was amended by No. 23 (14 Sept.), 'The Certificates of Death, (Amendment) Ordinance, 1899', reprinted ibid., pp. 55–7.

[3] No. 42, reprinted in *Proclamations Published 1899*, p. 54.

[4] No. 21 of 1900 (25 Sept.), 'An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the Sanitation Ordinances passed during the years 1899 and 1900', reprinted in *Laws of Mauritius (Revised to 1920)*, vol. v, pp. 3039–54.

[5] No. 47 of 1925 (31 Dec.), 'An Ordinance to make provision for the public health', reprinted in *Laws of Mauritius (1921–1929)*, pp. 609–86.

[6] See Proclamation No. 29 of 1919 (12 July), reprinted in *Statutory Regulations, Rules, &c.*, vol. ii, p. 1499.

72. Where no medical certificate, as required by article 70, is produced to the Civil Status Officer at the time of the declaration of death, he shall report the death to the Medical Officer appointed under article 69, who shall make such enquiry and examination as to the cause of death as he may deem necessary, and shall issue the certificate as to the cause or probable cause of death required by article 70.

Provided that if for any cause no medical certificate is produced within twenty-four hours after death, it shall be lawful for the Sanitary Authority or the Sanitary Inspector of the district on the report of the Civil Status Officer to authorise the issue of the permit of burial.

73. Nothing in this Ordinance contained shall affect the powers of the Director under article 92 (2) of the Civil Status Ordinance, 1890.

75. When a death has occurred in any part of the Colony which has not been proclaimed under article 68, the Civil Status Officer shall, before registering such death, make enquiries from the persons declaring the same and from such other persons as he may deem expedient as to the cause or probable cause of death. If the Civil Status Officer is of opinion that there is reason to suspect that the death was due to *infectious or contagious* disease he shall forthwith report the same to the Sanitary Authority or to the Sanitary Inspector of the district, who may thereupon exercise all the powers conferred on them, or either of them, by this Part.

The number of areas in which the cause of death was to be certified was increased by Proclamations of 1 June 1909[1] and 24 January 1914,[2] but both Proclamations were repealed by a Proclamation of 22 May 1919,[3] 'whereas it is expedient to dispense, temporarily, with the certificates of deaths'. However, a Proclamation of 12 July[4] reintroduced the issue of certificates in the 6 townships and 13 villages where it had been prescribed before 22 May 1919. Finally a Proclamation of 26 December 1939[5] revoked the Proclamation of 12 July 1919. 'Since then no medical certificates of any kind has been required.'[6]

In 1925 there was passed 'An Ordinance to provide for the early notification of births'.[7] This Ordinance has been amended twice.[8] It now reads as follows:

1. This Ordinance may be cited as 'The Notification of Births Ordinance, 1925'.

2.—(1) This article shall apply to any child which has issued forth from its mother after the expiration of the twenty-eighth week of pregnancy, whether alive or dead.

(2) Whenever a child shall be born (as defined in the preceding paragraph), it shall be the duty of any person in attendance upon the mother at the time of, or within six hours after, the birth, to give notice of the birth within thirty-six hours thereof at the nearest police station, in the manner provided by this article, and stating:—

(*a*) the date, time and place of the birth;

(*b*) whether the child was born alive and was alive at the time of notification;

[1] No. 19, reprinted in *Proclamations Published 1909*, pp. 23–4.

[2] No. 4, reprinted ibid. *1914*, pp. 5–6.

[3] No. 20, reprinted in *Proclamations and Government Notifications 1919*, p. 14.

[4] No. 29, reprinted ibid., pp. 18–19.

[5] No. 44, reprinted in *Proclamations and Government Notices Published 1939*, p. 39.

[6] Rankine, *Report on Health Conditions in Mauritius* (1944), p. 6.

[7] No. 14 of 1925 (5 May), 'The Notification of Births Ordinance, 1925', reprinted in *Ordinances Passed 1925*, pp. 26–8.

[8] See Ordinances No. 33 of 1926 (30 Dec.), 'The Notification of Births (Amendment) Ordinance, 1926', reprinted ibid. *1926*, pp. 69–70, and No. 38 of 1927 (6 Dec.), 'The Notification of Births (Amendment) Ordinance, 1927', reprinted ibid. *1927*, pp. 70–1. The Ordinance as it stands to-day is reprinted in *Laws of Mauritius (1921–1929)*, pp. 92–4.

(c) the name and address of the informant;

(d) the name and address of the Nurse, Midwife or Labour Attendant (if any) who conducted the labour.

Provided that in the case of births in prisons, hospitals, orphanages, barracks, or quarantine stations, the duty to give such notice shall lie on the officer in charge of the establishment in which the birth took place.

(3) Notice under this article may be given verbally or by posting a prepaid letter or postcard addressed to the officer in charge of the police station giving the necessary information of the birth, or by delivering a written notice of the birth at such police station.

(4) Any person who fails to give notice of a birth in accordance with this article shall be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees.

Provided that a person shall not be liable to a penalty under this provision if he satisfies the Court that he had reasonable grounds to believe that notice had been duly given by some other person.

(5) Any person giving notice under this Ordinance who makes a false statement which he knows to be false shall be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees (Rs.500) and to imprisonment not exceeding six months.

3. The notification required to be made under the preceding article shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, the requirements of any law relating to the registration of births.

4.—(1) The Officers in charge of Police Stations shall forward daily the notifications received by them to the Government Medical Officer of the district, except in the case of notifications received in the district of Port Louis which shall be forwarded to the Medical Officer of Health for Port Louis.

(2) The Government Medical Officers and the Medical Officer of Health for Port Louis shall keep a register wherein shall be entered daily all notifications forwarded to them in accordance with the preceding paragraph.

5.—(1) The Governor in Executive Council may make regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Ordinance.

(2) Such regulations may provide that any breach thereof shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding five hundred rupees.

(3) Such regulations shall be laid on the table of the Council.

The motives for passing this Ordinance were as follows:

Under existing legislation a delay of 45 days is granted for the registration of births. The necessity from the public health point of view, of making compulsory the early notification of births has been urged very strongly. Close and immediate investigation of factors affecting the life of the community is extremely difficult and unavoidably delayed otherwise.[1]

It is doubtful, however, whether notification can be really called 'compulsory' as long as only 'any person in attendance upon the mother at the time of, or within six hours after, the birth' is obliged to give such notice. The Civil Code prescribed that declarations of births should be made within 3 days. This time limit was extended to 15 days by the Supplementary Decree of 23 October 1805, to 1 month by the Ordinance of 20 April 1853, and to 45 days by the Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1898. 'The necessity from the public health point of view, of making compulsory the early notification of births' would probably be met more effectively by reducing the unnecessarily long time limit for the declaration of births.[2]

[1] *Medical Report 1924*, p. 2.

[2] In 1919–33 the numbers of live-born infants whose births had not been registered when they died were 1,182, 1,082, 1,237, 1,102, 1,109, 1,142, 1,099, 864, 917, 964, 864, 1,056, 1,024, 742, and

Birth and death registration were incomplete prior to the 1870s, and they are not yet accurate. The data concerning causes of death are worthless, and the statement made by the Registrar-General in 1872 that 'the births and deaths of some Creole Indians, number at present uncertain, have been registered as belonging to the general population'[1] holds still true to-day. Whether the total numbers of births and deaths 'may be regarded as substantially accurate'[2] it is difficult to tell. Dr. Andrew Balfour in his brilliant *Report on Medical and Sanitary Matters in Mauritius 1921* was very sceptical:

> There can be little doubt that a considerable number of births are not registered, while a few fallacies have been discovered in the death returns. Mr. Walter refers to these in his Parliamentary[3] Report on the Census made on May 20th, 1921. He thinks the comparatively large difference, i.e., 11,001, between the estimated and censused population for the whole Island suggests the possibility of errors in registration.
>
> By these he means errors of omission or commission inadvertently made by the public over which the registration department has no control.[4]

But the fact that the estimated population lagged considerably behind the actual population in 1921 cannot be taken as evidence that birth records were more incomplete than death records, any more than the fact that the estimated population was much larger than the actual population in 1931 can be taken as evidence that death records were more incomplete than birth records. What may at first sight seem more suspicious are the great fluctuations in the yearly numbers of births. When the general death-rate and some special mortality rates dropped very much in 1932, the Medical and Health Department, it is true, said:

> These figures are interesting as shewing the great fluctuations to which the vital statistics of the Colony are liable. This tendency is always present in statistics which deal with fairly small numbers; the colonial population is a small statistical unit when compared with other countries, and its statistics are apt to be unduly sensitive.[5]

But this comment is not to the point. An island with 400,000 inhabitants is a fairly large statistical unit. Fluctuations of the same size as those in the general death-rate and the infant mortality rate of Mauritius are to be found in countries with many millions of people. On the other hand, it may seem unbelievable that the number of births actually dropped in 1932 to 10,266, after having oscillated in 1897–1930 between 12,669 and 16,545.

If the argument of the Medical Department were correct, one would expect much greater oscillations in the birth figures of the General Population than in those of the Indian population because the latter is very much larger than the former. But the contrary is true. The numbers of Indian births recorded in 1930–2 were 8,153, 7,317, and 6,244, after having oscillated in 1897–1929 between 8,870 and 11,267. The numbers of births

836 respectively (see *Report of the Registrar General 1919*, pp. 2–3; *1920*, pp. 2–3; *1921*, p. 3; *1922*, pp. 2–3; *1923*, p. 3; *1924*, p. 3; *1925*, p. 3; *1926*, p. 3; *1927*, p. 3; *1928*, p. 3; *1929*, p. 3; *1930*, p. 3; *1931*, p. 3; *1932*, p. 5; *1933*, p. 6). No figures have been published for recent years.

[1] *Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part II, p. 47. See also ibid., p. 48.

[2] *Medical Report 1933*, p. 10.

[3] Should read 'Preliminary'.

[4] Balfour, p. 14. See also p. 784 above.

[5] *Medical Report 1932*, p. 6.

recorded among the General Population oscillated in 1869–1946 between 3,577 and 5,278. The drop in the number of Indian births in 1930–2 was in fact amazing. But it may have been genuine, since the number of Indian infants ascertained at the 1931 census was also extraordinarily small. I, therefore, see no good reason to doubt that both birth and death registration have been fairly complete for many decades.[1]

As regards still-births there is no evidence that registration is more defective than that of live births. The Report on the Medical and Health Department for 1922, it is true, stated: 'Unfortunately registration of still-births is not compulsory and the total number of still-births in Mauritius probably greatly exceeds [the official] figures.'[2] But a slip attached to this Report contained the following Corrigendum: 'The statement as regards the non-registration of still-births was written under a misapprehension. Registration is required by Ordinance No. 26 of 1890.' The Report for 1924 suggested even that the number of still-births may be overstated:

> There is no legal definition of still-birth in Mauritius, either laid down in the Law or Civil Code. As a result of investigations made, it appears that errors occasionally arise in respect of children, born alive and dying a few minutes after, who are declared and registered as still-births.[3]

VI. Birth and Death Statistics

According to *Annonces, Affiches et Avis Divers pour les Colonies des Isles de France et de Bourbon*,[4] there occurred in Mauritius in 1773 among the white population 121 baptisms and 297 burials;[5] and in 1774 among the white population 93 baptisms and 180 burials, and among the black population 670 baptisms and 854 burials.[6]

Vital statistics for the free population seem to have been compiled regularly since the appointment of civil commissaries as registrars.[7]

[1] In so far as registration is incomplete this may be due in part to inadequacy of the Civil Status Ordinance which considers registration as a privilege rather than as a duty. The vast majority of Indian children are 'illegitimate'. If the mother of an illegitimate child fails to declare the birth within 3 months she is liable to a fine not exceeding Rs.100. This will be an incentive for her to declare the birth within 3 months, and since a birth which has not been declared within 45 days shall not be registered except on payment of a fine not exceeding Rs.2, the mother will be apt to declare the birth within this time limit. But there is no incentive whatsoever for the other persons who, instead of the mother, *may* declare a birth, since they are not liable to a penalty if they fail to do so, and since the birth of a child more than 3 months old cannot be registered except on payment of a fine not exceeding Rs.50. It would, therefore, not be surprising at all if many children whose mothers die soon after their delivery were not registered.

The provisions ensuring registration of deaths are still more defective. The owner or occupier of the premises in which a death occurs is bound to give notice thereof to the civil status officer. But if he fails to do so he is not liable to a penalty. The only safeguard for registration of deaths is that a heavy penalty is provided for burying a deceased person before having registered the death.

[2] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 2.

[3] Ibid. *1924*, p. 3. The 'Notification of Births Ordinance, 1925' does not prevent such errors, since it merely states that its provisions shall apply 'to any child which has issued forth from its mother after the expiration of the twenty-eighth week of pregnancy, whether alive or dead'.

[4] First issued on 13 Jan. 1773.

[5] See No. 2 of 1774 (12 Jan.), p. 6. The figures for the black population were omitted as being too defective.

[6] See No. 1 of 1775 (4 Jan.), p. 2.

[7] See p. 840 above. This was not true of the slave population until 1825; see pp. 842-3 above.

D'Unienville gives (1) for the periods 1804–16, 1817–24, 1804–24, and 1825–9, separately for the white and the free coloured population, the average yearly numbers of births and deaths in each District; (2) for the period 1804–24, separately for the white and the free coloured population, the total numbers of deaths by sex and age (under 1, 1–5, 6–10, &c.) in Port Louis and elsewhere; (3) for the year 1829, for each District, the births by sex among the whites, the free coloured, and the slaves, the deaths of men, women, boys, and girls among the whites and the free coloured, and the deaths of slaves by sex.[1]

TABLE 50. *Births and Deaths of Free Population, Mauritius 1804–29*

Area	White					Coloured				
	Mean population	Average yearly		Birth-rate	Death-rate	Mean population	Average yearly		Birth-rate	Death-rate
		Births	Deaths				Births	Deaths		
				1804–24[1]						
Port-Louis	2,875	104·5	74·6	36	26	4,282	257	63·8	60	15
Elsewhere	4,231	112·2	60·8	27	14	5,137	208·3	50·4	41	10
Total	7,106	216·7	135·4	30	19	9,419	465·3	114·2	49	12
				1804–16[2]						
Port-Louis	2,736	105·5	65·3	39	24	3,050	234	44·2	77	14
Elsewhere	4,009	105·6	63	26	16	4,224	183·4	55·1	43	13
Total	6,745	211·1	128·3	31	19	7,274	417·4	99·3	57	14
				1817–24[3]						
Port-Louis	3,100	102·9	89·6	33	29	6,283	294·4	96	47	15
Elsewhere	4,592	117·1	56·3	26	12	6,622	254	44·6	38	7
Total	7,692	220	145·9	29	19	12,905	548·4	140·6	42	11
				1825–9[4]						
Port-Louis	3,397	119·4	127·6	35	38	8,002	350·6	242·6	44	30
Elsewhere	4,675	115·6	62·6	25	13	8,423	359	74·6	43	9
Total	8,072	235	190·2	29	24	16,425	709·6	317·2	43	19

[1] See D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Isle Maurice* (1838), vol. i, pp. 56, 79–80, 100, 126, 150, 178–9, 202–3, 222, 239; vol. iv, Tables 41–3.

[2] For average yearly births and deaths, see ibid., vol. i, pp. 54, 76, 97, 122–3, 147, 176, 200, 220, 236–7. I have derived the mean population from the figures entered under 1804–24 and 1817–24.

[3] For average yearly births and deaths, see ibid., pp. 55, 79, 99–100, 125, 149–50, 178, 202, 222, 239. I have entered the mean population of 1817 and 1 Jan. 1825, as given ibid., vol. iv, Tables 19, 37.

[4] For average yearly births and deaths, see ibid., vol. i, pp. 63–4, 86–7, 106, 131, 155, 183–4, 207, 227, 244. I have entered the mean population of 1 Jan. 1825 and 1830, as given ibid., vol. iv, Tables 37, 51.

A 'Return', signed by Governor Farquhar on 22 July 1822, gives separately for the white and the free coloured population the births and deaths by sex for each year from 1812 to 1821[2] and for January to March 1822.

The *Blue Book* for 1832 shows the births and deaths among Government Slaves in 1814–32.[3]

A 'Return of the free Blacks and Coloured Population' shows the numbers of births and deaths among the free coloured population in 1821–6.[4]

[1] See Tables 50, 51, 57.
[2] See Table 52.
[3] See Table 53.
[4] See Table 54.

TABLE 51. *Deaths of Free Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1804–24*[1]

Age Years	White						Coloured					
	Males			Females			Males			Females		
	Port Louis	Elsewhere	Total	Port Louis	Elsewhere	Total	Port Louis	Elsewhere	Total	Port Louis	Elsewhere	Total
Under 1	77	46	123	53	33	86	46	39	85	45	43	88
1–5	82	66	148	83	65	148	98	82	180	88	66	154
6–10	16	24	40	16	20	36	21	16	37	13	17	30
11–15	5	9	14	7	8	15	18	14	32	18	25	43
16–20	18	15	33	19	16	35	19	27	46	67	36	103
21–5	27	33	60	34	13	47	42	31	73	108	50	158
26–30	47	35	82	40	22	62	47	19	66	94	43	137
31–5	57	33	90	36	20	56	38	14	52	79	38	117
36–40	77	52	129	41	25	66	33	23	56	92	57	149
41–5	76	65	141	31	19	50	29	15	44	56	39	95
46–50	88	75	163	33	26	59	24	30	54	47	34	81
51–5	105	65	170	32	20	52	17	17	34	23	30	53
56–60	82	87	169	26	21	47	24	28	52	29	42	71
61–5	87	60	147	30	27	57	10	25	35	18	15	33
66–70	70	84	154	20	19	39	13	32	45	26	32	58
71–5	63	65	128	14	14	28	6	16	22	9	10	19
76–80	29	44	73	11	18	29	9	15	24	12	14	26
81–5	14	14	28	10	5	15	4	7	11	4	4	8
86–90	3	8	11	3	3	6	2	3	5	5	2	7
Over 90	2	2	4	2	2	4	1	4	5	6	5	11
Total	1,025	882	1,907	541	396	937	501	457	958	839	602	1,441

[1] See D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Isle Maurice* (1838), vol. iv, Tables 42 and 43.

TABLE 52. *Births and Deaths of Free Population, Mauritius 1812–21*[1]

Year	White				Coloured			
	Births		Deaths		Births		Deaths	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1812	92	102	131	47	206	242	94	126
1813	94	103	116	59	223	269	99	121
1814	93	103	113	47	233	225	135	144
1815	129	114	156	74	241	264	150	186
1816	93	96	161	76	233	230	172	209
1817	103	96	137	50	256	248	129	132
1818	128	109	190	57	269	267	168	168
1819	99	123	203	64	284	292	178	159
1820	119	106	127	51	277	269	101	134
1821	120	110	132	58	265	291	86	133

[1] See *Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius* (1823), p. 127.

TABLE 53. *Births and Deaths of Government Slaves, Mauritius 1814–32*[1]

Year	Births	Deaths	Year	Births	Deaths	Year	Births	Deaths	Year	Births	Deaths
1814	48	99	1819	52	185	1824	34	70	1829	32	48
1815	42	105	1820	34	70	1825	21	72	1830	44	55
1816	43	92	1821	33	50	1826	38	54	1831	28	57
1817	44	81	1822	41	59	1827	24	48	1832	30	54
1818	43	90	1823	36	62	1828	42	63			

[1] See *Blue Book 1832*, p. 291. See also *Returns of the Number of Slaves belonging to Government at the Mauritius*, Mar. 1828, pp. 26–35.

The *Blue Book* for 1825 gives, separately for the whites and the free coloured, the deaths by sex and years of age in 1825.[1]

The *Almanach de L'Île de Maurice* for 1837[2] gives for each year from 1825 to 1835 the births by sex and the deaths by sex and quinquennial age-groups among the free population.[3] The *Almanach* for 1838 gives for the five years from 1 February 1832 to 31 January 1837 the yearly interments (excluding slaves and Indian immigrants) at the Cemetery of Port Louis, distinguishing men, women, and children, both among the free and the apprentice population.[4]

The *Blue Books* for 1824–34 (and the *Brown Books* for 1826–31) show, as a rule, for each District, the births and deaths by sex among the white, the free coloured, and the slave population in 1824–9, and among the total free and the slave population in 1830–4.[5] The data are given in a haphazard fashion; sometimes the free persons are omitted and sometimes the slaves; the distinction by sex is often lacking, and for some years figures are given only for the whole Colony.[6]

The *Blue Books* for 1835 and 1836 show the total number of births and deaths in each District excluding the apprentice population and the Indian immigrants. The *Blue Books* for 1837–40 give the same data including the apprentice (and ex-apprentice) population. The *Blue Books* for 1841–50 give in addition numbers of births and deaths among the Indian immigrants and usually also among the immigrants from Madagascar, and from the Malay Coast and China.[7]

The *Blue Book* for 1851 gives only the total number of births and deaths for the whole island, but the *Report on the Blue Book* shows for each District, separately for the General, the Ex-apprentice, and the Immigrant Population, the births and deaths by sex. The *Blue Books* for 1852–8 give

[1] See *Blue Book 1825*, p. 230. I have not reproduced these figures.

[2] See Martin, *Statistics of the Colonies* (1839), p. 504. I had no access to the early *Almanacs*.

[3] See Table 56. Martin does not describe the population covered in this table. Major Tulloch says that the figures refer to the 'white resident population' (*Statistical Reports on the Sickness, Mortality, & Invaliding, among the troops in Western Africa*, &c., 1840, p. 4c). Meldrum, on the other hand, says (p. 118) that the table shows 'the births and deaths among the white and coloured populations', but adds that it 'does not comprise the deaths among the "apprentis", who were not borne on the registers of the free population until after 1835'. It certainly also excluded the slaves.

[4] See Table 58.

[5] See Table 55.

[6] The figures for the free population in the *Blue Books* differ in part considerably from those in the *Almanac*.

	1825	*1826*	*1827*	*1828*	*1829*	*1830*	*1831*	*1832*	*1833*	*1834*	*1835*
Births: Blue Books	828	987	..	..	1,141	656	942	959	1,178	1,060	1,233
Almanac	806	1,035	925	882	939	1,001	988	975	1,183	1,186	1,232
Deaths: Blue Books	566	390	..	..	562	259	635	687	619	896	882
Almanac	556	410	494	552	579	640	613	577	602	915	766

Some of the figures in the *Blue Books* are evidently defective; it is, for example, impossible that in 1830 the free population outside Port Louis, which was nearly 14,000, could have suffered only 74 deaths. (For the Rempart's River District, with a free population of 1,670, there are listed 63 births and only 3 deaths.) But apparently the compilation in the *Almanac* is also not accurate, the totals reproduced above differing for some years from the detailed figures in Table 56.

[7] See Table 60.

TABLE 54. *Births and Deaths of Free Coloured Population, Mauritius 1821–6*[1]

	1821	*1822*	*1823*	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*
Births . .	572	543	608	514	603	610
Deaths .	106	167	250	224	359	354

[1] See 'Return of the free Blacks and Coloured Population', *Returns from all Colonies in the West Indies and the Isle of France* (1828), p. 109. As the Return is dated 1 Oct. 1826, the figures for 1826 must be incomplete (though the number of deaths is larger than in the *Blue Book*; see Table 55).

TABLE 55. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1824–34*[1]

	Births							*Deaths*						
	White		*Free Coloured*		*Slaves*			*White*		*Free Coloured*		*Slaves*		
Year	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
PORT LOUIS														
1826	124		362		..	..	..	106		186		..	..	..
1827	..	..	..	..	189	180	758	..	..	..	..	299	185	728
1828	..	..	..	..	226	232	1,347	..	..	..	..	242	234	1,376
1829	78	75	206	209	228	231	1,051[2]	85	59	120	149	317	181	948[2]
1830	311				284	240	835	185				400	279	864
1831	530				394		924	504				472		976
1832	520				..	..	..	577				..	..	..
1833	616				467		1,083	458				536		994
1834	569				440		1,009	673				746		1,419
MAURITIUS														
1824	192		514		..	..	..	173		224		..	..	..
1825[3]	107	108	299	304	183	174	1,175	123	84	145	214	980	662	2,208
1826[4]	126	112	393	356	608	638	2,233	99	57	106	128	1,058	587	2,035
1827	..	..	..	..	685	712	2,180	..	..	..	..	1,217	656	2,137
1828	..	..	..	..	816	795	4,027	..	..	..	..	1,394	852	4,750
1829	140	143	431	427	859	817	2,841[2]	120	78	158	206	1,451	818	2,868[2]
1830	656				767	775	2,198	259				1,347	801	2,407
1831	942				1,416		2,358	635				1,870		2,505
1832	959				1,665		2,624	687				2,230		2,917
1833	1,178				1,608		2,786	619				1,942		2,561
1834	1,060				1,753		2,813	896				2,709		3,605

[1] See for 1824–6 *Blue Book 1824*, p. 143, *1825*, p. 228, *1826*, folio 138, *1827*, p. 328; for 1827–9 ibid. *1828*, pp. 406–9, *1829*, pp. 517–18, *Brown Book July to Dec. 1827*, *July to Dec. 1828*, *July to Dec. 1829*, Sections 'Population', and Table above; for 1830–4 *Blue Book 1830*, pp. 498–502, *1831*, pp. 404–9, *1832*, pp. 434–9, *1833*, folios 212–15, *1834*, pp. 262–6.

[2] Including apprentices.

[3] 'The Births and deaths, among the slave Population, as contained in the above return, must be considered as very incorrect, the owners having hitherto been very irregular in making their declarations.'

[4] It is not quite clear whether the figures for slaves refer to 1826 or 1827.

TABLE 56. *Deaths of Free Population by Sex and Age, Mauritius 1825–35*[1]

Age Years	*1825*	*1826*	*1827*	*1828*	*1829*	*1830*	*1831*	*1832*	*1833*	*1834*	*1835*
						Males					
0–5	96	60	62	82	74	113	114	101	108	220	147
5–10	3	4	3	8	13	3	4	6	11	17	13
10–15	4	3	6	5	8	6	5	4	9	10	6
15–20	10	5	11	11	11	12	11	11	2	10	13
20–5	7	9	21	13	25	10	28	18	18	12	26
25–30	11	19	9	29	20	21	17	19	12	20	30
30–5	13	17	21	28	20	32	15	14	19	26	18
35–40	20	15	16	14	22	27	15	17	16	23	24
40–5	17	18	7	15	23	18	11	18	16	21	17
45–50	11	15	20	24	26	12	18	15	10	16	16
50–5	12	10	17	17	16	21	14	16	19	13	17
55–60	12	11	15	20	22	17	10	13	15	12	24
60–5	12	12	12	4	12	17	19	14	13	14	14
65–70	15	10	16	10	9	14	12	9	5	15	12
70–5	11	8	6	14	7	3	8	10	7	13	15
75–80	11	4	7	13	7	6	7	8	5	11	6
80–5	4	3	5	8	3	8	6	10	7	9	4
85–90	1	—	4	3	3	—	2	3	3	1	—
Over 90	4	—	2	3	1	1	—	1	—	3	3
Total	274	223	260	321	322	341	316	307	295	466	405
						Females					
0–5	94	44	52	56	86	105	88	84	111	208	121
5–10	10	5	16	9	4	3	7	8	11	23	14
10–15	9	2	4	2	10	7	9	4	8	10	9
15–20	22	8	11	11	15	8	14	7	22	15	11
20–5	20	17	23	19	25	21	20	10	22	24	24
25–30	16	18	19	21	15	23	17	19	14	24	24
30–5	15	13	23	19	13	20	31	29	18	20	26
35–40	15	12	14	11	18	16	20	22	17	21	21
40–5	16	8	9	12	12	12	11	10	16	14	16
45–50	17	7	10	15	7	13	9	8	14	15	16
50–5	7	11	15	18	12	22	16	16	10	13	16
55–60	12	5	9	8	10	11	9	10	7	12	10
60–5	10	12	10	13	10	14	12	18	8	11	18
65–70	6	7	2	5	6	1	6	6	5	7	15
70–5	2	7	5	7	6	3	15	6	4	10	6
75–80	4	7	4	3	4	6	3	3	2	11	9
80–5	4	2	4	6	4	5	8	6	1	4	7
85–90	1	—	1	4	2	1	1	1	4	2	4
Over 90	2	2	3	2	3	3	1	3	3	7	4
Total	282	187	234	241	262	294	297	270	297	451	371

[1] See Martin, *Statistics of the Colonies of the British Empire* (1839), p. 504.

either no figures at all, or merely, for each District, the total numbers of births and deaths. The *Blue Books* for 1859–67 give for each year the same detailed classification of births and deaths as the *Report on the Blue Book* for 1851.[1]

Meldrum gives for each year from 1831 to 1860 the total number of births and deaths.[2]

TABLE 57. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1829*[1]

Area	Sex	Births				Deaths					
						White		Free Coloured			
		White	Free Coloured	Slaves	Total	Adult	Children	Adult	Children	Slaves	Total
Port Louis .	M.	78	206	228	520[3]	68	17	62	58	317	544[5]
	F.	75	209	231	525[4]	37	22	85	64	181	404[5]
Elsewhere .	M.	62	225	631	918	29	6	32	6	1,134	1,207
	F.	68	218	586	872	13	6	43	14	637	713

[1] See D'Unienville, *Statistique de l'Isle Maurice* (1838), vol. i, pp. 61–3, 85–6, 104–6, 130–1, 154–5, 182–3, 206–7, 226–7, 243–4. Figures for the apprentice population are given only for Port Louis.
[2] Including 14 among apprentices.
[3] Including 18 men and 4 boys among apprentices.
[4] Including 10 among apprentices.
[5] Including 9 women and 6 girls among apprentices.

TABLE 58. *Interments at the Cemetery of Port Louis, 1 February 1832 to 31 January 1837*[1]

Period	Free				Apprentices				Total
	Men	Women	Children	Total	Men	Women	Children	Total	
Feb. 1832 to Jan. 1833	240	128	201	569	351	161	272	784	1,353
Feb. 1833 to Jan. 1834	206	127	224	557	308	185	348	841	1,398
Feb. 1834 to Jan. 1835	257	170	377	804	313	212	473	998	1,802
Feb. 1835 to Jan. 1836	245	194	249	688	260	173	354	787	1,475
Feb. 1836 to Jan. 1837	303	188	286	777	311	170	325	806	1,583

[1] See Martin, *Statistics of the Colonies* (1839), p. 504. The meaning of the term 'Apprentices' in this table is not clear. There were few apprentices prior to the abolition of slavery on 1 February 1835. After that date they were much more numerous than the free persons.

The *Mauritius Almanac* for 1869 gives (1) for each year from 1834 to 1867 the births and deaths by sex among the (immigrant) Indian population, and (2) for each year from 1861 to 1867, for each District, separately for the General and the Indian Population, the births and deaths by sex, and the still-births.[2]

[1] See Table 61.
[2] See Table 59, columns 'Total Population'. These figures are on the whole more satisfactory than those in the *Blue Books*. Meldrum reports (p. 134): '. . . the Registrar General was good enough to direct some of his Assistants to compile from the records of the Civil Status Office statements of the births and deaths in 1835–36 and 1853–58, and these statements filled up some of the principal gaps.'
[3] See Tables 59, 62. The figures differ in part essentially from those shown in the *Blue Books*.

TABLE 59. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1831–60*[1]

Year	Births				Deaths			
	Total population	Indian population			Total population	Indian population		
		Male	Female	Total		Male	Female	Total
1831	2,358	—	—	—	2,495	—	—	—
1832	2,624	—	—	—	2,917	—	—	—
1833	2,786	—	—	—	2,561	—	—	—
1834	2,829	—	—	—	3,714	1	—	1
1835	2,181	2	—	2	3,367	5	—	5
1836	2,910	1	1	2	3,020	64	4	68
1837	2,725	1	4	5	3,862	300	4	304
1838	2,674	19	32	51	3,533	607	28	635
1839	3,120	37	41	78	4,483	889	46	935
1840	3,872	70	76	146	3,464	495	38	533
1841	3,821	72	87	159	4,750	413	44	457
1842	3,770	94	86	180	4,760	373	45	418
1843	4,471	109	91	200	4,993	1,094	129	1,223
1844	4,192	235	213	448	8,737	3,862	238	4,100
1845	4,408	346	359	705	6,198	2,100	252	2,352
1846	5,045	529	477	1,006	5,305	1,447	298	1,745
1847	5,188	664	625	1,289	4,764	1,171	295	1,466
1848	5,133	652	643	1,295	4,403	1,215	289	1,504
1849	5,059	687	627	1,314	5,235	1,220	296	1,516
1850	5,281	675	650	1,325	5,547	1,350	356	1,706
1851	5,288	737	670	1,407	4,890	1,249	331	1,580
1852	5,775	926	774	1,700	5,591	1,594	464	2,058
1853	5,864	974	960	1,934	6,192	2,076	484	2,560
1854	6,364	1,095	972	2,067	17,978	4,517	781	5,298
1855	5,931	1,183	1,096	2,279	7,269	2,727	687	3,414
1856	6,076	1,329	1,278	2,607	11,312	3,955	923	4,878
1857	7,110	1,475	1,483	2,958	6,107	2,074	743	2,817
1858	7,544	1,619	1,644	3,263	7,242	2,582	992	3,574
1859	8,275	2,089	2,018	4,107	9,179	4,075	1,336	5,411
1860	9,737	2,978	2,787	5,765	9,805	3,842	1,442	5,284

[1] See for Indian Population *The Mauritius Almanac 1869*, pp. 130–3; for total Population Meldrum, p. 135. The birth figures for the total population are the same as in the *Blue Books* for 1831–3, 1837–9, 1842–52, and 1856; this is true also of the death figures for 1832–3, 1837–9, 1842–3, 1848–52, and 1856. The birth figures for the Indian Population 1841–50 are all higher than in the *Blue Books*; the same is true of the death figures except in 1849.

The *Report on the Blue Book* for 1867 gives, for each District, for each year from 1861 to 1867, separately for the General and the Indian Population, the births and deaths by sex and the still-births.[1]

The *Blue Books* for 1868–70 give for each year from 1861 onwards, for each District, separately for the General and the Indian Population, revised figures for births and deaths, and the numbers of still-births.[2]

[1] See Table 62. The figures differ in part essentially from those given in the *Blue Books* and in the *Almanac*. The *Report on the Blue Book* says: 'The figures in this Statement do not correspond with those in the Population Return appended to the Blue Book, in consequence of the Still-births having been separated from the total number of Deaths.' But this does not explain the actual differences between the data given in the two documents.

[2] See Table 63.

The *Mauritius Almanac* for 1921 gives (1) for each year from 1871 to 1919, separately for the General and the Indian Population, the births by sex, the deaths by sex and age (under 1, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5–9, 10–14, 15–19, 20–4, 25–34, 35–44, 45–54, 55–64,65–74, 75 and over), and the still-births by sex. The annual *Reports of the Registrar General* contain similar data also for subsequent years.[1]

TABLE 60. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1835–50*[1]

	General population						*Indian population*		*Total population*	
	Port Louis		*Elsewhere*		*Total*					
Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Births*	*Deaths*
1835	595	582	638	300	1,233	882	..	..	..	..
1836[2]	706	636	1,170	1,237	1,878	1,873	..	..	..	..
1837	1,293	1,619	1,432	2,243	2,725	3,862	..	..	..	..
1838	1,300	1,591	1,374	1,942	2,674	3,533	..	..	..	..
1839	1,407	2,236	1,713	2,247	3,120	4,483	..	..	..	..
1840	1,547	1,672	2,314	1,783	3,861	3,455	..	..	..	..
1841	1,367	1,980	2,034	2,264	3,401	4,244	131	342	3,532	4,586
1842	1,546	2,211	2,123	2,116	3,669	4,327	99	348	3,770[3]	4,700[4]
1843	1,558	1,602	2,730	2,251	4,288	3,853	183	1,058[5]	4,471	4,993[6]
1844	1,522	1,984	2,262	2,722	3,784	4,706	407	4,089	4,192[7]	8,955[8]
1845	1,497	1,936	2,261	1,955	3,758	3,891	650	2,228	4,408	6,194[9]
1846	1,718	1,750	2,449	1,579	4,167	3,329	878[10]	1,676[10]	5,045	5,005
1847	1,637	1,650	2,308	1,711	3,945	3,361	1,243[11]	1,422[11]	5,188	4,783
1848	1,590	1,563	2,280	1,408	3,870	2,971	1,263[11]	1,432[11]	5,133	4,403
1849	1,627	1,864	2,161	1,795	3,788	3,659	1,271[11]	1,576[11]	5,059	5,235
1850	1,666	2,100	2,356	1,896	4,022	3,996	1,259[11]	1,551[11]	5,281	5,547

[1] See *Blue Book 1835*, pp. 282–3; *1836*, folios 142–3; *1837*, folios 164–5; *1838*, folios 133–4; *1839*, folios 152–3; *1840*, folios 178–9; *1841*, pp. 252–3; *1842*, pp. 322–3; *1843*, pp. 314–15; *1844*, pp. 206–7; 1845, pp. 224–5; *1846*, pp. 192–3; *1847*, pp. 220–1; *1848*, pp. 220–1; *1849*, pp. 286–7; *1850*, pp. 258–9. The figures for the General Population prior to 1841 possibly comprise the Indian Population.

[2] 'Population not subjected to Apprenticeship.' This applies undoubtedly also to 1835.

[3] Including 2 among Labourers from Madagascar.

[4] Including 41 among Labourers from China and the Malay Coast, and 44 among Labourers from Madagascar.

[5] 'This number includes the Death Casualties among the Chinese and Madagascar Labourers in Port Louis.'

[6] Including 66 among Chinese, &c., Labourers, and 16 among Madagascar Labourers. But see also footnote 6.

[7] Including 1 among Chinese &c Labourers.

[8] Including 60 among Chinese &c Labourers and 20 among Madagascar Labourers.

[9] Including 38 among Chinese &c Labourers and 37 among Madagascar Labourers.

[10] 'Indian & other Immigrant Labourers.'

[11] 'Indian and other Immigrants.'

Death-rates for the total population have been published for every year from 1831 onwards.[2] They were computed for about six decades by relating the number of deaths to the population estimated at the end of the year, from the 1890s until 1934 to the population estimated at the beginning of the year, and from 1934 on to the estimated mid-year population.

[1] See Tables 64, 65. To save space I reproduce the details concerning the age of the deceased, only from 1919 onwards and only for the total population (see Table 66). These data are not available for 1940–4, as no reports by the Registrar-General have been published for those years. Some gaps in the birth and death data can be filled by perusing the *Blue Books* and the *Medical Reports*.

[2] For 1831–60 the rates were first computed and published by Meldrum (p. 135) and later reproduced in the *Mauritius Almanacs* (see, for example, *1900*, p. 392), which gave also death-rates for subsequent years.

TABLE 61. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1851–67*[1]

Year	General population		Ex-apprentice population		Immigrant population		Total population		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
					Births				
1851	701	700	1,264	1,271	704	648	2,669	2,619	5,288
1853	1,616		2,142		1,934		..	..	5,692
1859	1,094	1,134	988	952	2,092	1,997	4,174	4,083	8,257
1860	1,223	1,098	898	919	2,883	2,716	5,004	4,733	9,737
1861	1,247	1,227	837	859	2,854	2,885	4,938	4,971	9,909
1862[2]	1,308	1,312	767	778	2,982	2,972	5,060	5,065	10,125
1863	1,458	1,390	657	723	3,120	3,100	5,235	5,213	10,448
1864	1,430	1,399	722	711	3,177	3,174	5,329	5,284	10,613
1865	1,454	1,384	774	765	3,435	3,326	5,663	5,475	11,138
1866	1,398	1,461	719	695	3,452	3,342	5,569	5,498	11,067
1867	1,090	1,114	450	454	2,988	3,027	4,528	4,595	9,123
					Deaths				
1851	551	480	1,330	1,022	1,206	301	3,087	1,803	4,890
1853	1,173		2,435		2,560		..	..	6,168
1859	744	575	1,235	1,210	4,058	1,357	6,037	3,142	9,179
1860	1,198	755	1,267	1,211	3,899	1,475	6,364	3,441	9,805
1861	1,185	860	1,219	1,093	4,247	1,492	6,651	3,445	10,096
1862	1,409	1,053	1,420	1,291	7,084	2,263	9,913	4,607	14,520
1863[2]	998	685	1,046	906	6,678	2,000	8,712	3,591	12,303
1864[2]	933	795	940	840	6,427	2,331	8,400	3,966	12,366
1865[2]	1,157	1,000	1,017	1,018	5,909	2,675	8,082	4,693	12,775
1866	1,227	1,012	892	913	6,032	2,271	8,151	4,196	12,347
1867	4,350	2,873	5,051	4,750	17,205	6,972	26,606	14,595	41,201

[1] See *State of Colonial Possessions 1851*, Part I, p. 255; *1853*, p. 155; *Blue Book 1853*, pp. 242–3; *1859*, Section P, p. 5; *1860* P, p. 5; *1861* P, p. 5; 1862 P, p. 2 to *1867* P, p. 2. The total numbers of births and deaths in 1852 and 1854–8 were given as follows:

	1852	*1854*	*1855*	*1856*	*1857*	*1858*
Births . .	5,775	5,683	5,964	6,076	7,069	7,252
Deaths . .	5,591	14,398	6,223	11,312	6,076	7,170

See *Blue Book 1852*, pp. 254–5; *1854*, pp. 404–5; *1855*, pp. 230–1; *1856*, pp. 435–6; *1857*, pp. 307–8; *State of Colonial Possessions 1858*, Part I, p. 113. According to ibid. *1855*, p. 221, the births numbered 5,846 in 1854 and 5,966 in 1855, the deaths 14,775 in 1854 and 7,175 in 1855. According to ibid. *1856*, p. 140, the births among the General Population amounted in 1852 and 1855 to 1,722 and 1,604, and the deaths to 1,202 and 1,227 respectively.

[2] Totals do not tally with items.

TABLE 62. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1861–7*

Year	Births					Deaths					Still-births	
	General population		Indian population			General population		Indian population				
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total	General population	Indian population
According to Mauritius Almanac[1]												
1861[2]	1,674	1,637	2,302	2,252	7,865	1,516	1,240	3,078	1,020	6,854	206	256
1862	2,171	2,139	3,283	3,262	10,855	2,690	2,237	6,818	2,009	13,754	241	340
1863	2,203	2,185	3,436	3,359	11,183	1,839	1,467	6,505	1,888	11,699	287	324
1864	2,242	2,190	3,579	3,502	11,513	1,714	1,504	6,311	2,166	11,695	280	407
1865	2,355	2,264	3,834	3,683	12,136	1,990	1,861	5,937	2,286	12,074	313	383
1866	2,250	2,265	3,929	3,703	12,147	1,916	1,742	5,890	2,187	11,735	351	515
1867	1,750	1,764	3,528	3,545	10,587	9,112	7,340	16,973	6,769	40,194	420	486
According to Report on Blue Book[3]												
1861[2]	1,583	1,572	2,116	2,088	7,359	1,516	1,240	3,078	1,020	6,854	206	256
1862	2,073	2,072	3,022	3,071	10,194	2,690	2,237	6,818	2,009	13,754	241	340
1863	2,108	2,106	3,140	3,147	10,501	1,839	1,467	6,505	1,888	11,619	287	324
1864	2,146	2,119	3,217	3,206	10,688	1,714	1,504	6,311	2,166	11,695	280	407
1865	2,205	2,132	3,495	3,389	11,221	1,990	1,861	5,937	2,286	12,074	313	383
1866	2,107	2,153	3,527	3,378	11,165	1,916	1,742	5,890	2,187	11,735	351	515
1867	1,534	1,576	3,036	3,065	9,211	9,057	7,342	16,933	6,765	40,097	442	556

[1] See *The Mauritius Almanac 1869*, pp. 61–3.

[2] From census date (8 Apr.) to 31 Dec.

[3] See *State of Colonial Possessions 1867*, Part III, p. 29.

TABLE 63. *Births and Deaths, Mauritius 1861–70*[1]

Year	Births					Deaths					Still-births	
	General population		Indian population			General population		Indian population				
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total	Males	Females	Males	Females	Total	General population	Indian population
1861[2]	1,670	1,633	2,302	2,252	7,857	1,476	1,240	3,078	1,020	6,814	206	256
1862	2,160	2,132	3,283	3,262	10,837	2,659	2,233	6,818	2,009	13,719	241	340
1863	2,198	2,176	3,436	3,359	11,169	1,806	1,467	6,505	1,888	11,666	287	324
1864	2,234	2,184	3,579	3,502	11,499	1,670	1,502	6,311	2,166	11,649	280	407
1865	2,344	2,257	3,834	3,683	12,118	1,958	1,861	5,937	2,286	12,042	313	383
1866	2,242	2,260	3,929	3,703	12,134	1,884	1,741	5,890	2,187	11,702	351	515
1867	1,740	1,755	3,528	3,545	10,568	9,038	7,334	15,973	6,769	40,114	420	486
1868	1,637	1,592	3,066	3,141	9,436	3,431	2,786	8,119	4,067	18,403	330	332
1869	1,898	1,823	3,214	3,044	9,979	1,881	1,488	5,356	2,570	11,295	282	413
1870	2,198	1,992	3,464	3,503	11,157	1,451	1,207	3,081	1,687	7,426	356	477

[1] See *Blue Book 1870*, Section P, pp. 3–5.

[2] From census date (8 Apr.) to 31 Dec.

TABLE 64. *Births, Mauritius 1871–1946*[1]

Year	Total population					Indian population					General population				
	Live-born			Still-born	Birth-rate	Live-born			Still-born	Birth-rate	Live-born			Still-born	Birth-rate
	Males	Females	Total			Males	Females	Total			Males	Females	Total		
1871	6,046	5,757	11,803	897	37·3	3,762	3,592	7,354	569	34·0	2,284	2,165	4,449	328	[2] 44·6
1872	5,827	5,536	11,363	895	35·3	3,644	3,467	7,111	551	32·2	2,183	2,069	4,252	344	41·9
1873	5,891	5,643	11,534	882	35·1	3,839	3,650	7,489	563	33·1	2,052	1,993	4,045	319	39·3
1874	6,073	5,911	11,984	964	35·8	3,984	3,828	7,812	621	33·6	2,089	2,083	4,172	343	40·8
1875	6,504	6,427	12,931	972	38·0	4,264	4,232	8,596	657	36·4	2,140	2,195	4,335	315	41·6
1876	6,450	6,381	12,831	898	37·3	4,298	4,305	8,603	593	36·2	2,152	2,076	4,228	305	39·7
1877	6,285	6,201	12,486	965	36·1	4,155	4,123	8,278	615	34·7	2,130	2,078	4,208	350	39·3
1878	6,335	6,087	12,422	976	35·4	4,222	4,014	8,236	600	34·0	2,113	2,073	4,186	376	38·7
1879	6,635	6,462	13,107	1,106	37·0	4,419	4,328	8,747	771	35·7	2,206	2,154	4,360	337	39·9
1880	6,796	6,577	13,375	1,082	37·4	4,572	4,486	9,058	725	36·6	2,226	2,091	4,317	357	39·2
1881	6,506	6,520	13,026	1,020	36·2	4,394	4,317	8,711	658	35·1	2,112	2,203	4,315	362	38·6
1882	6,543	6,412	12,955	1,107	36·1	4,382	4,264	8,646	711	35·0	2,161	2,148	4,309	396	38·6
1883	6,271	6,338	12,609	1,113	35·2	4,200	4,185	8,385	714	34·1	2,071	2,153	4,224	399	37·6
1884	7,215	6,943	14,158	1,007	39·0	4,923	4,786	9,709	679	39·0	2,292	2,157	4,449	328	39·1
1885	6,956	6,601	13,557	934	37·0	4,817	4,590	9,407	631	37·5	2,139	2,011	4,150	303	35·9
1886	6,822	6,502	13,324	872	36·6	4,642	4,426	9,068	603	36·4	2,180	2,076	4,256	269	37·0
1887	7,097	6,817	13,914	903	38·3	4,909	4,648	9,557	618	38·3	2,188	2,169	4,357	285	38·4
1888	6,680	6,440	13,120	793	36·1	4,510	4,307	8,817	541	35·4	2,170	2,133	4,303	252	37·8
1889	6,941	6,760	13,701	846	37·6	4,802	4,715	9,517	619	38·1	2,139	2,045	4,184	247	36·6
1890	6,769	6,534	13,303	863	36·2	4,655	4,458	9,113	623	36·0	2,114	2,076	4,190	240	36·7
1891	7,150	6,728	13,878	900	37·4	4,925	4,668	9,593	639	37·4	2,225	2,060	4,285	261	37·3
1892	7,596	7,389	14,985	1,140	40·1	5,416	5,202	10,618	825	41·1	2,180	2,187	4,367	315	38·0
1893	6,724	6,471	13,195	991	35·6	4,726	4,560	9,286	727	36·3	1,998	1,911	3,909	264	34·2
1894	7,195	6,967	14,162	944	38·4	5,031	4,844	9,875	697	38·8	2,164	2,123	4,287	247	37·5
1895	7,035	6,935	13,970	995	37·6	4,972	4,852	9,824	744	38·2	2,093	2,053	4,146	251	36·2
1896	5,810	5,708	11,518	911	31·1	3,996	3,924	7,920	649	30·9	1,814	1,784	3,598	262	31·7
1897	7,037	6,630	13,667	962	37·1	4,938	4,603	9,541	715	37·3	2,099	2,017	4,116	247	36·5
1898	6,994	6,710	13,704	1,038	37·1	5,001	4,828	9,829	742	38·4	1,993	1,882	3,875	296	34·3
1899	7,092	6,797	13,889	1,044	37·7	5,023	4,849	9,872	769	38·6	2,069	1,948	4,017	275	35·7
1900	7,402	7,088	14,490	1,073	39·2	5,364	5,153	10,517	801	40·9	2,038	1,935	3,973	272	35·3
1901	6,614	6,296	12,910	1,011	34·8	4,645	4,430	9,095	768	35·0	1,949	1,866	3,815	243	34·2
1902	6,913	6,582	13,495	1,076	36·2	4,973	4,803	9,776	823	37·3	1,940	1,779	3,719	253	33·5
1903	6,898	6,713	13,611	1,134	36·4	4,919	4,848	9,767	883	37·2	1,979	1,865	3,844	251	34·6
1904	7,149	6,954	14,103	1,199	37·7	5,087	4,978	10,065	907	38·3	2,062	1,976	4,038	292	36·3
1905	7,050	6,993	14,043	1,152	37·4	5,047	5,052	10,099	885	38·3	2,003	1,941	3,944	267	35·3
1906	6,456	6,211	12,669	1,128	34·0	4,506	4,364	8,870	803	33·9	1,952	1,847	3,799	235	34·2
1907	7,139	7,047	14,186	1,205	38·1	5,123	5,070	10,193	941	39·0	2,016	1,997	3,993	264	36·1
1908	6,874	6,582	13,456	1,096	36·3	4,904	4,703	9,607	852	36·8	1,970	1,879	3,849	244	35·0
1909	6,709	6,128	12,837	1,139	34·8	4,589	4,671	9,260	891	35·8	1,820	1,757	3,577	248	32·6

1910	6,701	6,628	13,329	1,195	36·2	4,670	4,651	9,321	933	36·2	2,031	1,977	4,008	262	36·4
1911	7,366	7,219	14,585	1,392	39·4	5,367	5,203	10,570	1,060	40·9	1,999	2,016	4,015	312	35·6
1912	6,756	6,451	13,209	1,250	35·4	4,881	4,616	9,497	970	36·6	1,877	1,835	3,712	280	32·6
1913	7,700	7,453	15,153	1,472	40·4	5,533	5,266	10,799	1,162	41·4	2,167	2,187	4,354	310	38·0
1914	7,520	7,709	15,229	1,467	40·2	5,302	5,517	10,879	1,174	41·3	2,158	2,192	4,350	293	37·6
1915	6,747	6,347	13,094	1,257	34·4	4,662	4,307	8,969	950	33·8	2,085	2,040	4,125	307	35·6
1916	6,607	6,555	13,162	1,542	34·4	4,461	4,518	8,979	1,238	33·7	2,146	2,037	4,183	304	36·2
1917	7,038	6,849	13,887	1,436	36·2	4,909	4,712	9,621	1,077	35·9	2,129	2,137	4,266	359	36·6
1918	6,704	6,405	13,109	1,534	34·0	4,642	4,416	9,058	1,174	33·6	2,062	1,989	4,051	350	35·1
1919	6,687	6,574	13,261	1,400	34·9	4,685	4,672	9,357	1,068	35·1	2,002	1,902	3,904	332	34·4
1920	6,440	6,351	12,791	1,369	34·1	4,506	4,489	8,995	1,068	34·0	1,934	1,862	3,796	301	34·2
1921	7,228	7,132	14,360	1,623	38·1	4,981	4,961	9,942	1,273	37·5	2,247	2,171	4,418	350	39·7
1922	7,013	6,942	13,955	1,678	37·0	4,742	4,753	9,495	1,285	35·9	2,271	2,189	4,460	418	39·9
1923	7,042	6,837	13,879	1,557	36·8	4,705	4,557	9,262	1,204	34·9	2,337	2,280	4,617	353	40·9
1924	7,882	7,548	15,430	1,608	40·4	5,396	5,192	10,588	1,280	39·6	2,486	2,356	4,842	328	42·3
1925	8,299	8,246	16,545	1,439	42·6	5,616	5,651	11,267	1,134	41·5	2,683	2,595	5,278	305	45·2
1926	7,736	7,784	15,520	1,315	39·4	5,140	5,392	10,532	1,027	38·4	2,596	2,392	4,988	288	41·6
1927	7,089	6,659	13,748	1,227	34·5	4,756	4,575	9,331	938	33·6	2,333	2,084	4,417	289	36·7
1928	7,676	7,528	15,206	1,354	37·9	5,106	5,072	10,178	1,057	36·4	2,572	2,456	5,028	297	41·2
1929	6,983	6,788	13,771	1,182	34·0	4,583	4,551	9,134	907	32·5	2,400	2,237	4,637	275	37·5
1930	6,442	6,351	12,793	1,203	31·5	4,030	4,093	8,153	909	29·2	2,382	2,258	4,640	294	37·8
1931	6,057	5,884	11,941	1,231	30·2	3,719	3,598	7,317	905	27·1	2,338	2,286	4,624	326	36·9
1932	5,164	5,102	10,266	995	26·2	3,139	3,105	6,244	724	23·5	2,025	1,997	4,022	271	32·1
1933	6,836	6,643	13,479	1,245	34·7	4,511	4,398	8,909	978	33·9	2,325	2,245	4,570	267	36·3
1934	6,932	6,584	13,516	1,307	34·5	4,548	4,359	8,907	1,025	33·7	2,384	2,225	4,609	282	36·1
1935	6,791	6,455	13,246	1,301	33·6	4,474	4,274	8,748	1,004	32·9	2,317	2,181	4,498	297	34·9
1936	6,972	6,895	13,867	1,321	34·9	4,590	4,519	9,109	1,021	34·1	2,382	2,376	4,758	300	36·4
1937	7,187	6,910	14,097	1,305	35·2	4,763	4,560	9,323	1,009	34·7	2,424	2,350	4,774	296	36·3
1938	6,790	6,630	13,420	1,246	33·4	4,358	4,270	8,628	967	32·1	2,432	2,360	4,792	279	36·0
1939	7,415	7,163	14,578	1,271	36·0	4,776	4,628	9,404	990	34·8	2,639	2,535	5,174	281	38·4
1940	6,164	5,981	12,145	1,055	29·8	3,891	3,879	7,770	766	28·7	2,273	2,102	4,375	289	32·2
1941	6,778	6,652	13,430	1,100	33·0	4,370	4,424	8,794	829	32·4	2,408	2,228	4,636	271	34·1
1942	6,950	6,603	13,553	1,305	33·2	4,630	4,343	8,973	984	32·9	2,320	2,260	4,580	321	33·8
1943	6,857	6,747	13,604	991	33·2	4,565	4,459	9,024	746	33·0	2,292	2,288	4,580	245	33·5
1944	9,080	9,178	18,258	1,319	43·5	6,624	6,806	13,430	1,108	50·6	2,456	2,372	4,828	211	31·3
1945	8,184	8,106	16,290	1,484	38·5	5,709	5,630	11,339	1,178	42·2	2,475	2,476	4,951	306	32·0
1946	8,388	8,039	16,427	1,374	38·7	5,746	5,468	11,214	1,086	41·8	2,642	2,571	5,213	288	33·5

[1] See *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, p. 10; *Report of the Registrar General 1919*, p. 8; *1920*, p. 7; *1921*, p. 8; *1922*, pp. 3, 7; *1923*, p. 8; *1924*, pp. 3, 8; *1925*, p. 8; *1926*, pp. 3, 8; *1927*, p. 7; *1928*, p. 7; *1929*, p. 8; *1930*, p. 7; *1931*, p. 8; *1936*, pp. 6–8; *1938*, pp. 6–8; *1939*, pp. 7, 9–10; *1945*, pp. 5–6; *1946*, pp. 5–6; *Medical Report 1940*, p. 7; *Blue Book 1940*, Section N, p. 2. The numbers of male and female live-born among the Indian and the General Population in 1940 were kindly provided by Mr. M. Herchenroder, Director of Statistics, Mauritius.

TABLE 65. *Deaths, Mauritius 1871–1946*[1]

Year	Total population						Indian population						General population					
	Total deaths			Deaths under 1	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate	Total deaths			Deaths under 1	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate	Total deaths			Deaths under 1	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate
	Males	Females	Total				Males	Females	Total				Males	Females	Total			
1871	4,911	3,258	8,169	1,772	25·8	150	3,423	2,026	5,449	1,196	25·2	163	1,488	1,232	2,720	576	27·3	129
1872	5,122	3,623	8,745	1,734	27·1	153	3,423	2,174	5,597	1,128	25·4	159	1,699	1,449	3,148	606	31·0	142
1873	6,525	4,685	11,210	2,251	34·1	195	4,264	2,677	6,941	1,378	30·7	184	2,261	2,008	4,269	873	41·5	216
1874	5,809	4,210	10,019	1,976	30·0	165	3,989	2,560	6,549	1,272	28·2	163	1,820	1,650	3,470	704	34·0	169
1875	5,021	3,563	8,584	2,014	25·2	156	3,469	2,143	5,612	1,315	23·8	153	1,552	1,420	2,972	699	28·6	161
1876	5,617	3,908	9,525	2,109	27·7	164	3,909	2,448	6,357	1,454	26·7	169	1,708	1,460	3,168	655	29·8	155
1877	6,087	4,248	10,335	1,987	29·9	159	4,197	2,650	6,847	1,354	28·7	164	1,890	1,598	3,488	633	32·5	150
1878	5,782	3,867	9,649	1,973	27·5	159	4,082	2,433	6,515	1,330	26·9	161	1,700	1,434	3,134	643	29·0	154
1879	6,812	4,673	11,485	2,060	32·4	157	5,014	3,106	8,120	1,446	33·1	165	1,798	1,567	3,365	614	30·8	141
1880	5,857	4,286	10,143	2,001	28·4	150	4,085	2,715	6,800	1,414	27·5	156	1,772	1,571	3,343	587	30·4	136
1881	6,225	4,521	10,746	2,131	29·9	164	4,366	2,885	7,251	1,421	29·2	163	1,859	1,636	3,495	710	31·5	165
1882	7,385	5,178	12,563	2,203	35·0	170	5,180	3,250	8,430	1,447	34·1	167	2,205	1,928	4,133	756	37·0	175
1883	7,314	5,456	12,770	2,376	35·7	188	5,024	3,257	8,281	1,508	33·7	180	2,290	2,199	4,489	868	40·0	205
1884	6,487	4,760	11,247	2,245	31·0	159	4,582	2,970	7,552	1,507	30·3	155	1,905	1,790	3,695	738	32·4	166
1885	7,149	5,203	12,352	2,242	33·7	165	5,094	3,395	8,489	1,502	33·8	160	2,055	1,808	3,863	740	33·4	178
1886	6,115	4,509	10,624	2,045	29·2	153	4,351	2,928	7,279	1,391	29·2	153	1,764	1,581	3,345	654	29·1	154
1887	7,200	5,490	12,690	2,404	34·9	173	5,068	3,561	8,629	1,604	34·6	168	2,132	1,929	4,061	800	35·8	184
1888	6,409	4,784	11,193	2,077	30·8	158	4,385	3,002	7,387	1,377	29·6	156	2,024	1,782	3,806	700	33·4	163
1889	7,131	5,436	12,567	1,901	34·5	139	5,161	3,635	8,796	1,342	35·2	141	1,970	1,801	3,771	559	33·0	134
1890	7,308	5,473	12,781	2,440	34·8	183	5,190	3,511	8,701	1,705	34·4	187	2,118	1,962	4,080	735	35·7	175
1891	5,725	4,355	10,080	2,084	27·2	150	3,991	2,807	6,798	1,366	26·5	142	1,734	1,548	3,282	718	28·6	168
1892	7,309	5,746	13,055	2,449	35·0	163	5,028	3,615	8,643	1,549	33·5	146	2,281	2,131	4,412	900	38·4	206
1893	8,912	6,395	15,307	2,654	41·3	201	6,554	4,285	10,839	1,811	42·4	195	2,358	2,110	4,468	843	39·1	216
1894	5,923	4,869	10,792	2,264	29·2	160	4,032	3,175	7,207	1,449	28·3	147	1,891	1,694	3,585	815	31·4	190
1895	7,862	6,096	13,958	2,900	37·5	208	5,565	4,028	9,593	2,023	37·3	206	2,297	2,068	4,365	877	38·1	212
1896	8,671	7,172	15,843	3,179	42·8	276	6,114	4,749	10,863	2,107	42·4	266	2,557	2,423	4,980	1,072	43·9	296
1897	6,170	4,896	11,066	..	30·0	..	4,319	3,246	7,565	..	29·6	..	1,851	1,650	3,501	..	31·0	..
1898	6,745	5,137	11,882	2,200	32·2	161	4,727	3,351	8,078	1,458	31·6	148	2,018	1,786	3,804	742	33·6	191
1899	7,412	5,810	13,222	2,242	35·9	161	5,116	3,852	8,968	1,535	35·0	155	2,296	1,958	4,254	707	37·8	176
1900	7,476	6,219	13,695	2,637	37·1	182	5,249	4,175	9,424	1,831	36·7	174	2,227	2,044	4,271	806	38·0	203
1901	8,291	6,679	14,970	2,424	40·3	188	5,814	4,551	10,365	1,574	39·9	173	2,477	2,128	4,605	850	41·3	223
1902	6,927	5,789	12,716	2,318	34·1	172	4,755	3,834	8,589	1,591	32·7	163	2,172	1,955	4,127	727	37·2	195
1903	8,346	6,688	15,034	2,227	40·3	164	6,006	4,698	10,704	1,632	40·8	167	2,340	1,990	4,330	595	38·9	155
1904	6,590	5,474	12,064	2,076	32·2	147	4,692	3,873	8,565	1,505	32·6	150	1,898	1,601	3,499	571	31·4	141
1905	8,360	7,019	15,379	2,517	41·0	179	6,002	4,959	10,961	1,760	41·5	174	2,358	2,060	4,418	757	39·6	192
1906	8,251	6,873	15,124	2,252	40·5	178	5,959	4,876	10,835	1,594	41·4	180	2,292	1,997	4,289	658	38·6	173
1907	7,058	5,979	13,037	2,172	35·0	153	4,928	4,195	9,123	1,529	34·9	150	2,130	1,784	3,914	643	35·4	161
1908	8,054	7,040	15,094	2,466	40·7	183	5,840	5,080	10,920	1,742	41·8	181	2,214	1,960	4,174	724	37·9	188

1909	7,480	6,281	13,761	2,257	37·3	176	5,530	4,536	10,066	1,668	38·9	180	1,950	1,745	3,695	589	33·7	165
1910	6,642	5,846	12,488	2,103	33·9	158	4,874	4,217	9,091	1,478	35·3	159	1,768	1,629	3,397	625	30·8	156
1911	6,562	5,642	12,204	2,046	33·0	140	4,642	4,019	8,661	1,444	33·5	137	1,920	1,623	3,543	602	31·6	150
1912	7,541	6,888	14,429	2,559	38·6	194	5,213	4,711	9,924	1,828	38·3	192	2,328	2,177	4,505	781	39·5	197
1913	7,028	6,173	13,201	2,212	35·2	146	4,999	4,447	9,446	1,596	36·2	148	2,029	1,726	3,755	616	32·8	141
1914	6,395	5,739	12,134	2,113	32·1	139	4,560	4,092	8,652	1,485	32·8	137	1,835	1,647	3,482	628	30·3	144
1915	6,938	6,163	13,101	2,161	34·4	165	4,883	4,296	9,179	1,476	34·6	165	2,055	1,867	3,922	685	34·0	166
1916	6,074	5,358	11,432	1,932	29·9	147	4,304	3,830	8,134	1,352	30·5	151	1,770	1,528	3,298	580	28·5	139
1917	6,587	5,647	12,234	2,299	31·9	166	4,547	3,812	8,359	1,536	31·2	160	2,040	1,835	3,875	763	33·4	179
1918	6,911	5,883	12,794	2,317	33·2	177	4,609	3,893	8,502	1,511	31·5	167	2,302	1,990	4,292	806	37·2	199
1919	13,368	11,087	24,455	2,506	64·3	189	9,388	7,672	17,060	1,676	63·9	179	3,980	3,415	7,395	830	65·2	213
1920	6,188	5,585	11,773	2,000	31·4	156	4,319	3,859	8,178	1,379	30·9	153	1,869	1,726	3,595	621	32·4	164
1921	8,124	7,035	15,159	2,538	40·3	177	5,595	4,824	10,419	1,634	39·3	164	2,529	2,211	4,740	904	42·6	205
1922	6,916	6,051	12,967	2,065	34·5	148	4,884	4,279	9,163	1,436	33·3	151	2,032	1,772	3,804	629	35·5	141
1923	5,674	5,104	10,778	1,935	28·5	139	3,883	3,555	7,438	1,320	28·1	143	1,791	1,549	3,340	615	29·6	133
1924	5,584	4,974	10,558	2,000	27·7	130	3,887	3,522	7,409	1,414	27·7	134	1,697	1,452	3,149	586	27·5	121
1925	4,736	4,591	9,327	1,981	24·1	120	3,305	3,246	6,551	1,425	24·2	126	1,431	1,345	2,776	556	23·8	105
1926	5,174	4,784	9,958	1,873	25·3	121	3,540	3,438	6,978	1,285	25·4	122	1,634	1,346	2,980	588	25·0	118
1927	5,220	4,795	10,015	1,878	25·1	137	3,725	3,449	7,174	1,331	25·8	143	1,495	1,346	2,841	547	23·6	124
1928	5,852	5,490	11,342	1,909	28·2	126	4,110	3,936	8,046	1,339	28·8	132	1,742	1,554	3,296	570	27·0	113
1929	6,535	5,878	12,413	1,821	30·7	132	4,711	4,190	8,901	1,301	31·7	142	1,824	1,688	3,512	520	28·4	112
1930	7,391	6,950	14,341	2,527	35·4	198	5,112	4,891	10,003	1,741	35·6	214	2,279	2,059	4,338	786	34·8	169
1931	7,943	7,524	15,467	2,425	39·1	203	5,760	5,537	11,297	1,660	41·8	227	2,183	1,987	4,170	765	33·3	165
1932	6,917	5,931	12,848	1,682	32·8	159	5,020	4,192	9,212	1,047	34·6	168	1,897	1,739	3,636	585	29·0	145
1933	5,529	5,086	10,615	1,773	27·3	132	3,873	3,640	7,513	1,163	28·6	131	1,656	1,446	3,102	610	24·6	133
1934	5,301	4,768	10,069	1,754	25·7	130	3,711	3,371	7,082	1,208	26·8	136	1,590	1,397	2,987	546	23·3	118
1935	5,388	5,057	10,445	1,847	26·5	139	3,842	3,649	7,491	1,257	28·2	144	1,546	1,408	2,954	590	22·9	131
1936	5,420	5,080	10,500	1,973	26·4	142	3,848	3,613	7,461	1,349	27·9	148	1,572	1,467	3,039	624	23·3	131
1937	5,846	5,681	11,527	2,178	28·8	155	4,070	3,952	8,022	1,483	29·9	159	1,776	1,729	3,505	695	26·6	146
1938	6,274	5,772	12,046	2,181	29·9	163	4,432	4,068	8,500	1,473	31·6	171	1,842	1,704	3,546	708	26·6	148
1939	5,619	5,721	11,340	2,296	28·0	157	3,783	3,877	7,660	1,522	28·3	162	1,836	1,844	3,680	774	27·3	150
1940	5,327	5,046	10,373	1,968	25·5	162	3,688	3,627	7,315	1,373	27·0	177	1,639	1,419	3,058	595	22·5	136
1941	5,243	5,193	10,436	1,810	25·6	135	3,555	3,564	7,119	1,193	26·2	135	1,688	1,629	3,317	617	24·4	133
1942	6,183	5,744	11,927	2,215	29·2	163	4,324	4,016	8,340	1,504	30·6	168	1,859	1,728	3,587	711	26·5	155
1943	5,724	4,918	10,642	1,926	25·9	142	3,817	3,250	7,067	1,290	25·8	143	1,907	1,668	3,575	636	26·1	139
1944	6,105	5,250	11,355	2,575	27·1	141	4,117	3,530	7,647	1,880	28·8	140	1,988	1,720	3,708	695	24·1	144
1945	7,995	7,282	15,277	3,063	36·1	188	5,721	5,141	10,862	2,226	40·4	196	2,274	2,141	4,415	837	28·5	169
1946	6,476	6,052	12,528	2,385	29·5	145	4,497	4,148	8,645	1,622	32·2	145	1,979	1,904	3,883	763	24·9	146

[1] See *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, p. 10; *Report of the Registrar-General 1919*, pp. 3–4, 16; *1920*, pp. 3, 14; *1921*, pp. 4, 15; *1922*, pp. 3, 14; *1923*, pp. 3–4, 15; *1924*, pp. 3–4, 15; *1925*, pp. 3–4, 15; *1926*, pp. 3–4, 15; *1927*, pp. 3, 14; *1928*, pp. 3, 14; *1929*, p. 15; *1930*, p. 14; *1931*, p. 15; *1932*, p. 21; *1933*, p. 22; *1934*, p. 24; *1935*, p. 26; *1936*, p. 27; *1937*, p. 29; *1938*, pp. 8, 27; *1939*, pp. 11, 14, Tables 3, 10; *1945*, pp. 7, 10, 13, 25; *1946*, pp. 7, 10, 13, 25; *Medical Report 1940*, pp. 7–8; *1941*, p. 5; *1942*, p. 5; *1943*, p. 5; *1944*, p. 5; *Blue Book 1946*, Section N, p. 2; *1942* N, p. 2; *1943* N, p. 2; *1944* N, p. 2. Some figures for 1940-1 were kindly provkied by Mr. M. Herchenroder.

TABLE 66. *Deceased by Age and Sex, Mauritius 1919–46*[1]

Year	Sex	Under 1	1	2	3	4	5 to 9	10 to 14	15 to 19	20 to 24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55 to 64	65 to 74	75 to 84	85 to 94	95 and over	Not stated
1919	M.	1,334	482	379	233	157	411	414	598	1,023	1,990	2,134	1,655	1,164	794	381	105	20	94
	F.	1,172	447	418	242	166	439	465	740	1,054	1,645	1,470	947	809	575	290	122	44	42
1920	M.	1,064	294	219	150	117	212	196	194	297	513	667	743	668	497	271	68	18	—
	F.	936	330	307	188	122	241	247	250	358	501	514	428	380	422	237	88	36	—
1921	M.	1,342	401	314	170	109	315	311	337	461	753	1,021	945	710	561	269	87	18	—
	F.	1,196	374	341	194	147	337	321	380	508	717	711	526	482	408	266	95	32	—
1922	M.	1,120	300	265	153	92	202	251	279	366	599	798	858	725	520	280	86	22	—
	F.	945	406	257	170	120	241	262	323	469	617	603	450	390	407	265	92	34	—
1923	M.	1,058	332	281	120	62	195	175	219	301	465	602	682	524	376	211	55	16	—
	F.	877	357	293	133	74	196	229	252	406	499	459	349	372	311	183	80	34	—
1924	M.	1,099	216	182	123	64	171	161	201	302	469	623	741	570	382	215	49	16	—
	F.	901	212	187	128	67	167	183	255	421	568	495	430	369	327	174	63	27	—
1925	M.	1,049	269	174	104	72	131	147	184	229	407	492	516	463	313	147	32	7	—
	F.	932	272	206	118	83	149	171	254	326	451	426	332	286	289	181	80	35	—
1926	M.	1,034	304	205	110	75	173	141	176	268	460	504	571	498	414	163	60	18	—
	F.	839	303	223	146	80	188	148	225	346	476	419	405	381	316	162	92	35	—
1927	M.	1,030	309	221	107	74	152	165	170	218	397	551	615	549	411	181	63	5	2
	F.	848	332	230	135	92	179	146	243	323	490	455	338	346	346	195	64	30	3
1928	M.	994	282	246	137	101	175	138	187	261	506	640	784	681	455	201	52	12	—
	F.	915	299	295	163	134	241	149	299	415	570	459	432	424	366	222	86	20	1
1929	M.	1,022	324	257	180	103	228	177	221	300	547	741	883	740	472	247	66	26	1
	F.	799	353	291	219	136	221	211	275	377	576	536	527	507	431	267	111	39	2

1930	M.	1,277	493	495	259	171	296	216	206	289	502	708	777	755	528	309	89	21	—
	F.	1,250	531	540	321	257	350	237	270	383	528	488	453	468	455	273	103	42	1
1931	M.	1,272	406	349	240	179	390	249	241	372	713	828	914	869	606	227	73	15	—
	F.	1,153	452	381	349	199	466	270	362	488	748	609	548	588	480	267	118	46	—
1932	M.	871	214	198	125	88	253	212	285	378	718	867	949	914	541	221	61	22	—
	F.	761	235	209	151	100	266	224	309	387	633	601	559	616	507	252	90	31	—
1933	M.	938	168	148	99	64	214	171	212	267	519	634	719	704	430	190	41	11	—
	F.	835	174	161	97	85	223	179	254	373	587	482	426	453	441	217	75	23	1
1934	M.	976	202	135	77	62	184	169	210	274	500	535	647	613	448	204	45	20	—
	F.	778	183	134	92	54	165	173	237	403	536	492	412	414	354	239	84	18	—
1935	M.	1,019	198	147	73	47	176	154	195	281	525	605	686	611	416	186	61	8	—
	F.	828	186	162	84	57	189	142	276	414	593	478	433	466	412	229	87	21	—
1936	M.	1,078	231	144	76	54	138	153	190	245	483	615	690	597	443	219	53	11	—
	F.	895	227	186	126	68	148	158	245	406	546	490	429	421	385	253	79	18	—
1937	M.	1,153	282	213	125	97	156	149	208	245	457	579	752	694	480	192	59	5	—
	F.	1,025	282	249	169	121	179	148	269	387	593	520	460	491	402	259	107	20	—
1938	M.	1,151	261	182	116	64	151	160	210	330	569	701	816	766	496	240	49	12	—
	F.	1,030	223	193	117	76	174	156	315	449	635	545	482	547	448	267	96	19	—
1939	M.	1,244	397	272	181	114	253	140	168	239	422	454	547	578	397	176	30	7	—
	F.	1,052	382	339	195	126	283	181	300	391	528	427	396	410	373	232	78	28	—
1945	M.	1,637	246	169	79	60	178	106	294	491	877	908	1,126	977	585	228	33	1	—
	F.	1,426	256	164	76	57	163	110	380	711	913	653	612	693	663	302	87	16	—
1946	M.	1,297	218	209	74	52	148	104	267	418	727	732	826	733	462	174	31	4	—
	F.	1,088	252	190	80	41	130	114	323	535	700	579	523	571	559	275	76	16	—

[1] See *Report of the Registrar General 1919*, p. 16; *1920*, p. 14; *1921*, p. 15; *1922*, p. 14; *1923*, p. 15; *1924*, p. 15; *1925*, p. 15; *1926*, p. 15; *1927*, p. 14; *1928*, p. 14; *1929*, p. 15; *1930*, p. 14; *1931*, p. 15; *1932*, p. 21; *1933*, p. 22; *1934*, p. 24; *1935*, p. 9; *1936*, p. 10; *1937*, p. 10; *1938*, p. 10; *1939*, p. 14; *1945*, p. 25; *1946*, p. 25.

No birth-rates seem to have been published for any year prior to the census of 1861 (8 April), and the official birth-rates for 1862–70 are very contradictory as the population estimates to which the births were related were often revised.[1] I have, therefore, computed new birth-rates for 1831–70 by relating the numbers of births to the population figures used in computing the death-rates. The results for 1831–70 are as follows:

Year	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1831	25·4	26·84	1841	33·4	41·53	1851	28·7	26·50	1861	30·8	31·34
1832	28·2	31·35	1842	33·6	42·41	1852	29·0	28·07	1862	33·2	42·05
1833	29·8	27·35	1843	31·0	34·64	1853	28·1	29·66	1863	34·0	35·56
1834	30·4	39·85	1844	28·0	58·41	1854	30·0	84·61[1]	1864	34·6	35·06
1835	23·3	35·96	1845	28·1	39·48	1855	26·9	33·01	1865	34·7	34·55
1836	29·8	30·96	1846	31·1	32·71	1856	27·2	50·56[1]	1866	34·6	33·38
1837	26·2	37·16	1847	31·9	29·31	1857	30·4	26·08	1867	33·0	125·11[2]
1838	23·2	30·70	1848	30·8	26·44	1858	29·3	28·09	1868	30·2	58·95
1839	27·1	38·99	1849	29·8	30·84	1859	28·3	30·88	1869	32·6	36·89
1840	33·5	30·00	1850	30·0	31·46	1860	31·4	31·64	1870	35·6	23·70

[1] Epidemic of cholera. [2] Epidemic of malaria.

Some of these rates may be wide of the mark because, quite apart from defects in registration, the population estimates were in part very uncertain.[2] Since, moreover, the rates were computed by relating births and deaths to the estimated population at the end of the year, they are too low for years when immigration was very large and they are too high for years when mortality was excessive.

For 1871–1920 I have computed birth- and death-rates[3] by relating the numbers of registered births and deaths to the estimated mid-year population shown in Table 25 and on page 787. For 1921–46 I have accepted the official birth- and death-rates[4] because I felt unable to revise the intercensal estimates. But as the basic population figures are sometimes too low and sometimes too high,[5] these rates are in part inaccurate.

[1] See p. 782 above.

[2] Meldrum, who rejected the final official population estimates (see p. 783 above), gave the following death-rates for 1861–70:

1861	*1862*	*1863*	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*	*1868*	*1869*	*1870*
31·13	41·50	34·79	34·12	33·42	32·06	120·47	56·73	34·98	22·59

I am inclined to think that his population figures for 1861–6 come nearer the truth than the final official estimates but that his figures for 1867–70 are too high.

[3] See Tables 64, 65.

[4] See ibid.

[5] The population was, for example, understated by 3·0 per cent. in 1920 and overstated by 2·3 per cent. in 1930.

VII. Fertility, Mortality, and Population Growth

1. *Fertility*

There seems to be a consensus of opinion that the white women in Mauritius were very fecund. Some writers relate that they were also very fertile,[1] but Chapotin, whose judgement undoubtedly carries more weight, said:

> The women are in general very fecund in the Isle of France; but they are frequently subject to miscarriages and haemorrhages . . . .[2]

It should be realized, furthermore, that there were few white married women in the Colony as most white men, especially those residing in the capital, were bachelors living with black concubines.[3]

On 7 July 1778 the Superior Council of the Isle of France, in view of the numerous abortions of unmarried women, enacted[4] that the Edict issued by Henry II in February 1556 and the Declaration made by Louis XIV on 25 February 1708, which inflicted the death penalty on women concealing their pregnancies, were to be in full force and vigour in the Colony. Even so, Eugène Bernard in 1834 complained about the wide spread of birth-control and abortions among the slaves, particularly those from Madagascar.[5]

D'Unienville reckoned throughout the period from 1767 to 1824 with a birth-rate of 30 among the slaves,[6] but this was merely an estimate since there were no records for this period. The statistics available for 1827–34 show a yearly average of about 1,600 births among a slave population of about 65,000, indicating a birth-rate of about 25. Since birth registration was undoubtedly incomplete, the actual rate was higher, but it must be realized that the large preponderance of men tended to reduce the rate. The births registered among whites in 1804–29 show a rate averaging about 30, while that among the free coloured (with a considerable preponderance of women) exceeded 40.[7]

Total Population. The yearly number of births registered increased from 2,636 in 1831–8 to 3,646 in 1839–42, 4,357 in 1843–5, 5,329 in 1846–53, and 6,124 in 1854–6. The number then rose, without any setback, to 12,134 in 1866. It dropped, owing to the malaria epidemic, to 10,568 in 1867 and 9,436 in 1868, but increased again gradually and averaged 11,671 in 1871–4 and 12,860 in 1875–83. Thus, after an enormous increase in the second third of the nineteenth century it took a long time to make good the losses incurred in connexion with the epidemic. During the six decades

[1] Admiral Kempenfelt said in 1758 that they 'are very fruitful, which circumstance is imputed to the salubrity of the climate' (Grant, p. 470). Stirling, *Cursory Notes on the Isle of France*, p. 27, wrote in 1827 that 'the women are very prolific, and, generally speaking, rear large families'.

[2] Chapotin, *Topographie médicale de l'Ile de France* (1812), p. 77.

[3] See B. de St. Pierre, Letter from Port-Louis, 10 Feb. 1769, *Voyage à l'Ile de France* (1773), vol. i, p. 184.

[4] *Code Delaleu*, pp. 183–4, No. 138.

[5] Bernard, 'Essai sur les nouveaux affranchis de l'Île Maurice', pp. 550–1.

[6] In the printed edition of his book published after his death this rate is raised to 33⅓. See p. 759 above.

[7] See Table 50.

from 1884 to 1943 there were three years with less than 12,000 births (1896, 1931–2) and six years with more than 15,000 births (1913–14, 1924–6, 1928), but the figures showed no definite trend. The average number was 13,619 in 1884–1912, 15,191 in 1913–14, 13,500 in 1915–23, 15,037 in 1924–9, 11,667 in 1930–2, and 13,540 in 1933–43. The figure then leapt to 18,258 in 1944 and amounted in 1945–6 to 16,290 and 16,427 respectively.

The birth-rate has not changed essentially in the course of time. In 1831–70 the average of the official rates was 30, but registration was defective. In 1871–1920 the rate oscillated between 31·1 and 40·4 and was lower than 34 only in 1896. The averages in these five decades were 36·5, 36·8, 37·1, 36·2, and 36·3 respectively. From 1921 onwards the rates become less certain owing to difficulties in ascertaining the intercensal population. The official birth-rates oscillated in 1921–46 between 26·2 and 43·5. They averaged 37·9 in 1921–9, 29·3 in 1930–2, and 33·8 in 1933–43. The rate leapt to 43·5 in 1944 and averaged 38·6 in 1945–6.

The birth-rate remained constant during the half-century from 1871 to 1920. But this does not mean that fertility was constant. Since the proportion of women among the total population increased steadily during that period, a constant birth-rate indicated rather a decline in fertility. The females of child-bearing age in 1871–1910[1] and the births in that period numbered as follows:

	Females					
Period	*15–19*	*20–34*	*35–44*	*Total 15–44*	*total births*	*female births*
1871–80	13,585	35,751	17,467	66,803	123,836	61,002
1881–90	16,607	39,691	18,179	74,477	133,667	65,867
1891–1900	18,155	42,290	18,208	78,653	137,448	67,383
1901–10	18,694	45,757	19,001	83,452	134,639	66,434

It appears that while the mean population increased from 339,400 in 1871–80 to 372,100 in 1901–10 or by only 10 per cent. and the mean yearly number of births from 12,384 to 13,464 or by only 9 per cent., the number of women of child-bearing age increased from 66,800 to 83,450 or by 25 per cent. If one computes, in a very rough manner, gross reproduction-rates by allocating the female births to the women of child-bearing age so that the specific fertility-rates are twice as high at ages 20–34 as at ages 15–19 and 35–44, these reproduction-rates turn out to be in the four decades 2·68, 2·60, 2·51, and 2·35 respectively. In 1920–2 the reproduction-rate was 2·31, although the birth-rate was still 36·4. In 1930–2 (when Indian fertility was exceptionally low) the reproduction-rate was 1·93 and the birth-rate 29·7. In 1943–5 the reproduction-rate was 2·38 while the birth-rate was as high as 38·3.

Fertility was higher in Mauritius in 1871–1900 than it ever was in England. But it has been notably lower in Mauritius since the beginning of

[1] Computed from the revised intercensal estimates by sex and age published in *Mauritius Almanac 1921*, Section E, pp. 7–9.

this century than during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. In many years during the present century it was still about as high as it was in England before the decline began, but it was sometimes much lower.

The excess of male over female births has been small. The number of male births registered in 1859–1946 was 588,508 and the number of female births registered 572,686. There were 1,028 male to 1,000 female births.

The proportion of registered still-births has been large. It increased from 7·3 per cent. in 1866–1915 to 10·0 per cent. in 1916–24 and declined to 8·5 per cent. in 1925–38 and 7·7 per cent. in 1939–46. The frequency of still-births has been attributed to venereal disease, malaria, and ankylostomiasis, to the early marriages amongst Indians and child-bearing at immature age, to the work of expectant mothers in the fields, and to hardships and privations in the poorer classes.[1]

General Population. Birth figures prior to 1859 are uncertain and are lacking entirely for some years. The number of registered births oscillated in 1859–1922 between 3,229 (1868) and 4,601 (1865), and in 1923–46 between 4,022 (1932) and 5,278 (1925). The average number was 4,333 in 1859–66, 3,482 in 1867–9, 4,249 in 1870–95, 3,957 in 1896–1920, and 4,704 in 1921–46.

The birth-rates are still more uncertain than for the total population, because the allocation to General Population at birth registration may have differed from that at the censuses. Apparently the rate oscillated in 1871–1920 between 31·7 and 44·6. The averages in the five decades were 40·5, 37·7, 35·7, 34·8, and 35·7. The official birth-rates oscillated in 1921–46 between 31·3[2] and 45·2. They averaged 41·0 in 1921–8, 36·2 in 1929–39, and 32·9 in 1940–6.

The birth-rates decreased steadily from 1871–80 to 1901–10, and there was an actual decline in fertility. The gross reproduction-rate computed in the manner described above decreased in the four decades from 2·48 to 2·29, 2·14, and 2·02. I do not know the cause of this startling development. The gross reproduction-rate was about 2·30 in 1920–2, about 2·21 in 1930–2, and about 1·89 in 1943–5, the birth-rates in those triennial periods being 38·1, 35·5, and 31·1 respectively.

The sex ratio has changed somewhat in the course of time. There were only 102·8 male to 100 female births in 1859–1918, 104·7 in 1919–40, but again only 102·8 in 1941–6.

The proportion of registered still-births rose from 6·0 per cent. in 1866–1915 to 7·4 per cent. in 1916–24 and decreased to 5·7 per cent. in 1925–46.

Indian Population. Birth figures for the Immigrant Indian Population have been published from the beginning of the importation of coolies. No births occurred in 1834 and only 2 each in 1835–6. The number

[1] See *Medical Report 1922*, p. 2; *1923*, p. 3; *1924*, p. 5; *1925*, p. 5; *1937*, p. 15; *1938*, p. 15.

[2] This was the birth-rate in 1944. The actual birth-rate in 1943 was only 30, but since the population in 1943 had been very much underestimated, the official birth-rate for that year was 33·5.

exceeded 100 for the first time in 1840, 1,000 in 1846, 2,000 in 1854, 3,000 in 1858, 4,000 in 1859, and 5,000 in 1860. From 1862 onwards revised birth figures are available for the total Indian Population. The number of registered births oscillated in 1862–73 between 6,207 (1868) and 7,632 (1866), and in 1874–1946 between 6,244 (1932) and 13,430 (1944). In the latter period, covering 73 years, it was below 8,000 in 5 years (1874, 1896, 1931–2, 1940) and above 11,000 in 4 years (1925, 1944–6). It averaged 7,065 in 1862–74, 8,584 in 1875–83, 9,665 in 1884–1929, 8,522 in 1930–43, and 11,994 in 1944–6.

The birth-rates at first were extremely low owing to the very small number of Indian women in the Colony. The rate exceeded 10 for the first time in 1845, 20 about 10 years later, and 30 probably in 1860. The rate apparently oscillated in 1871–1920 between 30·9 and 41·4. The averages in the five decades were 34·7, 36·5, 37·8, 36·8, and 36·6. The official birth-rates oscillated in 1921–8 between 33·6 and 41·5, declined gradually to 23·5 in 1932, oscillated in 1933–43 between 28·7 and 34·8, and amounted in 1944–6 to 50·6, 42·2, and 41·8 respectively.

The increase in the Indian birth-rate from 1871–80 to 1891–1900 was due to an increase in the proportion of women of child-bearing age. The gross reproduction rates for the last three decades of the nineteenth century were 2·78, 2·77, and 2·70, and for 1901–10 2·46. The rate was about 2·31 in 1920–2, about 1·79 in 1930–2, and about 2·68 in 1943–5, the birth-rates in those triennial periods being 35·7, 26·9, and 42·5 respectively. That the trend of the birth-rate is an utterly inadequate gauge for measuring the trend of fertility within a population, which for a long time increased mainly through immigration of men, appears from the fact that the Indian birth-rate in 1943–5 was 42·5 as compared with 34·7 in 1871–80, while the gross reproduction-rate in 1943–5 (2·68) was slightly lower than in 1871–80 (2·78).[1]

The birth-rate among Indians was apparently lower than that of the General Population in every year prior to 1885. It was, as a rule, higher from 1891 to 1914, but has probably been lower in every year from 1915 onwards except 1919 and 1941–6. The gross reproduction-rate of the Indian Population was much higher than that of the General Population in every decade from 1871–80 to 1901–10, and also in 1943–5. Both rates were about the same in 1920–2. But in 1930–2 the Indian rate was much lower than that of the General Population.

The excess of male over female births has been small throughout. The sex ratio has changed somewhat in the course of time, but not in the same direction as for the General Population. There were 103·0 male to 100 female births in 1859–1918, 100·7 in 1919–32, 103·3 in 1933–9, and 101·5 in 1940–6.

The proportion of still-births in the last third of the nineteenth century was about the same as for the General Population, but has been much

[1] In such cases the female birth-rate, i.e. the number of female births per 1,000 females, conveys a much clearer picture of the trend of fertility than the general birth-rate. (The female birth-rate among Indians was 46·7 in 1871–80 and 43·7 in 1943–5.)

higher since. The percentage rose from 6·8 in 1866–1900 to 8·4 in 1901–10, and 10·6 in 1911–24. It decreased to 9·7 in 1925–40, and 8·6 in 1941–6.

2. *Mortality*

Mortality has never been low in Mauritius, and it was often excessive. I shall first discuss the incidence of smallpox, cholera, influenza, plague, and malaria.[1]

Smallpox. Epidemics under the French Administration have been reported for 1742,[2] 1754,[3] 1756, 1758,[4] 1770–2, 1782–3, and 1792–3. The outbreak of 1756, it is told, killed one-half of the slaves of the settlers and 1,800 negroes belonging to the Company.[5] In the epidemic which started in December 1770 the Colony is said to have lost one-fifth or one-quarter of its slaves.[6] The outbreak of 1782 affected mainly de Bussy's squadron and troops. It killed within four months 429 soldiers and sailors, 106 negroes, and several hospital attendants.[7] As regards the epidemic which broke out in January 1792 the reports about the number of deaths differ widely. De Villèle, who arrived in Mauritius on 14 June, related that 'within three months one-third of the black population were carried off' and that 'one-half of the white families were plunged into mourning'.[8] Pridham states that in 1792 smallpox 'is said to have carried off twenty thousand persons'.[9] But D'Unienville certainly came nearer the truth when he wrote:

> Within three months there perished in the Isle of France more than 4,000 persons of the various populations which then comprised about 58,000 souls excluding the garrison.[10]

A new outbreak in January 1793 also claimed many victims, particularly among the slaves.[11] But this was the last of a long series of smallpox

[1] I shall not deal here with hurricanes, although they sometimes claimed as many victims as serious epidemics. That of 29 Apr. 1892 killed 1,232 persons; see *Colonial Reports, Mauritius 1892*, p. 8.

[2] See Grant, p. 211.

[3] See Coqueval, *Précis de l'histoire de l'Île Maurice*, p. 263; Saint Elier, pp. 115–16; D'Epinay, p. 140; De Burgh-Edwardes, p. 19.

[4] See Azéma, 'La Variole à l'Île de la Réunion', p. 558; D'Epinay, p. 158.

[5] See Toussaint, *Port-Louis*, p. 61.

[6] See Charpentier-Cossigny, *Moyens d'amélioration proposés au Gouvernement* (1802), vol. i, p. 82; Saint Elier, p. 165; L. H. de Froberville, 'La Variole à l'Île de France en 1771'; D'Epinay, pp. 199, 212–13, 227; Toussaint, p. 111.

[7] See Saint-Elme le Duc, p. 507.

[8] Comte de Villèle, *Mémoires et Correspondance*, vol. i, p. 77. Azéma ('La Variole à l'Île de la Réunion', p. 585) says, evidently by mistake, that one-half of the (white) inhabitants died. According to de Villèle smallpox still prevailed in the island when he sailed on 18 Dec. (see *Mémoires*, vol. i, p. 81).

[9] Pridham (1846), p. 225.

[10] D'Unienville, vol. ii, p. 190. According to Saint-Elme le Duc (p. 274) about one-twelfth of the population died.

[11] See J.-F. Charpentier-Cossigny, *Voyage à Canton*, p. 55; *Moyens d'amélioration et de restauration*, vol. i, p. 83; D'Epinay, p. 367. There was, in addition, a great scarcity of food in Sept. 1792, in Aug. and Sept. 1793, and in March 1794. On 4 Feb. 1794 the Colonial Assembly, by a decree, rationed bread (6 ounces per head per day); see ibid., pp. 366–7, 370, 378, Pitot, *L'Île de France (1715–1810)*, p. 165. Dearth of food harassed the population of Mauritius very frequently during the eighteenth century; see, for example, Poivre, *Œuvres complettes*, pp. 28, 62. Meldrum describes (pp. 199–200) the 'severest droughts from 1726 to 1867'.

epidemics. Vaccine was introduced in 1802,[1] and on 6 June 1806 the Colonial Prefect issued detailed Regulations prescribing compulsory vaccination.[2] Governor Farquhar repeatedly took measures with the same object in view.[3] Even so the island did not remain free from smallpox. There were outbreaks in 1820[4] and 1844–5.[5] An epidemic which started in September 1855 killed up to 10 May 1856 687 in Port Louis, and in the whole island 1,013 (General Population 308, ex-apprentices and their descendants 509, Indians 196).[6] An outbreak which lasted from March 1891 to November 1892 caused in Port Louis alone 657 deaths.[7] From 1892 onwards vaccination seems to have been actually enforced.

Cholera. The first epidemic occurred apparently in 1775. It 'continued for probably two months, and caused a great mortality particularly among the Blacks and people of colour'.[8] Cholera again ravaged the island in 1819–20.[9] The number of deaths in Port Louis from 19 November to 19 January amounted to 1,047 (121 whites, 131 free coloured, and 795 slaves).[10] But some deaths occurred before and after that date. Nothing definite is known about the total number of fatal cases in the island. In a memorandum to the Acting Governor, Major-General Darling, which was read in the General Council on 14 February 1820, Thomi Pitot speaks of '20,000 dying'.[11] D'Unienville mentions estimates of from 10,000 to 15,000,[12] but feels certain that the number 'did not much exceed 6,000'.[13]

Two more particularly severe epidemics occurred in 1854 and 1856. In Port Louis 3,492 deaths from cholera were declared between 25 May and

[1] See Azéma, p. 587.

[2] French and English text, Rouillard, vol. ii, pp. 400–5.

[3] See Government Notice of 10 Jan. 1811 (French text, *Code Farquhar*, p. 10, No. 20) and Proclamations of 6 Feb. 1812 (ibid., p. 34, No. 81) and 30 July 1814 (ibid., pp. 92–3, No. 147). See also Rouillard, vol. iii, p. 89. See, furthermore, Dispatch from Governor Farquhar to Earl Bathurst, 8 Apr. 1814, *Papers relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius 1811–1817*, p. 84.

[4] See D. E. Anderson, *The Epidemics of Mauritius*, p. 154.

[5] See Proclamations and Government Notices, *Recueil des Lois 1844*, pp. 68–9, 71–4, 98–100, *1846*, pp. 2–3, 18, 32, 36, 41, 53–4, 59, 92. Governor Gomm, in a dispatch to Lord Stanley, 9 Mar. 1846, said: 'Small-pox continues to manifest its presence but little more' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1845*, p. 143). A year later (6 Mar. 1847) he wrote to Earl Grey: 'Small-pox, the scourge of past years, may be pronounced to be at this hour extinct in the colony' (ibid. *1846*, p. 196).

[6] See 'Report on the Epidemic of Smallpox in Mauritius, in 1855–56', *State of Colonial Possessions 1855*, p. 233.

[7] See D. E. Anderson, *The Epidemics of Mauritius*, pp. 155–9.

[8] Report from Chief Medical Officer Dr. W. A. Burke to Major-General Darling, 26 Nov. 1819, *Report of Committee on Outbreak of Cholera in Mauritius 1856*, Appendix, p. 144. See also ibid., p. 146.

[9] For details see Government Notices, *Recueil des Lois 1819*, pp. 66–89; *1820*, pp. 23–36; D'Unienville, vol. iii, pp. 75–82; Pitot, *L'Île Maurice (1810–1823)*, pp. 275–303, 336–48.

[10] See Commissioners of Eastern Inquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 8.

[11] See Pitot, p. 314.

[12] See also Pike, *Sub-Tropical Rambles* (1873), p. 376: 'In November, the cholera suddenly broke out in Port Louis, and spread with terrible rapidity to the country districts. It continued its ravages till April in the following year, and carried off nearly 12,000 persons.' Pridham (1846), p. 225, says that 'there perished twelve thousand persons'. De Burgh-Edwards (1921), p. 59, states that the epidemic 'caused the death of some 10,000 victims'.

[13] D'Unienville, vol. iii, p. 82. Ex-Governor Farquhar wrote on 9 Feb. 1829 to Under-Secretary of State R. W. Hay that cholera 'in 1819 and 1820 suddenly carried off 7,000 slaves', *Correspondence between Farquhar and the Colonial Department*, p. 5.

I August 1854,[1] and the total number for the island from 25 May to 14 September was 8,496.[2] In March to May 1856, 3,656 persons died from cholera.[3] There was another outbreak in the autumn of 1859, which did not claim many victims, and a severe epidemic which started in December 1861. It lasted seven months and caused 4,198 deaths.[4] Since 1862 the island has never been revisited by cholera.[5]

Influenza. 'In September [1851] the influenza called "grippe" broke out, and in a few days there was scarcely a house in the island where half of its members were not laid up and unable to attend to their duties.'[6] An epidemic starting towards the end of June 1893 caused 3,441 deaths.[7] The pandemic which apparently reached Mauritius in April 1919 was much more devastating. Between 1 May and 13 July 3,662 deaths due to this disease were registered in Port Louis alone.[8] In the whole island 'the deaths from Influenza, including its close concomitants, numbered 12,860 in 1919'.[9]

Plague. The first case was apparently discovered towards the end of 1898. In 1899, 711 died from plague in Port Louis.[10] The total numbers of deaths in Mauritius from 1899 to 1927 were as follows:[11]

Year	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Deaths*
1899	1,117	1906	344	1913	261	1922	75
1900	593	1907	178	1914	111	1923	118
1901	805	1908	137	1915	25	1924	144
1902	384	1909	333	1916	15	1925	65
1903	1,035	1910	553	1917	17	1926	41
1904	449	1911	131	1918–20	—	1927	5
1905	251	1912	541	1921	297		

[1] See *Report of Committee on Cholera-Epidemic of 1854*, p. 4.

[2] See Dispatch from Major-General Hay to Secretary of State Sidney Herbert, 3 May 1855, *State of Colonial Possessions 1854*, pp. 176–7. According to *Report of Committee 1854*, p. 120, there occurred, between 25 May and 31 Aug., 7,650 deaths (General Population 1,538, ex-apprentices and their descendants 3,832, Indians 2,280). The discrepancy between the two statements may be due in part to the inclusion by Major-General Hay of deaths which were not 'declared, to be caused by cholera. The figure 7,650 for the whole island comprises 3,492 deaths from cholera in Port Louis, of which 64 occurred in July, but Dr. Dauban, a member of the Committee, said that most of the 374 people who died in the month in the town had been suffering from cholera (see *Report*, p. 74). It should be noted, furthermore, that a considerable number of deaths occurring in Port Louis from 1 Feb. onwards, which were probably due to cholera, were attributed to diarrhoea (see *Report of Committee 1856*, Appendix, p. 127), that some of the declared deaths from cholera occurred before 25 May (see *Report of Committee 1854*, pp. 2–3, 73–4), and that there was a new outbreak of cholera in Oct. and Nov. (see ibid., pp. 27–8, 108–13).

[3] See Dispatch from Governor Higginson to Secretary of State Labouchere, 13 June 1857, *State of Colonial Possessions 1856*, p. 140. Pike, p. 387, and Toussaint, p. 358, put the deaths at 3,532. According to *Report of Committee 1856*, Appendix, pp. 102–6, there died from cholera between 6 Mar. and 19 May, 1,484 in Port Louis and 3,223 in the whole island; but the latter figure may not have included the deaths at Gabriel and Flat Islands, and does not take account of deaths which occurred after 19 May.

[4] See Dispatch from Acting Governor, Major-General M. C. Johnstone to the Duke of Newcastle, 6 Aug. 1863, *State of Colonial Possessions 1862*, Part I, p. 106. See also Meldrum, pp. 53–4; Toussaint, p. 359.

[5] See D. E. Anderson, p. 147.

[6] De Burgh-Edwards, p. 79.

[7] See *Colonial Reports, Mauritius 1893*, p. 8.

[8] See *Mauritius Almanac 1920*, Section E, p. 59.

[9] *Report of Registrar General 1919*, p. 3.

[10] See Toussaint, pp. 419–21.

[11] See *Medical Report 1923*, p. 7; *1927*, p. 4.

'Plague has not occurred in Mauritius since 1927.'[1]

Malaria. Before the catastrophic epidemic of 1865–8 malaria had been very rare. Meldrum described the position as follows:

> It appears to be universally acknowledged that, previously to 1857, genuine Malarial Fever was unknown in Mauritius, except in the case of persons who had contracted the disease in other countries.[2]
>
> Cases of malarial fever occurred in Mauritius, long before 1865, among soldiers, Indians, natives of Madagascar, Creoles, and others who had contracted the disease in places where it was endemic; and there is no doubt that it was in the Colony in 1863 and 1864.[3]
>
> There is no proof that previously to 1865, malarial fever existed among persons who had never been out of Mauritius.[4]
>
> The first cases of malarial fever, respecting which there is no doubt of their having been contracted in the Colony occurred . . . in January 1866. . . .[5]

'Sporadic cases of fever, evidently of malarious origin, began to appear among the men of the Royal Artillery . . . in the beginning of 1865',[6] and the malady became more widespread in the last quarter of 1865.[7] 'After November, 1866, the disease began to increase rapidly in the localities in which it had appeared in that and in the preceding year, and to invade new localities.'[8]

> Wherever bad hygienic conditions, such as overcrowding, small, low, hot and badly ventilated dwellings existed, and constitutions weakened by improper food and want of medical care were found, the disease made a clean sweep. Entire families disappeared, and the odour of putrefaction exhaled from their dwellings indicated to the passers by, or to the Inspectors, that there were bodies to be interred.[9]

In March, April, and May 1867 there died (from all causes) 15,006 persons in Port Louis and 'upwards of 25,000' in the whole island.[10] 'After May the mortality began to abate considerably, and, upon the whole, it continued to do so until December, when it began to increase once more.'[11] Another peak was reached in March 1868, but from September to December deaths apparently were rare. There was a new recrudescence in the first half of 1869, but from July onwards mortality from malaria was negligible.

It is impossible to tell how many people died from malaria in Mauritius

[1] Rankine (1944), p. 26.

[2] Meldrum, p. 55. See also *Report of Fever Commission 1866 & 1867*, Replies to Questions.

[3] Meldrum, p. 70. See also ibid., pp. 61–2.

[4] See also ibid., pp. 62–4; see, furthermore, Davidson, *Geographical Pathology* (1892), vol. ii, p. 732: 'From an official return of the admissions into that institution I find that during the forty-five years 1820–65, only twelve natives of the Colony were admitted into the [Civil] Hospital for intermittent fever, and it cannot be known whether these persons may not have contracted the disease elsewhere.'

[5] Meldrum, p. 69. See also Ross, *Memoirs*, p. 496: 'It is certain that so recently as 1866 malaria entered Mauritius . . . for the first time . . . .'

[6] Meldrum, pp. 55–6.

[7] Ibid., p. 56.

[8] Ibid., p. 58.

[9] Ibid., p. 59.

[10] See Dispatch from Governor Barkly to the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, 11 Aug. 1868, *State of Colonial Possessions 1867*, Part III, p. 23; Fowler, p. 20. According to Davidson (p. 747), 'more than one-fifth of the inhabitants [of Port Louis] perished in 1867 from fever alone, and one-fourth died from all diseases'. But see also Ross, *Memoirs*, p. 500: 'The disease is said to have killed a quarter of the population of Port Louis in 1867 . . . .'

[11] Meldrum, p. 59.

in 1865–9. The numbers of deaths from fever (of some kind) and from other causes were as follows:[1]

Deaths	*1864*	*1865*	*1866*	*1867*	*1868*	*1869*	*1870*
Fever . .	5,789	5,181	4,913	31,920	10,923	6,330	3,329
Other causes .	5,860	6,861	6,789	8,194	7,480	4,965	4,094
Total . .	11,649	12,042	11,702	40,114	18,403	11,295	7,423

In 1865 and 1866 the monthly numbers of deaths from fever varied between 306 and 516.[2] In 1867–9 they were as follows:[3]

Year	*Jan.*	*Feb.*	*Mar.*	*Apr.*	*May*	*June*	*July*	*Aug.*	*Sept.*	*Oct.*	*Nov.*	*Dec.*
1867	717	2,028	5,403	7,831	6,077	3,768	2,996	738	1,027	320	351	664
1868	1,135	1,575	1,905	1,218	1,389	1,121	764	520	367	276	307	346
1869	502	547	888	952	944	589	417	341	288	306	239	317

While deaths from malaria were apparently few in 1865 and 1866, they cannot have been less than 28,000 in 1867 or less than 7,500 between January 1868 and June 1869. Since death registration was incomplete[4] and since some deaths due to malaria were attributed to other causes,[5] it seems probable that from January 1867 to June 1869 malaria caused 40,000 or 45,000 deaths. About one-ninth or one-eighth of the population may have been killed by the disease.[6]

The appearance of malaria in Mauritius changed the health position of the island completely. Dr. Fowler said in 1908:

> From a health resort and sanatorium for all countries within its reach, it has become a place to be avoided by all, who have not to make their livelihood by remaining there.[7]

Dr. Balfour, who was asked in 1920 by the Colonial Office to visit Mauritius with a view to investigating the sanitary condition of the Colony, said:

> It was explained to me that the Governor of Mauritius had represented that, despite the many natural advantages of the Colony, its general unhealthiness had reached a degree unparalleled in any similar tropical Dependency of the Empire.[8]

He concluded:

> It is a case of Paradise Lost, and it remains to be seen if the sequel, Paradise Regained, will ever become an accomplished fact.[9]

[1] See ibid., pp. 39, 41. For many more details up to 1867 see *Report of Fever Commission 1866 & 1867.*

[2] See ibid., pp. 56, 58.

[3] See ibid., pp. 59–61.

[4] See p. 849 above.

[5] See Davidson, p. 747.

[6] Daniel E. Anderson says (p. 174): 'During the epidemic of 1867–1868, one fifth of the population of Mauritius is computed to have died.' D. Drysdale Anderson, evidently by adding up all deaths from fever in 1865–70, concluded (p. 541): 'The Malarial Epidemic . . . took six years to kill 62,596 persons.' Those are certainly gross overstatements.

[7] Fowler, p. 18. It is interesting to note that as far back as 18 Sept. 1871 the Officer Administering the Government, Major-General E. Selby Smyth, wrote to the Earl of Kimberley: 'I am afraid it would be fallacious to expect that, what with its present over-populated state—to which thousands are annually added—and with a malarial fever that has already so terribly proved what malignant power it can assume always lurking in an endemic form throughout the Island, it will ever be likely again to resume its once celebrated salubrity' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1870*, Part II, p. 66).

[8] Balfour, p. 1.

[9] Ibid., p. 89.

Whether there has been any essential change in the incidence of malaria since the great epidemic of the 1860s it is impossible to tell, as 'the malaria returns are hopelessly inaccurate'.[1] The Director of the Medical Health Department, Dr. Rankine, summarized the position in 1944 as follows:[2]

It is unnecessary to give any account of the history of this disease in Mauritius. Suffice it to say that, despite periodic visits of renowned malariologists and sanitarians, malaria continues to be the principal cause of death. Considerable sums of money have been spent in the past, and in various parts of the Island there remains evidence of former anti-malarial work, yet, except in the districts of Plaines Wilhelms and Moka, there has been no continued improvement.[3] Campaigns have been instituted from time to time but have come to an inglorious end, costly works have been planned and commenced but have not been pressed to a finish, and well spent money has been wasted through lack of provision for maintenance.

After having shown that 'the sanitary condition of Port Louis leaves much to be desired', he says:

One of the reasons for this state of affairs may be found in the prevalence of malaria in Port Louis which has resulted in an exodus of most people who are able to go to the higher altitudes where they reside and whence they travel daily to their work. Thus there may not have been brought to bear on the city fathers that degree of pressure demanding more active and more forceful measures to maintain the sanitary services at a satisfactory level. There is a close relationship between malaria and sanitation and, while Port Louis has natural mosquito breeding grounds on three sides of it there is no doubt that much of the disease is contracted within the municipal boundaries.[4]

Malnutrition is prevalent in Mauritius,[5] and 'the very close relationship

[1] Balfour, p. 15. See also ibid., pp. 16, 29, and MacGregor, *Report on the Anophelinæ of Mauritius* (1922), p. 23.

[2] Rankine, *Report on Health Conditions in Mauritius*, pp. 22–3.

[3] See also in this connexion Mauritius, *Council of Government Debates* (1943–4), *A Statement on Public Health in Mauritius* by Dr. de Chazal, p. 8: 'Every available evidence goes to prove that there has been since the days of Ross no improvement whatever in the malarial situation in the coastal belt below an altitude of 750 ft.'

[4] Rankine, p. 38. See also *Memorandum by Dr. de Chazal on Proposed Scheme for Improvement and Expansion of Medical and Health Services in Mauritius* (1946), pp. 5–6:

'In order to improve the conditions of health in Mauritius, the technical staff most needed for service in the Medical and Health Department as well as with local authorities and sugar estates is Sanitary staff. The most urgent need of Mauritius is sanitation. Sanitation must precede the attainment of positive health.

'In his *Report on the Prevention of Malaria in Mauritius* (1908) Ross states that: "Malaria Control would be a kind of general insurance policy for good sanitation."

'In an island which is naturally healthy and where malaria is principally due to man-made nuisances, it would be even more true to say that "good sanitation would be a kind of general insurance policy against malaria".

'The clearing up of the ubiquitous dungheaps and cesspools in and around the centres of population is a measure of ordinary sanitation which by itself would reduce the incidence of malaria in Mauritius by at least 50 per cent.'

As regards sanitation, see furthermore *Report on Estate Housing, &c., First Report* by P. M. Alfred (1946), pp. 1, 14.

[5] See, for example, Orde Browne, *Labour Conditions in Ceylon, Mauritius, and Malaya* (1943), p. 59: 'School children are reported to be, on the whole, healthy and well-nourished. On the other hand, the majority of the manual labourers appear to be definitely undernourished, and this is borne out by the improvement which takes place in the weight and health of prisoners undergoing sentence; some further support is given by the generally expressed view that the labourer of the present day is less robust than the worker of a generation ago. An important factor in this change is probably the abandoning of the former system of issuing rice as part of the wage; this

between chronic malnutrition and malaria' has been shown in detail in the *Nutritional Investigations in Mauritius 1942–45*.[1]

Dr. de Chazal, in 1943, reached the following conclusion:

> The eradication of malaria from *a small, densely populated island*, like Mauritius, is not wishful thinking, or the dream of an idealist.
>
> It is both a practicable and an economical proposition, and until it is effected, we shall remain what we are: the Cinderella of the Empire.[2]

I shall now discuss the trend of mortality in general.

Slaves. Mortality of slaves was apparently always high. There occurred in 1735–40 very many deaths among the negroes imported by La Bourdonnais,[3] and the smallpox epidemic of 1756 may have carried off one-half of all the slaves. D'Unienville reckoned for 1767–1824 with a yearly death-rate of 33⅓.[4] But since he listed the same rate for every single year it is not clear what he really meant. The rate was certainly very much higher in 1770–2 and 1792–3, when smallpox ravaged the island during the last years of the French régime,[5] and also in 1815–20, 'a period during which the Colony was visited with epidemic Measles, pestilential Cholera, endemic Berriberri, and contagious Dysentry'.[6] The statistics available for 1827–34 show a yearly average of about 2,200 deaths, indicating a death-rate of about 37.

Free Persons. Practically nothing seems to be known about the general mortality of free persons in the eighteenth century.[7] The deaths registered in 1804–29 indicate for Whites a rate of 19 in 1804–16, 19 in 1817–24, and 24 in 1825–9. The corresponding rates for Free Coloured were 14, 11, and 19 respectively. Meldrum, in 1881, used the low death-rate among Whites in 1804–24, 'a rate less than the present death-rates of England and France', as an argument 'that in former times Mauritius was one of the healthiest places in the world'.[8] But it is most unlikely that the death-rate

never formed more than a basic ration but it did, at least, encourage a full, if unbalanced diet.' See also Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report*, Part II (1939), p. 76; de Chazal, *A Statement on Public Health in Mauritius* (1943), pp. 6, 11–12; Rankine, p. 31. It should be noted in this connexion that as recently as 1936 'a circular to medical officers of the Health Department revealed that in the opinion of these officers, malnutrition was rare among the labouring classes of the Colony' (*Final Report, Nutritional Investigations in Mauritius 1942–45*, p. 1).

[1] See in particular pp. 15–16.

[2] De Chazal, *A Statement on Public Health in Mauritius*, p. 18.

[3] See p. 755 above.

[4] In the printed edition of his book published after his death this rate is reduced to 30. See p. 759 above.

[5] See Dispatches from Governor Farquhar, 15 Feb. 1811 (quoted p. 791 above) and 28 July 1812 (C.O. 167, vol. x).

[6] Telfair, p. 81; see also ibid., pp. 86–7. D'Unienville puts the total number of slave deaths for 1815–20 at 13,142. But the interments of slaves in those years in Port Louis alone numbered 6,565, see Telfair, p. 10. Chapotin, in 1812, had already discussed (pp. 91, 96) the severity of measle epidemics and the appearance of beriberi in the Isle of France.

[7] Burials of white persons numbered 297 in 1773 and 180 in 1774; see p. 850 above. The journal which published those figures points out that they include deaths of soldiers of the garrison, sailors, and other persons temporarily present. Even so, the death-rate in 1773 must have been excessive.

[8] Meldrum, p. 133. Even granted that the rural districts were very healthy, this cannot be said of the capital where about one-half of all the Whites and Free Coloured resided. Chapotin, in 1812, related that people who had lived for a long time in the Colony claimed that diseases were more frequent and more severe than in former times. He thought that this was true of Port Louis, but not of the rural areas (see *Topographie médicale*, p. 41).

was actually lower in 1817–24 than in 1825–9, and there is not the slightest doubt that death registration for young children was very incomplete prior to 1825.[1]

Total Population. Table 67 shows for each quinquennial period from 1831 to 1945 the average yearly number of deaths and the average yearly death-rate. It appears that, owing to various epidemics, the numbers and rates fluctuated considerably in 1831–70.[2] The average death-rate for this whole period was 38, the minimum for any year being 24 (1870) and the maximum 125 (1867). From 1871 to 1946 the death-rate was much more steady; it exceeded 43 only in 1919 when it rose to 64. The death-rate, which had been favourable in 1870 (the year after the malaria epidemic), was comparatively low also in the following years. But it rose from 28·4 in 1871–5 to 37·6 in 1901–5. While the average rate in 1871–90 amounted to 31, it was in 1891–1920 not less than 36. In 1921–46 it was nearly 30.[3]

TABLE 67. *Average Yearly Deaths and Death-rates, Mauritius 1831–1946*

Years	*Number*	*Rate*	*Years*	*Number*	*Rate*	*Years*	*Number*	*Rate*	*Years*	*Number*	*Rate*
1831–5	3,011	32·3	1861–5	11,178	35·7	1891–5	12,638	34·0	1921–5	11,758	31·0
1836–40	3,672	33·6	1866–70	17,788	55·6	1896–1900	13,142	35·6	1926–30	11,614	28·9
1841–5	5,868	43·3	1871–5	9,345	28·4	1901–5	14,033	37·6	1931–5	11,889	30·3
1846–50	5,051	30·2	1876–80	10,227	29·2	1906–10	13,901	37·5	1936–40	11,157	27·7
1851–5	8,384	40·4	1881–5	11,936	33·1	1911–15	13,014	34·7	1941–5	11,927	28·8
1856–60	8,729	33·5	1886–90	11,971	32·8	1916–20	14,538	38·1	1946	12,528	29·5

General Population. Death figures prior to 1859 are uncertain and are lacking entirely for some years. In 1859–69 mortality was very high owing to epidemics, and it seems that in this period, as also in the preceding years, mortality was particularly great among the ex-apprentices and their descendants.[4] This group constituted already in 1851 the minority of the

[1] See p. 883 below.

[2] Referring to the epidemics of 1854 and 1856, Governor Stevenson, on 8 June 1859, wrote to Sir E. B. Lytton: 'Undoubtedly, such visitations might, humanly speaking, be rendered less terrible, and the rate of mortality in years that are free from them very much reduced, if the influence of a climate, naturally the most conducive to health and longevity, were not counteracted by the uncleanly habits of a large portion of the population, and by the over-crowded and ill-ventilated state of the dwelling houses even of the better class of citizens in Port Louis. The latter evil has probably been aggravated within the last year in consequence of a very large increase in the price of rent; and the municipal body have certainly not taken sufficient measures for ensuring that increased attention to drainage and other sanitary measures, which might in some measure have warded off the evil effects of over-crowding and improper ventilation' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1858*, Part I, p. 113).

[3] The rates in 1925–7 were 24·1, 25·3, and 25·1 respectively. D. Drysdale Anderson of the Mauritius Health Department thereupon wrote: 'The vigilance of an efficient Medical and Sanitary Service is keeping the death-rate consistently low at about 25% . . .' ('The Point of Population Saturation, Its Transgression in Mauritius', p. 540). This was an illusion. In not a single year was the death-rate again so low as in each of those three years. Dr. Chazal was likewise mistaken when he stated in 1943: 'Since the beginning of this century there has been a gradual and progressive decrease in the death-rate' (*A Statement on Public Health in Mauritius*, p. 4).

[4] It is possible, however, that in the first decade after the abolition of slavery mortality among the ex-slaves was not excessive. See Dispatch from Governor Gomm to Earl Grey, 6 Mar. 1847: '. . . the mortality among the emancipated class has averaged little above 3 per cent. throughout the ten years that have elapsed since they became free' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1846*, p. 192).

General Population. But it suffered in 1851 2,535 deaths as compared with 1,401 deaths among the rest of the General Population, the death-rates being 52 and 26 respectively. In 1853 there occurred 2,142 deaths among the ex-apprentices and 1,616 among the rest of the General Population. Among these groups deaths from cholera in 1854 numbered 4,200 and 1,700 respectively, and deaths from smallpox in 1855–6, 509 and 308 respectively. The cholera epidemic of 1856 caused more than 2,000 deaths among the ex-apprentice class and certainly much less than 1,000 among the rest of the General Population.[1] In 1859–66 there occurred 17,518 deaths among ex-apprentices and 15,586 among the rest of the General Population. At the end of 1866 the total General Population numbered about 130,000, of whom 35,000 at the utmost belonged to the ex-apprentice class. In 1867, 9,801 deaths were registered among the ex-apprentices and 7,223 among the rest of the General Population, but registration apparently was very incomplete. No further data concerning mortality among ex-apprentices are available after 1867, but by that time their number had decreased so much that they constituted only a small proportion of the General Population.

In 1868 mortality among the General Population (including ex-apprentices) was still high, the deaths amounting to 6,217. In the 50 years from 1869 to 1918 the number oscillated between 2,658 (1870) and 4,980 (1896). It rose in 1919 to 7,395 and varied in 1920–46 from 2,776 (1925) to 4,740 (1921). The death-rate oscillated in 1869–1918 between 27 (1870–1) and 44 (1896) and rose to 65 in 1919. The official death-rate varied in 1920–46 from 42·6 (1921) to 22·5 (1940).

Indian Population. Mortality among Indians has always been high. They suffered, as a rule, more than the General Population from epidemics which afflicted both groups, and they had, in addition, diseases of their own.[2] Their excessive mortality during the first stage of the importation of coolies (1834–9) attracted special attention.[3] But conditions were again particularly bad from 1862 to 1869, when the number of deaths oscillated between 7,926 and 22,742 and when the death-rate averaged 50, although the vast majority of Indians were young adults. Then followed a short period of comparatively low mortality and a long period of increasing

[1] Governor Higginson, in his Dispatch to Secretary of State Labouchere, 13 June 1857, said that the death-rate (from all causes) 'during the year 1856 amounted to 10½ per cent. amongst the ex-apprentices, to 3½ per cent. amongst the Indians, and to 4 per cent. amongst the general population'. He says, furthermore, that the number of ex-apprentices (and their descendants) decreased in the five years 1852–6 from 48,366 to 40,730 and that out of the decrease of 16 per cent. '14½ per cent. is ascribable to the effects of epidemic diseases' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1856*, pp. 139–40). This implies that the total deaths of ex-apprentices due to cholera and smallpox in 1854–6 numbered about 7,000.

[2] The 'Bombay Fever', which attacked almost exclusively Indians, 'was apparently introduced about the year 1838 by immigrants from the Bombay province, and rapidly spread amongst the camps on the sugar estates, both on the coast and inland' (Fowler, p. 19). It seems to have claimed particularly numerous victims in 1844–5, 1850, and 1855 (see for details *Report of the Fever Enquiry Commission 1866 & 1867*, pp. 11–13, Appendix, pp. 9–23). An epidemic of beriberi which 'was almost entirely confined to the Indians' and which lasted from Nov. 1878 to Feb. 1880, caused 729 deaths; see Daniel E. Anderson, pp. 226–8.

[3] See, for example, *Despatches from Sir William Nicolay*, pp. 76–81; *Correspondence relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers into the Mauritius 1840*, pp. 14, 34–5, 54–5, 87, 108–11, 134–7.

mortality which lasted until 1922, from when onwards mortality again became more favourable. The number of deaths oscillated in 1870–8 between 4,768 and 6,941, in 1879–92 between 6,798 and 8,796, in 1893–1921 between 7,207 and 17,060, and in 1922–46 between 6,551 and 11,297. The death-rates in those four periods averaged 26·4, 31·8, 36·8, and 30·0[1] respectively. While the highest death-rate between 1870 and 1892 was 35·2 (1889), the death-rate exceeded 40 in 1893, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1906, 1909, 1919, 1931, and 1945.

In the 1860s the Indian death-rate had been higher than that of the General Population. In the last three decades of the nineteenth century it was, as a rule, lower. But it was again higher in 1903–6, 1908–11, 1913–16, and 1924–46.[2] In 1921–46 the average death-rates of male and female Indians were practically the same, the former being 30·5 and the latter 30·3. For the General Population, on the other hand, the male death-rate was higher than the female in every single year, the averages being 29·2 and 25·6. Thus there was only a slight difference for males, while for females the death-rate among Indians was much higher than among the General Population.

TABLE 68. *Death-rates by Races and Sex, Mauritius 1921–46*[1]

	Indian Population		*General Population*			*Indian Population*		*General Population*			*Indian Population*		*General Population*	
Year	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Year*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Year*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
1921	40·2	38·3	45·8	39·5	1930	35·1	36·1	36·4	33·2	1939	27·2	29·6	27·9	26·8
1922	35·2	33·9	36·3	31·7	1931	41·0	42·6	35·5	31·2	1940	26·4	27·6	24·8	20·4
1923	28·0	28·1	31·7	27·5	1932	36·4	32·8	30·8	27·3	1941	25·4	27·1	25·7	23·2
1924	27·8	27·6	29·7	25·4	1933	28·5	28·7	26·8	22·5	1942	30·9	30·3	28·7	24·4
1925	23·3	26·9	24·4	23·1	1934	27·2	26·4	25·4	21·4	1943	27·2	24·4	29·2	23·3
1926	24·7	26·2	27·3	22·7	1935	28·0	28·4	24·6	21·4	1944	30·2	27·4	26·9	21·5
1927	25·8	25·9	24·8	22·4	1936	27·9	28·0	24·6	22·0	1945	41·6	39·2	30·6	26·6
1928	28·3	29·3	28·4	25·6	1937	29·4	30·4	27·6	25·7	1946	32·7	31·6	26·4	23·6
1929	32·3	31·0	29·4	27·4	1938	31·9	31·2	28·3	25·0					

[1] See *Report of the Registrar General 1922*, p. 3; *1924*, p. 4; *1926*, p. 4; *1928*, p. 3; *1930*, p. 3; *1934*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 9; *1939*, p. 12; *1945*, p. 7; *1946*, p. 7.

Port Louis. The official death-rate in the capital has always been considerably higher than in the rest of the country.[3] But this was due in part to a concentration of hospital facilities in the town.[4] Moreover, the population figures to which the deaths were related are most uncertain. To quote only one striking example: although the number of deaths in Port Louis increased from 1,897 in 1920 to 2,723 in 1921 or by 44 per cent., the official death-rate rose only from 47·3 to 53·2 or by 12 per cent.

[1] From 1922 onwards I used the official death-rates which for many years were too low because the Indian population was over-estimated.

[2] The official death-rate of Indians was slightly lower than that of the General Population in 1943, but this was due to an over-estimate of the Indian Population and an under-estimate of the General Population.

[3] The death-rates for the capital and for the whole island are given for each year from 1868 to 1935 in Toussaint, *Port-Louis*, pp. 492–3.

[4] Telfair (1830) pointed out (pp. 81–2) that 'the proprietors of estates, who reside at Port Louis, bring thither for the benefit of the best medical treatment' their sick slaves 'and thus increase the apparent rate of mortality at Port Louis', and that 'cases of serious diseases are sent from every district' to the Slave Hospital in Port Louis.

because the population had been under-estimated by 22 per cent. in 1920.[1]

Infant Mortality. Nothing is known about infant mortality in Mauritius prior to 1871. According to D'Unienville registered births among the Whites numbered in 1804–24, 4,546, and registered deaths under 1 year of age, 209. The corresponding figures for Free Coloured are 9,774 and 173.[2] This would indicate infant mortality-rates of 46 and 18. It is obvious that at least among Free Coloured only a very small proportion of infant deaths were registered.[3] From 1871 to 1946[4] the infant mortality-rate of the total population oscillated between 120 and 276; it exceeded 208 only in 1896, owing apparently to an epidemic of diarrhoea. But in view of the large fluctuations in the numbers of registered births these annual infant mortality-rates (computed in the usual manner by relating the number of infant deaths to the number of births in the same calendar year) sometimes *understate* and *sometimes overstate mortality in a single year.*[5] I have, therefore, calculated quinquennial infant mortality-rates for 1871–1945[6] by relating the infant deaths in a five-year period to the births registered in the same period. These rates averaged 163 in 1871–90, 176 in 1891–1910, 161 in 1911–20, 141 in 1921–30, and 154 in 1931–45. There is no evidence that infant mortality in Mauritius was at any period excessive,[7] but the improvement achieved in the course of time has been slight.

Between 1871 and 1921 the infant mortality-rate among the General Population was higher than that of the Indian Population in 34 out of 50 years, the average rate being 175 for the former and 165 for the latter.[8]

[1] The Preliminary Report on the 1921 census says that the under-estimate was 'due to the practice of applying the correction for arrivals and departures to Port Louis alone'. It adds that the death-rate 'for Port Louis for the year 1920 drops from 47 per 1,000 to 37 per 1,000 on the revised population figures'.

[2] See D'Unienville, vol. iv, Tables 38 and 39, and Table 51 above.

[3] The small numbers of infant deaths registered were not due to an overstatement of the age of infants at death registration. The recorded numbers of deaths of children from 1 to 5 years were 296 for Whites and 334 for Free Coloured. It is, of course, out of the question that the ratio of deaths under 6 to 1,000 births was actually only 71 (111 for Whites and 52 for Free Coloured). According to the *Almanach de l'Île de Maurice* for 1837, births among Whites and Free Coloured in 1825–35 numbered 11,152, and deaths under 5 years of age, 2,226. The ratio of such deaths to 1,000 births was 200. This ratio seems acceptable. Stirling (p. 29) noted in 1827: 'Children born of European parents appear to thrive wonderfully well till a certain age, and the number of deaths is extremely small.'

[4] No figures seem to be available for 1897.

[5] The infant mortality-rates of 1943 and 1944 provide an outstanding example. In 1943 the number of births (13,604) had been practically the same as in 1942 (13,553). The infant mortality-rate of 142, therefore, gave a true picture of infant mortality in 1943. But in 1944 the number of births (18,258) was by one-third larger than in 1943. The official infant mortality-rate of 141, therefore, conveyed too favourable a picture of infant mortality in 1944 because the average number of infants exposed to death was smaller than the number of births in that year. The actual mortality-rate of infants in 1944 may have been 150. Owing to the neglect of such discrepancies some comments in the Medical Reports on the changes in infant mortality are erroneous; see *Medical Report 1927*, p. 3; *1928*, p. 2.

[6] See Table 69.

[7] Infant mortality-rates in England and Wales in the six decades 1841–50 to 1891–1900 were 153, 154, 154, 149, 142, and 153 respectively.

[8] Dr. Andrew Balfour, who visited Mauritius in 1921, wrote: '. . . a study of the records from 1871 onwards shows that a large proportion of these deaths in children [under five years] occurs in infants under one year of age. This is specially true of the Indian population, amongst whom the conditions are truly appalling' (*Report on Medical and Sanitary Matters in Mauritius*, p. 66). Actually, conditions were not worse among the Indian than among the General Population.

But from 1922 to 1946 infant mortality among the General Population was higher than among Indians in only three years (1933, 1944, 1946), and the average rates were 137 and 153. Thus, there has been a notable reduction of infant mortality among the General Population and an insignificant one among Indians. It should be noted, however, that conditions have deteriorated for both groups in recent years. The average rate for the General Population rose from 130 in 1922–36 to 143 in 1937–41, and to 151 in 1942–6. The corresponding rates for Indians were 149, 161, and 158 respectively.

TABLE 69. *Quinquennial Infant Mortality-rates, Mauritius 1871–1945*

Years	*General Population*	*Indian Population*	*Total*	*Years*	*General Population*	*Indian Population*	*Total*	*Years*	*General Population*	*Indian Population*	*Total*
1871–5	163	164	163	1896–1900[1]	215	182	191	1921–5	139	143	142
1876–80	147	163	158	1901–5	181	165	170	1926–30	127	148	141
1881–5	178	165	169	1906–10	168	170	169	1931–5	139	158	151
1886–90	162	161	161	1911–15	159	154	156	1936–40	142	165	156
1891–5	198	167	176	1916–20	178	162	167	1941–5	148	157	154

[1] 1896 and 1896–1900.

The figures on mortality by age of infants published for 1935–9 and 1945–6[1] indicate that mortality in earliest childhood is particularly high among Indians. In those 7 years the ratio of deaths under 3 months to 1,000 live-born was 77, 80, 68, 78, 78, 91, and 90 respectively for the General Population, but 97, 104, 101, 108, 98, 122, and 96 for the Indians. The high rates for Indians are the more noteworthy in view of the excessive number of still-births in this section of the population. The Medical Reports attribute the high neo-natal mortality mainly to the same causes as the frequency of still-births and point out that 'those children which survive till birth usually are weaklings and must tend to an early death'.[2]

A closer study of mortality by age since 1871 might reveal peculiarities which are not frequently found. It seems that neo-natal mortality in Mauritius is high, that mortality during the rest of the first year of life is moderate, and that mortality among older children and among young adults is very unfavourable.

3. *Population Growth*

1835–66. At the time of the abolition of slavery the population of Mauritius numbered about 92,000, of whom about one-tenth were whites, while the rest, with the exception of some Asiatics, were negroes or mulattoes. In 1866 the population was nearly four times as large. The number of whites was probably about the same as in 1835; the number of negroes and mulattoes had apparently increased from 80,000 to 115,000, and there

[1] See *Report of the Registrar General 1935*, p. 28; *1936*, p. 27; *1937*, p. 29; *1938*, p. 27; *1939*, Table 10; *1945*, p. 25; *1946*, p. 25.

[2] *Medical Report 1922*, p. 2. See also, for example, ibid. *1924*, p. 5: 'The average weight of children at birth appears to be 2 kilogrammes in Mauritius.' The failure of the Ordinance to secure the training of midwives in the Colony and to regulate their practice (No. 26 of 1926) is fully described ibid. *1925*, pp. 29–30.

were about 235,000 Indians in the island. The rise in the number of non-Indians was due to immigration.[1] The same is true, of course, of the Indians who were mostly male coolies.[2]

1867–9. Owing to the malaria epidemic the total population decreased from about 365,000 to about 310,000.[3]

1870–1922. The total population, which at the beginning of 1870 numbered about 310,000, amounted at the end of 1922 to about 378,000. The total increase was about 68,000, of which 47,000 were due to an excess of births over deaths. The average yearly natural increase was one-quarter of one per cent. In 1881–90, when fertility was high and mortality comparatively low, the net reproduction-rate was 1·2.[4] In 1920–2, when fertility was lower and mortality slightly higher than in 1881–90, the net reproduction-rate hardly exceeded 1.[5]

1923–46. The population increased from about 378,000 at the beginning of 1923 to about 430,000 at the end of 1946. The total increase was about 52,000, and there was apparently some net emigration, since births exceeded deaths by 63,000. The average yearly natural increase was nearly two-thirds of 1 per cent. Taking the period as a whole the net reproduction-rate was well above 1. But it certainly was not higher than in 1881–90.

B. DEPENDENCIES

I. Censuses

The provisions of the Census Ordinances for Mauritius were applied from 1851 onwards, as far as practicable, to the several Dependencies.[6]

In 1851 the census of the Dependencies comprised the Seychelles, Rodrigues, two islands of the Amirantes Archipelago (Poivre, Desroches), the Islands North of Madagascar, Agalega, Coëtivy, Diego Garcia, Salomon Islands, Peros Banhos, and Trois Frères.[7] The census of 1861 covered

[1] According to the records, deaths among non-Indians in 1835–66 exceeded births by about 9,000. Birth registration, it is true, may have been more incomplete than death registration, and there was probably a small natural increase in 'normal' years in spite of the excessive mortality of the ex-apprentice population, but in years of epidemics deaths were much more numerous than births. (In the ex-apprentice class deaths exceeded births from the census date 1851 to the end of 1857 by 7,616, and in 1859–66 by 4,754; see *Blue Book 1857*, p. 310, and Table 61 above.) As regards immigration the available data are scanty and uncertain. It seems that among the non-Indian population recorded arrivals exceeded recorded departures in 1852–60 by 8,291 (see p. 781 above) and from 8 Apr. 1861 to 31 Dec. 1866 by 14,659 (see *State of Colonial Possessions 1867*, Part III, p. 29).

[2] The net immigration of Indians amounted in 1835–66 to 276,000, excluding those who had come at their own expense.

[3] Apart from the great mortality, there was a net emigration of 3,600 Indian coolies in 1867–9.

[4] The gross reproduction-rate was 2·6 (see p. 870 above). The net reproduction-rate was so low because, according to a (crude) life table which I computed, only 584 out of 1,000 newly-born girls reached the age of 15, and only 331 survived the age of 45. The years lived by them between 15 and 45 numbered only 13,700 (instead of 30,000, if none had died under 45).

[5] The gross reproduction-rate was 2·3. Of 1,000 newly-born girls 601 reached the age of 15, and 296 the age of 45. The years lived by them between 15 and 45 numbered 13,300. It seems that the net reproduction-rate was well above 1 in most years between 1871 and 1891, but below 1 in most years between 1892 and 1922.

[6] See pp. 735–8 above.

[7] Two special counts were made in 1856 and 1859; see Table 74.

the same area and in addition St. Brandon and Six Islands, but no returns were received from the Islands North of Madagascar. The censuses of 1871 and 1881 included all islands enumerated in either 1851 or 1861 and in addition two more Amirantes Islands (St. Joseph, Darros).[1] From 1891 onwards the census area was more restricted. The report for 1891 said:

> In previous Censuses Seychelles was included but this group of islands is now separated from Mauritius in administration and the results are given separately.
>
> The dependencies comprised in this Census are Rodrigues and the various groups islands or atolls known generally as the Oil Islands.
>
> They are Diego Garcia, Agaléga, Trois Frères, Salomon Islands, Six Islands and Coetivy. St. Juan de Nova[2] is one of the dependencies that should appear in this Census and Schedules were sent but not received in time. . . .[3]

Thus the 1891 census excluded not only the Seychelles (and the Amirantes Archipelago as well as the Islands North of Madagascar transferred to the Seychelles) but also Peros Banhos and St. Brandon. The 1901 census covered the same area, except Trois Frères, and in addition Peros Banhos, St. Brandon, St. Juan de Nova (Farquhar Isles), and Eagle Island.[4] The censuses of 1911 and 1921 comprised the same islands, except Coëtivy,[5] which had been transferred to the Seychelles. The census of 1931 excluded Eagle Island and also Farquhar Island,[6] which (in 1921) had been transferred to the Seychelles. Furthermore, the 1944 census excluded Trois Frères and Six Islands which then were uninhabited.[7] I shall deal with Seychelles in Chapter XVI and discuss here the population ascertained in Rodrigues and the Minor Dependencies of Mauritius.

II. Total Population

1. *Rodrigues*

1691–1809. The first inhabitants were apparently the French Protestant refugee François Leguat and 7 men, who had sailed from Texel (Holland) on 4 September 1690 and arrived in Rodrigues on 30 April 1691. They left for Mauritius on 21 May 1693.[8] 'After the departure of Leguat and his companions, Rodriguez once again became uninhabited.'[9] On 20 July 1725 the Superior Council of the Isle of Bourbon decided to take possession of the island in the name of the King and the India Company. Several French officers were immediately sent there and took possession.[10] The different Governors of Mauritius soon imported numerous tortoises from Rodrigues,[11] but the island had no permanent inhabitants until in

[1] See *Census Report 1861*, Appendix No. 19; *1871*, Part II, pp. 5–6; *1881*, Appendixes, pp. 482–3.

[2] This was apparently the only one of the 'Islands North of Madagascar' which was still inhabited in 1881. (Providence Island, with 28 inhabitants in 1881, had been transferred to the Seychelles.)

[3] *Census Report 1891*, p. 38.

[4] See ibid. *1901*, pp. 49, 168. Eagle Island and Trois Frères belong to the Chagos Archipelago. Trois Frères was possibly no longer inhabited. It certainly was not so in 1911 and in 1944, see ibid. *1911*, p. iii; *1944*, p. 5.

[5] See ibid. *1911*, p. iii; *1921*, p. 13. [6] See ibid. *1931*, p. 5. [7] See ibid. *1944*, p. 5.

[8] See François Leguat, *Voyages et Avantures* (1708), vol. i, pp. 6, 60; vol. ii, p. 1.

[9] Bertuchi, *The Island of Rodriguez* (1923), p. 35.

[10] See de Froberville, 'Rodrigues, Galega, Séchelles' (1848), pp. 78–9; Rouillard, 'Relation de l'Isle Rodrigues', p. 15; Bertuchi, p. 36.

[11] See ibid., p. 37.

1760 a small settlement was made.[1] When the abbé Pingré visited Rodrigues to observe the first passage of Venus over the sun (6 June 1761) 'the little colony consisted of only 3 or 4 Whites under the orders of M. de Puvigné, lieutenant in the troops of the company', who resided with his family in the island. There were in addition a number of slaves.[2] But 'owing to tortoises having become rarer' the Governor of Mauritius withdrew 'the garrison stationed at Rodriguez, allowing the inhabitants to cultivate the land and trade on their own'.[3] This apparently did not affect the size of the population.[4] In the following two decades the Government considered the possession of Rodrigues to be rather a nuisance.[5] But 'during the revolution concessions were granted to several persons resident in the Isle of France, one of whom received the title of government agent'.[6] However, on 30 January 1806, Decaen reported that he had ordered the almost complete evacuation of the island.[7] Bertuchi relates:

> In 1803[8] General Decaen, Governor of Mauritius, considering the Isle of Rodriguez a menace to the Isles of Bourbon and Mauritius, and in order to render the isle valueless as a re-victualling station for British ships, ordered most of the planters, with their families, to return to Mauritius, where land concessions were given them as compensation. Only a few families were left at Rodriguez to show that the island had not ceased to be French territory.[9]

Prentout reports that by 1 March 1806 Decaen had not been able to carry out his plan; only one family had returned to the Isle of France.[10] De Froberville, on the other hand, says that 'the eight families which resided' in Rodrigues returned to the Isle of France.[11] When in 1809 the British took the island, they found there 3 French planters with 70 or 80 slaves.[12]

1810–1945. Rodrigues is now by far the most populous Dependency of Mauritius. But this was not the case during the first decades of British administration. According to Bertuchi 'there were in 1820 over 150 people residing on the island'.[13] D'Unienville, in 'An Account of the Islands and Isles comprehended under the name of Dependencies of the Island of Mauritius', signed 18 August 1826, wrote:[14]

> At present this island is not inhabited by more than 123 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	7	5	8	—
Free Persons . .	2	1	—	—
Slaves . . .	49	28	12	11

It is possible that the population had been actually larger in 1820, since D'Unienville says: 'No civil or military establishment has existed there

[1] See de Froberville, 'Rodrigues, Galega, Séchelles', p. 79; Rouillard, p. 51; Bertuchi, p. 37.
[2] See de Froberville, p. 79. [3] Bertuchi, p. 39; see also de Froberville, p. 80.
[4] See Bertuchi, p. 39; 'The population consisted of a few whites from Mauritius and Bourbon, and a good number of slaves from Madagascar and the East Coast of Africa.'
[5] See, for example, Fauvel, *Unpublished Documents on the History of the Seychelles Islands*, pp. 143, 162.
[6] De Froberville, p. 80. [7] See *ibid.* [8] Should probably read 1805.
[9] Bertuchi, p. 43. [10] See Prentout, pp. 327–8. [11] De Froberville, p. 80.
[12] See Pridham, pp. 309–10; Bertuchi, p. 45; Toussaint, *Port-Louis*, p. 223.
[13] Bertuchi, p. 68.
[14] See *Return of the Number of Dependencies of Mauritius* (1827), pp. 2, 11.

since 1824. An agent of government was formerly stationed there. . . .' He adds, however: 'There are several demands for grants of land on the part of persons of the Island of Mauritius, who are desirous of going there, to settle with the few slaves which they possess.' The population seems in fact to have soon increased, since the number of slaves registered between 16 October 1826 and 2 December 1827 was 142 (83 males, 59 females; 32 under 8 years of age, 106 between 8 and 60, and 4 over 60). On 2 January 1830 there were 154 slaves (88 males, 66 females), and on 1 May 1832, 162 (92 males, 70 females).[1] In 1838, after the abolition of slavery, 'the population consisted of a few whites, 127 apprentices, and 42 children',[2] but it apparently increased in the following years, and on 19 June 1843 the Governor of Mauritius enacted an Ordinance 'for the purpose of forming at the Island of Rodrigues a Judicial and Police Establishment'.[3] Since then the population has risen constantly and rapidly. According to the census of 1851 it numbered 495; according to the census of 1944 it amounted to 11,885. For 31 December 1945 it was estimated at 12,542.[4] The area is about 42 square miles,[5] so that there are about 300 inhabitants to the square mile.

TABLE 70. *Population by sex, Rodrigues 1851–1944*[1]

	1851	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*	*1944*
Males . .	327	464	693	812	1,154	1,685	2,523	3,300	4,033	5,740
Females .	168	229	415	619	914	1,477	2,306	3,284	4,169	6,145
Total .	495	693	1,108	1,431	2,068	3,162	4,829	6,584	8,202	11,885

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, p. 38; *1901*, p. 45; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. xcvi–cii; *1921*, Appendixes, p. clxxiv; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, p. 3.

2. *Minor Dependencies*

D'Unienville, in his Account signed 18 August 1826, describes each of the Minor Dependencies.[6] I shall give a short extract:[7]

St. Brandon or Cargados Carayos. On the bank of St. Brandon . . . are 12 islets,

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 6; *Blue Book 1830*, pp. 501–2; *1833*, folio 214. [2] Pridham, p. 310.

[3] Ordinance No. 7 of 1843, *Recueil des Lois 1843*, pp. 37–9. The Preamble read: 'Whereas the Inhabitants of the Isle of Rodrigues, one of the dependencies of this Colony, have frequently expressed their desire for the appointment of a resident Police Magistrate and Police Establishment within the same, which its encreased population now renders the more indispensably necessary as well for the security and protection of its inhabitants as in the interests of the public in general.'

[4] See Mauritius, *Report of Registrar General 1945*, p. 26. The intercensal estimates are not satisfactory. The population was put, for example, on 31 Dec. 1932, 1933, and 1934 at 8,691, 8,950, and 9,111 respectively (see ibid. *1932*, p. 9; *1933*, p. 10; *1934*, p. 11). But the Government Medical Officer relates that 770 persons emigrated during the second half of 1933 to Reunion, of whom 687 came back in 1934 (see Mauritius, *Medical Report 1933*, p. 113; *1934*, p. 103). If this statement is correct, the population of Rodrigues must have been much smaller on 31 Dec. 1933 than on 31 Dec. 1932, and much larger on 31 Dec. 1934 than on 31 Dec. 1933.

[5] *Census Report 1944*, p. 5, gives 40 square miles as area; *Colonial Office List 1946*, p. 160, gives 42 square miles.

[6] See *Return of the Number of Dependencies of Mauritius*, French text, pp. 2–5, 8–10; English translation, pp. 11–14, 17–20.

[7] The English translation is very inaccurate. I have corrected it wherever necessary.

forming five separate groups. . . . [Five] persons to whom the government of the Island of Mauritius has granted the private privilege of the fisheries of these isles[1] . . . have no permanent establishment upon these islets; on which account there is no fixed population. . . .

Diego Garcia. It produces abundance of cocoa. . . . The privilege of this island was granted to and shared among three inhabitants of the Mauritius, by a decree of the 2d May 1809,[2] on condition of receiving thereon any individual attacked with leprosy, whom the government might send there. These three proprietors . . . domiciled at the Mauritius have, each of them, an establishment on the Island of Diego, conducted by a white manager. . . . The total population of this island amounts to 275 individuals, of whom 37 are leprous; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	5	1	—	3
Free Persons . .	1	4	6	10
Slaves . . .	168	37	3	2
Leprous . .	30	5	—	—

Les Six Isles. An inhabitant of the Mauritius . . . has been established there for twenty years, with some negroes, without any title having apparently been granted to him for that purpose.

Les Trois Frères. By an Act of the 18th May 1823, an inhabitant of the island of Mauritius . . . obtained the confirmation of the privilege of these [3] islets[3] where he has established a manufactory of cocoa oil. He employs 43 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	1	—	—	—
Free Persons . .	2	—	—	—
Slaves . . .	19	12	3	1
Leprous . .	5	—	—	—

Isles Salomon. Two inhabitants of the island of Mauritius . . . enjoy the privilege; first of four of these islets, by virtue of an Act dated the 18th June 1822; and, secondly, of the seven other islands, by virtue of an Act of the first September 1823. They employ there ten individuals; viz. [Whites, 1 man; Slaves, 4 men, 5 women].

Les Peros Banhos. An inhabitant of the Island of Mauritius, to whom the privilege of these [22] islets was confirmed by an Act of the 18th May 1823,[4] has formed there a fine establishment of oil and fisheries, where 120 individuals are employed; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	1	—	—	—
Free Persons . .	3	1	1	1
Slaves . . .	58	33	12	10

Isle Legour. . . . Mr. Legour, to whom the privilege was accorded, by an Act of the 20th December 1820, has not formed any establishment there.

Agalega. . . . an inhabitant of the Island of Mauritius . . . to whom it was made over in privilege, confirmed by an Act of the 28th October 1820,[5] has formed there

[1] The grant of these concessions began in 1818; see de Froberville, 'Rodrigues, Galéga, Les Séchelles', p. 80.

[2] When in 1784 the British temporarily occupied Diego Garcia, they found some French residents; see J.-F. Charpentier-Cossigny, *Voyage à Canton*, pp. 178–9. See also Pridham, p. 300: 'The French used to keep a small settlement of slaves and a few Europeans on this island.' See, furthermore, D'Unienville, vol. iii, pp. 183–4.

[3] A first concession had been granted on 31 May 1813; see ibid., p. 187.

[4] A first concession had been granted on 12 July 1813; see ibid., p. 189.

[5] Some French colonists settled in Agalega after 1785, but later renounced their concessions. The island had been uninhabited for several years when on 19 Aug. 1808 two inhabitants of

two excellent manufactories of oil, which employ 199 individuals; viz. [Whites, 1 man; Free Persons, 2 men; Slaves, 105 men, 53 women, 24 boys, 14 girls].

Coëtivy. A captain of the merchant navy . . . , an inhabitant of the island of Mauritius, . . . obtained the privilege in 1814. . . . He has a small establishment there, where 100 individuals are employed; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	1	—	—	—
Free Persons . .	4	4	5	6
Slaves . . .	40	25	7	8

Les Amirantes. These [11] islets . . . are uninhabited, and frequented in the fishing season merely by a few inhabitants of the Seychelles, to whom some of them [6] have been granted, or ceded, in privilege.

L'Isle Alphonse. This island . . . was granted, in privilege, to Mr. G. Harrison,[1] by an Act of the 17th December 1820, but as yet is not inhabited.

Isle de la Providence. It was granted in privilege, by an Act of the 20th July 1817, to an officer of the health department of the island of Mauritius, Monsieur Margeot, who engaged to receive and treat there persons attacked with leprosy. In consequence of this he formed an establishment, wherein are 35 individuals;[2] viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	1	—	—	—
Free Persons . .	4	2	1	—
Slaves . . .	16	7	1	1
Leprous . .	2	—	—	—

Les Isles Jean de Nove. These islets . . . were granted in privilege to an inhabitant of Mauritius . . . by an Act of the 10th December 1813; that person having died without having formed any establishment on them, they were accorded, by Act of the 4th of February 1826, to Mr. Margeot. . . . The establishment formed there by the grantee, employs 7 individuals who live there; viz. [Free persons, 1 man; Slaves, 5 men, 1 woman].

Isle Astove. It was granted in privilege, by Act of the 25th January 1821, to two Creoles of the Mauritius . . . who have not as yet taken possession of it.

Isle Cosmoledo. That island was granted in privilege, by Act of the 21st December 1820, to an inhabitant of Mauritius . . . who as yet has formed no establishment there.[3]

The figures concerning the population may be summarized as shown in the table on page 891.

Excluding the few inhabitants of the Six Islands, the Total Population was 789, of whom 682 were slaves. The Original Slave Registers of 1815 had shown only 356 slaves. The Registers established in accordance with the Order in Council of 30 January 1826 contained up to 2 December 1827 particulars of 639 slaves. Table 72 shows the distribution of the slaves then registered in Rodrigues and the Minor Dependencies by age and race. It appears that altogether 283 were Creoles (born in the Colony), 346 Mozambiques, 131 Malagasy, 20 Indians, and 1 Malay. The 170 slaves under 16 were all Creoles. On 2 January 1830 there were in the Minor

Mauritius were granted permission to form an establishment (see D'Unienville, vol. iii, p. 192; de Froberville, p. 83).

[1] He was then commander of the Seychelles; see de Froberville, p. 111.

[2] See also ibid., p. 112: 'In 1827 some 40 persons resided there.'

[3] See also ibid., p. 114: 'During the fishing season it [the island] is inhabited by some blacks.'

Dependencies	Whites		Free Coloured		Slaves		Lepers[1]		Total		
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	Total
Diego Garcia .	5	1	7	7	171	47	30	7	213	62	275
Trois Frères .	1	—	2	—	22	13	5	—	30	13	43
Salomon .	1	—	—	—	4	5	—	—	5	5	10
Peros Banhos .	1	—	4	2	70	43	—	—	75	45	120
Agalega . .	1	—	2	—	129	67	—	—	132	67	199
Coëtivy . .	1	—	9	10	47	33	—	—	57	43	100
Providence .	1	—	5	2	17	8	2	—	25	10	35
Jean de Nove .	—	—	1	—	5	1	—	—	6	1	7
Total . .	11	1	30	21	465	217	37	7	543	246	789

[1] See also in this connexion Government Notice, dated Chief Secretary's Office, Port-Louis, 7 July 1829 (*Recueil des Lois 1829*, pp. 135–6):

'The Colonial Government having it in contemplation to collect at *Île Curieuse* the Leprous Slaves now distributed in the Islands forming the minor dependencies of Mauritius—notice is hereby given that, until the 10th August next, at 12 o'clock, Sealed Tenders will be received at this Office, for the conveyance to *Île Curieuse* of the Leprous Slaves at present at *Diégo Garcia*, *Péros Banhos* and *Trois Frères*, as also for the conveyance, to the same destination, of those at *Île Providence* and *Jean de Nove*.

'The number of Lepers in the minor dependencies to be removed, may be stated as under, and Provisions for their subsistence during the voyage, will be supplied from the Public Stores.

Leprous Slaves & Convicts at *Diégo Garcia* . . . . 45.
Ditto at *Péros Banhos* . . . . 15.
Ditto at *Trois Frères* . . . . 14.
Ditto at *Providence & Jean de Nove* . . . 40.'

For further details concerning *L'Île Curieuse* (one of the Seychelles Islands) see p. 910 below.

Dependencies 527 slaves and on 1 May 1832, 575. According to the census of 1851 the population numbered 695.[1] It increased to 1,450 in 1881. The census of 1891 showed only 1,188 inhabitants, but the decrease was due in part to the transfer of several islands to the Seychelles and in part to the fact that the population of some islands was not enumerated in 1891.[2] In 1901, when the islands omitted at the 1891 census were included, the population amounted to 1,697.[3] The census of 1911 showed 1,861 inhabitants, but Coëtivy (with 143 inhabitants in 1901) had in the meantime been transferred to the Seychelles. Taking the census area of 1911, but excluding Farquhar Island, which was transferred in 1921 to the Seychelles, the number of inhabitants developed as follows:

Sex	1871	1881	1901	1911	1921	1931	1944
Males . . .	631	794	927	1,041	1,009	806	842
Females . . .	343	404	552	721	764	651	736
Total . . .	974	1,198	1,479	1,762	1,773	1,457	1,578

The combined area of these islands is 47 square miles, and there were in 1944, 34 inhabitants to the square mile.

[1] In Rodrigues and the Minor Dependencies the General Population comprised 349 males and 120 females, and the Ex-Apprentice Population 501 males and 220 females; see Mauritius, *Blue Book 1857*, p. 307.

[2] Considering only those islands which were included in 1891 in the Minor Dependencies and which were enumerated in that year, the population increased from 1,149 in 1881 to 1,188 in 1891.

[3] Excluding those islands it amounted to 1,426 as compared with 1,340 in 1881.

TABLE 71. *Slaves in Minor Dependencies of Mauritius 1815–32*[1]

Dependencies	*1815*[2]	*1816–18*	*1819*	*1820–1*	*1822*	*1823*	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*	*1827*[3]	*2 Jan. 1830*	*1 May 1832*
Agalega . .	196	196	123	196	196	196	196	196	199	176	182	197
Providence . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	29	26	27
Coëtivy . .	—	60	—	66	67	67	67	60	67	70	44	36
Peros Banhos .	16	16	45	92	92	93	92	93	99	105	96	89
Salomon . .	—	—	—	—	8	2	3	—	6	6	2	2
Trois Frères .	25	25	25	25	25	25	33	34	34	33	31	29
Six Islands . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	37	15	15
Diego Garcia .	89	126	61	137	67	132	118	149	141	171	118	170
St. Brandon .	30	30	10	10	—	—	—	—	—	12	11	10
Total . .	356	453	264	526	455	515	509	532	546	640[4]	527	575

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Returns*, Nos. 1, 6; *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), pp. 6–7; *Blue Book 1828*, pp. 406–9; *1830*, pp. 501–2; *1833*, folio 214. [2] Number of Slaves registered in the Original Slave Registers.
[3] Number of Slaves registered between 16 Oct. 1826 and 2 Dec. 1827. [4] Including 1 not stated.

TABLE 72. *Slaves Registered in Dependencies of Mauritius, except Seychelles, between 16 October 1826 and 2 December 1827*[1]

Age years[2]	*Creoles*		*Mozambiques*		*Malagasy*		*Indians*		*Total*		
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Under 6 .	43	55	—	—	—	—	—	—	43	55	98
6–11 . .	27	21	—	—	—	—	—	—	27	21	48
12–16 . .	12	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	12	24
17–60 . .	54	58	274	67	88	42	14[3]	4	430	171	601
61 and over .	—	1	5	—	1	—	3	—	9	1	10
Total .	136	147	279	67	89	42	17	4	522[4]	260	782[4]

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 6.
[2] See footnote 2 to Table 16. [3] Including 1 Malay. [4] Including 1 'Caste omitted'.

TABLE 73. *Population by Sex, Minor Dependencies of Mauritius 1851–81*[1]

Dependencies	*1851*			*1861*			*1871*			*1881*		
	M.	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Amirantes[2] .	28	2	30	57	17	74	64	33	97	66	44	110
St. Brandon .	..	..	..	35	—	35	9	—	9	6	—	6
Islands North of Madagascar[3] .	61	—	61	..	..	..	46	16	62	23	13	36
Agaléga . .	167	75	242	101	40	141	177	99	276	214	107	321
Six Islands .	..	..	..	30	6	36	22	24	46	50	32	82
Coëtivy . .	23	5	28	22	14	36	48	20	68	67	39	106
Diego Garcia .	134	44	178	297	79	376	245	128	373	291	152	443
Salomon Islands	31	3	34	36	16	52	66	33	99	72	36	108
Peros Banhos .	62	38	100	63	36	99	82	43	125	126	59	185
Trois Frères .	20	2	22	21	6	27	30	16	46	35	18	53
Total . .	526	169	695	662	214	876	789	412	1,201	950	500	1,450

[1] See *Census Report 1881*, Appendixes, pp. 482–3.
[2] 1851 and 1861 Poivre, Desroches; 1871 and 1881 also St. Joseph, Darros.
[3] 1851 Aldabra, Cosmoledo, Juan de Nova, Providence, Assumption, Astove, Glorieuse; 1861 not enumerated; 1871 Aldabra, Cosmoledo, Juan de Nova, Providence, Assumption; 1881 Juan de Nova.

TABLE 74. *Population of Some Minor Dependencies of Mauritius 1856 and 1859*[1]

Year	*Providence*	*Agalega*	*Six Islands*	*Coëtivy*	*Diego Garcia*	*Salomon Islands*	*Péros Banhos*	*Trois Frères*	*Juan de Nova*
1856	7	213	25	23	299	91	60	22	14
1859	..	..	44	44	338	77	104	26[2]	..

[1] See *State of Colonial Possessions 1856*, pp. 160–1; *1859*, Part I, p. 128 ('Report of the Commissioners appointed by His Excellency the Governor to visit the smaller Dependencies of Mauritius').
[2] Eagle Island.

TABLE 75. *Population by Sex, Minor Dependencies of Mauritius 1891–1944*[1]

Year	*Sex*	*Diego Garcia*	*Agalega*	*Péros Banhos*	*Coëtivy*[2]	*Salomon*	*Six Islands*	*St. Brandon*	*Farquhar*[3]	*Trois Frères*[4]	*Total*
1891	M.	308	215	..	40	88	47	..	20	52	770
	F.	161	121	..	18	54	20	..	12	32	418
	Total	469	336	..	58	142	67	..	32	84	1,188
1901	M.	324	223	111	95	69	69	85	55	46	1,077
	F.	202	149	73	48	50	48	2	20	28	620
	Total	526	372	184	143	119	117	87	75	74	1,697
1911	M.	315	228	165	..	90	88	97	56	58	1,097
	F.	202	187	135	..	70	68	13	43	46	764
	Total	517	415	300	..	160	156	110	99	104	1,861
1921	M.	255	267	194	..	81	117	21	29	74	1,038
	F.	190	250	156	..	62	48	1	8	57	772
	Total	445	517	350	..	143	165	22	37	131	1,810
1931	M.	249	161	192	..	65	37	61	..	41	806
	F.	206	169	180	..	40	21	—	..	35	651
	Total	455	330	372	..	105	58	61	..	76	1,457
1944	M.	246	228	160	..	115	—	93	..	—	842
	F.	255	209	172	..	100	—	—	..	—	736
	Total	501	437	332	..	215	—	93	..	—	1,578

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, pp. 38, 41; *1901*, p. 169; *1911*, Statistical Abstracts, pp. xcvi–ci; *1921*, Appendixes, p. clxxiv; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, p. 3.
[2] From 1911 onwards under Seychelles.
[3] From 1931 onwards under Seychelles.
[4] In 1901, 1911, and 1921 Eagle Island.

III. Composition of the Population

Race. Immigration of Asiatics into the Dependencies has been very small. At the last three censuses the distribution by races was as follows:[1]

	Year	General Population	Indo-Mauritians	Other Indians	Chinese
Rodrigues	1921	6,404	83	23	74
	1931	7,949	103	15	135
	1944	11,547	79	7	252
Minor Dependencies	1921	1,493	291	26	—
	1931	1,354	102	1	—
	1944	1,575	3		—

Birth-place. Of the 8,394 persons enumerated in 1921 in the Dependencies of Mauritius 7,068 were returned as born in such Dependencies, 1,016 in Mauritius, 51 in Seychelles, 38 in Madagascar, 21 in Réunion, 48 in British possessions in Asia, 36 elsewhere in Asia, 14 in Great Britain, 51 elsewhere in Europe, 1 in Australia, and 3 on sea, while for 47 (including

Table 76. *Population by Birth-place, Dependencies of Mauritius 1921 and 1944*[1]

Birth-place	Rodrigues 1921	Rodrigues 1944	Minor Dependencies 1921	Birth-place	Rodrigues 1921	Rodrigues 1944	Minor Dependencies 1921
Mauritius	252	2,149	764	England	12	1	—
Rodrigues	6,223	9,003	9	Scotland	2	—	—
Minor Dependencies	2	2	834	Alsace	1	—	—
Seychelles	5	—	46	Denmark	—	—	1
Madagascar	13	—	25	Germany	—	—	1
Réunion	4	2	17	Norway	—	—	1
Africa not specified	—	—	19	Sweden	—	—	47
Africa Total	6,499	11,756	1,714	Europe Total	15	17[2]	50[3]
Ceylon	—	—	1	Australia	—	—	1
India	23	7	24	On sea	—	—	3
China	34	105	—	Not stated	12	—	16
Cochin-China	—	—	1				
Pondicherry	1	—	—	Total	6,584	11,885	1,810
Asia Total	58	112	26				

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, pp. clxxxii, cxcv, cci, ccv, ccxi, ccxxi, ccxxix, ccxxxiv, ccxlii; *1944*, p. 124.
[2] Including 16 'Country not stated'.
[3] All persons born in Europe were enumerated in Six Islands.

19 born in Africa) the birthplace was not stated. Data concerning birthplace are lacking altogether for 1931, and for 1944 in the case of the Minor Dependencies. The most startling change which occurred in Rodrigues between 1921 and 1944 was the increase in the number of persons born in Mauritius from 252 to 2,149.

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, p. clxxiv; *1931*, p. 3; *1944*, pp. 115, 124, 127

Nationality. No data are available either for 1921 or 1931. In Rodrigues there were in 1944, 11,772 British, 10 French, and 103 Chinese subjects.[1]

Sex. In Rodrigues males exceeded females at every census up to 1921. In the Minor Dependencies there is still to-day a preponderance of males. In 1921, 1931, and 1944 the ratio of females to 100 males was 99·5, 103·4, and 107·1 in Rodrigues, and 74, 80, and 87 in the Minor Dependencies.

TABLE 77. *Population by Age and Sex, Rodrigues 1921 and 1931*[1]

Age years	Total Population 1921		General Population excluding Chinese			
			1921		1931	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
0–4	539	600	531	582	595	683
5–9	535	576	525	561	596	595
10–14	514	513	504	504	573	590
15–19	363	387	357	379	457	527
20–4	310	304	300	298	410	426
25–9	224	228	213	223	298	318
30–4	183	166	175	163	207	213
35–9	147	132	135	129	157	183
40–4	118	105	109	103	141	147
45–9	105	95	97	93	121	110
50–4	77	53	74	52	100	92
55–9	57	43	55	42	63	68
60–4	37	28	34	28	63	45
65–9	35	16	33	16	29	29
70–4	24	18	22	18	36	20
75–9	17	13	15	13	13	13
80–4	7	4	6	4	10	1
85–9	2	—	2	—	5	2
90 and more	6	3	6	3	6	7
Total	3,300	3,284	3,193	3,211	3,880	4,069

[1] See *Census Report 1921*, Appendixes, pp. clxxx-clxxxi; *1931*, p. lviii.

Age. In 1921 the proportion of children (under 15) among the total population of Rodrigues was 49·8 per cent., the proportion of males between 15 and 50 years 22·0 per cent., the proportion of females between 15 and 50 years 21·5 per cent., and the proportion of old people (50 and over) 6·7 per cent. For 1931 data are available only for the General Population (excluding Chinese).[2] In 1944 the percentages among the total population were 46·9 for children, 20·5 for males between 15 and 50, 24·2 for females between 15 and 50, and 8·4 for old people. In Mauritius the corresponding percentages were 34·6, 27·8, 25·4, and 12·2. It appears that the proportion of children was very much larger in Rodrigues, while the proportion of males between 15 and 50 and the proportion of old people were very much smaller.

The age data from the Minor Dependencies for 1931 are useless, as the

[1] See ibid. *1944*, p. 125.

[2] The percentages were 45·7 for children, 22·5 for men between 15 and 50, 24·2 for women between 15 and 50, and 7·6 for old people.

group 'Not Stated' comprises nearly one-half of the population.[1] No data were published for 1944.

TABLE 78. *Population by Age and Sex, Rodrigues 1944*[1]

Age years	General Population		Indian Population		Chinese Population		Total Population		
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
0–4	998	995	7	8	24	26	1,029	1,029	2,058
5–9	904	977	14	2	23	24	941	1,003	1,944
10–14	787	746	5	6	14	17	806	769	1,575
15–19	568	640	6	2	4	8	578	650	1,228
20–4	449	554	1	3	5	6	455	563	1,018
25–9	342	468	3	2	5	9	350	479	829
30–4	314	374	3	3	11	7	328	384	712
35–9	298	334	5	2	3	4	306	340	646
40–4	207	261	—	3	15	7	222	271	493
45–9	187	179	3	—	12	3	202	182	384
50–4	132	141	1	—	9	2	142	143	285
55–9	114	95	2	—	5	1	121	96	217
60–4	83	74	1	—	5	1	89	75	164
65–9	65	56	—	1	2	—	67	57	124
70–4	53	56	2	—	—	—	55	56	111
75–9	23	23	1	—	—	—	24	23	47
80–4	14	12	—	—	—	—	14	12	26
85–9	5	6	—	—	—	—	5	6	11
90 and more	5	7	—	—	—	—	5	7	12
Total	5,549[2]	5,998	54	32	137	115	5,740[2]	6,145	11,885[2]

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, p. 115. [2] Including 1 'Age not stated'.

Conjugal Condition. In the General Population of Rodrigues (excluding Chinese) 56·5 per cent. of the males 15 years and over in 1931 were bachelors, 41·2 per cent. husbands, and 2·3 per cent. widowers or divorced. Of the females 15 years and over, 54·1 per cent. were spinsters, 40·0 per cent. wives, and 5·9 per cent. widows or divorced. The proportion of

TABLE 79. *General Population (excluding Chinese) by Conjugal Condition and Sex, Dependencies of Mauritius 1931*[1]

Dependencies	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced		Not stated	
	Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly							
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*
Rodrigues .	2,724	2,820	226	236	1	—	870	879	46	124	2	5	11	5
Minor Dep. .	691	562	1	1	—	—	37	23	3	11	—	—	5	—

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Appendixes, pp. lix, lxii.

adults living as husbands and wives without being civilly married was 10·7 per cent. both for males and for females. In the Minor Dependencies nearly the whole General Population was returned as unmarried. No data on the conjugal condition of the other sections of the population are available from any Dependency for 1931.

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, Appendixes, p. lxi.

Conditions among the General Population of Rodrigues were quite different in 1944. The proportion of bachelors among the males over 15 years had decreased to 49·9 per cent., while the proportion of husbands had risen to 48·1 per cent.; the proportion of widowers or divorced was 2·0 per cent.

TABLE 80. *Population by Conjugal Condition and Sex, Rodrigues 1944*[1]

Population	Unmarried				Married				Widowed		Divorced	
	Single		Concubinage		Religiously		Civilly					
	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.	M.	F.
General . .	3,839	4,030	79	104	197	217	1,376	1,453	54	184	4	10
Indian . .	36	17	1	—	1	1	15	14	—	—	1	—
Chinese . .	81	84	9	4	2	2	41	24	4	1	—	—
Total . .	3,956	4,131	89	108	200	220	1,432	1,491	58	185	5	10

[1] See *Census Report 1944*, pp. 116–18.

The percentage of spinsters had decreased to 49·9, while the proportion of wives had risen to 44·2, that of widows or divorced (5·9) remaining unchanged. The proportion of adults living as husbands and wives without being married either civilly or religiously had dropped to 2·8 per cent. for males and 3·2 per cent. for females. The number of people only religiously married had risen from 1 to 414, the proportion in 1944 being 6·9 per cent. for men and 6·6 per cent. for women. Thus, there was the same trend towards exclusively religious marriage as in Mauritius,[1] but unlike in Mauritius the proportion of legally married had increased likewise.

No data concerning conjugal condition in 1944 have been published for the Minor Dependencies.

IV. BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION

The Civil Status Ordinance for Mauritius applies also to the Dependencies, but contains the following special provisions with regard to them:

3.—(1) This Ordinance shall apply to Mauritius and the Dependencies thereof. . . .

(2) The Governor in Executive Council may by Proclamation enact such modifications of the provisions of this Ordinance as may be required by the local circumstances of every Dependency.

Any such Proclamation may at any time be repealed, amended or added to by the Governor in Executive Council.

7.—(1) There shall be a civil status office in Rodrigues and the Magistrate of Rodrigues shall be the civil status officer for the Dependency.

In case the said Magistrate shall be unable to act as such officer through unavoidable absence from office or illness, it shall be lawful for the said Magistrate to authorise the Chief Officer of Police to act as civil status officer in his stead.

Whenever the said Chief Officer of Police shall act as civil status officer, as provided in the preceding paragraph, mention of the authorization given to him by the said Magistrate shall be made in the acts received and drawn up by such Chief Officer of Police.

(2) It shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint any person to act as civil status officer in any other Dependency for such time and under such conditions as he may

[1] It is possible, of course, that many of the couples returned in 1944 as married only religiously had immigrated from Mauritius.

deem fit. When a person so appointed is in such Dependency, he shall be deemed a civil status officer for such Dependency, and the house in which he resides in the Dependency shall be deemed the civil status office.

(3) Such person shall not be bound to take any oath prescribed to be taken by Ordinance 12 of 1869 or Ordinance 29 of 1876 and may receive such a salary as shall be fixed by the Governor with the consent of the Council of Government.

When there is no person appointed in a Dependency any person for the time being the manager of the Dependency may act as civil status officer.

V. Birth and Death Statistics

1. *Rodrigues*

Live-births. The number of recorded live-births oscillated in 1919–27 between 243 and 316, in 1928–34 between 327 and 384, and in 1935–9 between 405 and 486; they amounted in 1945 to 589. The increase was due to an increase in the adult female population. The official birth-rate in 1919–39 averaged 43 and was 48 in 1945. Fertility must be very high, since the proportion of women of child-bearing age is rather low.

Still-births. The number of still-births in 1932–8 were 16, 11, 11, 8, 9, 16, and 10 respectively.[1] No figures seem to have been published for earlier years.

Table 81. *Births and Deaths, Rodrigues 1913–39 and 1945*[1]

Year	Live-born			Total deaths			Deaths under 1	Year	Live-born			Total deaths			Deaths under 1
	M.	F.	Total	M.	F.	Total			M.	F.	Total	M.	F.	Total	
1913	118	135	253	50	48	98	16	1927	131	158	289	34	29	63	20
1914	131	108	239	36	37	73	29	1928	154	180	334	36	31	67	22
1915	123	143	266	38	28	66	22	1929	162	167	329	58	62	120	29
1916	130	129	259	28	23	51	13	1930	173	154	327	57	60	117	36
1917	145	148	293	40	26	66	19	1931	198	186	384	56	53	109	32
1918	136	149	285	22	32	54	24	1932	180	178	358	54	62	116	30
1919	132	111	243	36	30	66	22	1933	180	200	380	51	53	104	33
1920	138	161	299	36	33	69	22	1934	187	196	383	89	94	183	49
1921	134	126	260	54	73	127	25	1935	218	201	419	57	52	109	40
1922	155	157	312	49	32	81	25	1936	208	197	405	36	34	70	20
1923	147	116	263	40	32	72	25	1937	208	224	432	95	110	205	81
1924	156	161	316	36	45	81	28	1938	223	263	486	52	51	103	34
1925	137	128	265	36	32	68	24	1939	217	254	471	63	85	148	58
1926	141	149	290	45	24	69	17	1945	323	266	589	61	63	124	46

[1] See Mauritius, *Report of Registrar General 1913*, p. 21; *1914*, p. 21; *1915*, p. 19; *1916*, p. 17; *1917*, p. 14; *1918*, p. 15; *1919*, p. 17; *1920*, p. 15; *1921*, pp. 16–17; *1922*, p. 15; *1923*, pp. 16–17; *1924*, pp. 16–17; *1925*, pp. 16–17; *1926*, pp. 16–17; *1927*, pp. 15–16; *1928*, pp. 15–16; *1929*, pp. 16–17; *1930*, pp. 15–16; *1931*, pp. 16–17; *1932*, pp. 22–3; *1933*, pp. 23–4; *1934*, pp. 25–6; *1935*, pp. 27–8; *1936*, pp. 28–9; *1937*, pp. 30–1; *1938*, pp. 28–9; *1939*, Table 12; *1945*, pp. 26–7.

Total Deaths. The number of recorded deaths oscillated in 1919–28 between 63 and 81, with the exception of 1921 when it was 127, and in 1929–39 between 103 and 205, with the exception of 1936 when it was 70. The official death-rate averaged 11 in 1919–28 and 14 in 1929–39.[2] The

[1] See Mauritius, *Medical Report 1933*, p. 114; *1934*, p. 118; *1935*, p. 122; *1936*, p. 98; *1937*, p. 96; *1938*, p. 104.

[2] No data are available for 1940–4. In 1945 the number of deaths was 124 and the death-rate 10.

increase in the latter period was due in part to the big rise in mortality in 1934 and 1937. The rise in 1934 was attributed by the Government Medical Officer of Rodrigues to the return of a large number of people who had been healthy when they had emigrated the year before to Reunion, but who now brought 'with them numerous cases of Beri-Beri and of Malaria' and introduced into Rodrigues 'diseases like Typhoid Fever, Bacillary Dysentery, and Measles, all of which were not met with in 1933'.[1] Mortality was normal again in 1935, but in his report for that year the Director of the Medical and Health Department of Mauritius was rather pessimistic as to the sanitary future of Rodrigues:

> The large disproportion between the birth and death rates of the population shew that it is in process of vigorous growth. This, in itself, will inevitably bring serious problems in its train. The growth of the population in numbers is far outstepping its growth in productivity and sanitary practice, and it would appear that this community is fast heading for the kind of trouble experienced in a congested community whose hygienic practice and general economic level is low. Hookworm infection is already present and is bound to increase unless the people can be induced to build sanitary latrines and to use them habitually.
>
> The prospect of establishing such habits in this population are not very encouraging at present.[2]

In any case there cannot be the least doubt that until recently Rodrigues has been one of those exceptionally healthy islands with an enormous excess of births over deaths.[3]

Infant Deaths. Mortality of infants has been very low in Rodrigues in most years.

2. *Minor Dependencies*

Vital statistics have been published in an haphazard fashion for 1912–32 and none thereafter. The results are summarized in Table 82.[4]

[1] Mauritius, *Medical Report 1934*, p. 103.
[2] Ibid. *1935*, p. 35.
[3] In 1877–99 births and deaths numbered as follows:

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*
1877	67	14	1883	64	28	1889	91	33	1895	140	109
1878	81	25	1884	91	29	1890	131	80	1896	164	38
1879	76	18	1885	94	29	1891	109	22	1897	165	39
1880	76	48	1886	101	24	1892	130	23	1898	166	44
1881	70	26	1887	88	27	1893	128	30	1899	169	41
1882	88	17	1888	106	32	1894	140	41			

(See *Mauritius Almanac 1879*, p. 87; *Colonial Possessions Reports 1879*, p. 270; *1880–2*, p. 236; *1883–5*, p. 18; *1884–6*, p. 149; *Reports on Blue Books, Mauritius, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1886*, p. 22, *1887*, p. 22, *1888*, p. 17; *Colonial Reports, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1889 & 1890*, pp. 26, 33; *Rodrigues 1891*, p. 6, *1892*, p. 5, *1893*, p. 5; *Mauritius 1895. Rodrigues Annual Reports for 1894 and 1895*, p. 26; *Rodrigues 1896*, p. 8; *Mauritius and Rodrigues 1897*, p. 38, *1898*, p. 50, *1899*, p. 64.)

The death-rates in 1872–87 were 16·1, 16·4, 11·9, 10·0, 14·8, 10·0, 17·1, 11·8, 31·1, 18·4, 11·0, 17·9, 17·8, 17·1, 14·2, and 15·3 respectively (see Meldrum, p. 120; Davidson, *Geographical Pathology*, vol. ii, p. 783). In 1902–6 the death-rate averaged 19·3 (see Ross, *Report on the Prevention of Malaria in Mauritius*, p. 57).

[4] Mortality was evidently much higher than in Rodrigues. This was apparently also the case in earlier years. In 1902–6, when the population of Rodrigues was twice as high as in the Minor Dependencies, deaths in Rodrigues totalled 332, and in the Minor Dependencies 249 (see ibid.).

TABLE 82. *Births and Deaths, Minor Dependencies of Mauritius 1912–32*[1]

Year	*Diego Garcia*		*Agalega*		*Peros Banhos*		*Salomon*		*Six Islands*		*Saint Brandon*		*Trois Frères*[2]	
	B.	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*	*B.*	*D.*
1912	26	20	16	18	9	9	8	5	12	10	—	6	6	11
1913	28	13	..	..	11	8	6	6	5	5	..	..	3	8
1914	22	14	18	8	14	6	..	..	..	..	—	4	..	..
1915	22	18	22	11	10	18	13	2	6	5	—	6	5	3
1916	32	18	..	..	15	3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1917	..	..	25	5	6	5	8	3	10	8	—	2	4	8
1918	25	18	24	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	—	2	..	..
1919	31	36	..	..	14	11	7	8	11	4	—	2	6	6
1920	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
1921	23	25	27	18	13	18	6	6	5	7	..	..	8	11
1922	22	21	26	22	13	4	..	..	..	..	..	..	7	7
1923	..	..	28	21	15	14	8	15	3	4	..	..	6	3
1924	19	13	25	23	12	8	5	6	3	4	..	..	5	5
1925	..	..	30	6	..	..	..	..	..	..		3	..	..
1926	14	8	22	17	17	10	10	2	2	4	..	..	2	8
1927	15	9	19	27	11	5	9	5	5	3	..	..	6	5
1928	17	5	19	12	20	8	8	7	3	3	..	..	3	6
1929	16	10	30	17	11	8	4	1	6	3	..	..	5	3
1930	19	19	24	13	13	14	10	5	—	2	..	..	4	3
1931	21	13	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	4
1932	17	11	27	14	16	10	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

[1] See Mauritius, *Report of Registrar General 1913*, p. 8; *1914*, p. 8; *1915*, p. 7; *1916*, p. 7; *1917*, p. 5; *1918*, p. 5; *1919*, p. 5; *1920*, p. 5; *1921*, p. 6; *1922*, p. 5; *1923*, p. 6; *1924*, p. 6; *1925*, p. 6; *1926*, p. 6; *1927*, p. 5; *1928*, p. 5; *1929*, p. 6; *1930*, p. 5; *1931*, p. 6; *1932*, p. 9; *1933*, p. 10. In Farquhar Island (St. Juan de Nova) the births registered in 1913, 1914, 1916, 1918, and 1920 numbered 3, 7, 5, 11, and 6, and the deaths, 2, 2, 10, 10, and 6, respectively.

[2] Figures for 1912–24 refer to Eagle Island.

CHAPTER XVI

SEYCHELLES

I. Census-taking

The decennial censuses of 1851–91[1] were authorized by the Census Ordinances made for Mauritius and its Dependencies.[2] The decennial censuses of 1901–31 were taken in accordance with 'The Census Ordinance, 1900',[3] which began as follows:

Whereas it is expedient to take the Census of the Seychelles Islands in the year one thousand nine hundred and one.

Be it therefore enacted by the Governor of the Colony of Seychelles,[4] with the advice and consent of the Legislative Council thereof, as follows:

The Ordinance was *mutatis mutandis* the same as for Mauritius and does not differ in any essential point from the Mauritius Census Ordinance, 1930.[5] The schedule and instructions attached to the Census Ordinance, 1900, of the Seychelles are likewise almost identical with those attached to the Census Ordinance, 1930, of Mauritius.[6]

'The Census (Amendment) Ordinance, 1910' made the following provisions for the taking of future censuses:[7]

1. A Census of the Seychelles Islands shall be taken in the year one thousand nine hundred and eleven, and in such other years thereafter as may be ordered by Proclamation of the Governor in Executive Council.

2. (1) The provisions of Ordinance No. 27 of 1900 shall be held to be hereby re-enacted and to be applicable 'mutatis mutandis', to every Census taken under section 1 hereof.

(2) The Governor in Executive Council shall have power to alter, vary or modify the Schedule annexed to Ordinance No. 27 of 1900.

In accordance with this Ordinance the Governor proclaimed on 28 January 1931 that a census should be taken on 26 April 1931.[8]

[1] For earlier censuses see Section II of this chapter.

[2] See pp. 735–6 above.

[3] No. 27 of 1900 (10 Oct.), 'An Ordinance For taking the Census of the Seychelles Islands', *Government Gazette*, 13 Oct. 1900 (also *Seychelles Ordinances 1898–1901*), reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. iii, 1899–1906, pp. 1124–33.

[4] The original Ordinance said 'Administrator of the Seychelles Islands'; but by Letters Patent dated 31 Aug. 1903 the Seychelles Islands, which had been a Dependency of Mauritius, were erected into a separate Colony, and in Nov. 1903 the Administrator was raised to the rank of Governor. See also 'The Seychelles Legislature Order in Council, 1903' (10 Aug.).

[5] The only differences worth mentioning are:

Article 7 (2) of the Ordinance of Mauritius says that the Census Commissioner shall at least five days before the day fixed for taking the Census, cause one or more schedules to be left at every dwelling-house. The Census Commissioner of the Seychelles Islands shall do the same 'as far as possible'.

Article 15 of the Ordinance of Mauritius says that every superintendent shall take an account of the occupied houses. In the Seychelles Islands every enumerator shall take such an account.

[6] The only differences are that in the Seychelles the age at the time of marriage was not asked and that the instructions concerning the country of birth were less explicit.

[7] No. 10 of 1910 (1 Aug.), *Government Gazette*, 4 Aug. 1910, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. iv, 1907–11, pp. 164–5.

[8] Proclamation No. 5 of 1931, reprinted in Seychelles, *Proclamations 1931*, p. 7. The Census of 1921 had been taken on 24 Apr. in accordance with a Proclamation of 14 Mar. 1921, Proclamation No. 8 of 1921, reprinted in Seychelles, *Proclamations 1921*, p. 13.

The Census Commissioner apparently felt somewhat uncertain about the completeness of the 1931 census.

> According to the reports of the Superintendents who had the supervision of the work of the enumerators, it results that the work has been done in a satisfactory manner though I must state that the total population shown by the Census gives a difference of 1,103 less than the figures given by the Chief Civil Status Officer of the estimated population up to the date of the Census. I am unable to explain this difference in spite of careful check. There are a certain number drowned each year whose deaths are not registered. It is also difficult to check the emigration figures accurately particularly to Madagascar and islands in the Mozambique Channel. These causes will account for some of the difference but do not account for the whole.[1]

The Medical Department likewise says that 'deaths in the outlying islands due to drowning may not have been registered, further there may be stowaways in ships for Madagascar, and islands of the Mozambique Channel, which the emigration authorities are unaware of'. But it mentions still another important reason for the discrepancy of the census figures and those of the Civil Status Officer:

> Further labourers to the number of about 150 are engaged for the French island Juan de Nova, about 50 at the French island Glorieuse, and about 25 are engaged at Agalega Islands, these were not enumerated in the Census.[2]

The fact that the census result lagged behind the figure computed by the Civil Status Officer seems, therefore, to afford no proof that the former was incomplete.

The cost of the 1891 census was Rs.1,050 (including a personal remuneration of Rs.404 to the Census Superintendent),[3] or £4. 15*s*. 10*d*. per 1,000 enumerated persons. The cost of the 1931 census was Rs.2,592 c.68,[4] or £7. 2*s*. 1*d*. for each 1,000 enumerated persons.

II. Total Population

1. *1742–1810*

Mahé de La Bourdonnais, in 1742 and again in 1743, ordered Captain Lazare Picault to explore the islands north of the Isle of France. Before returning from his second voyage in June 1744 Picault named the principal island Mahé.[5] Twelve years later the Governor of the Isle of France, René Magon, sent Captain Corneille Nicolas Morphey, the son of an Irish refugee,[6] to take formal possession of the islands for the French King. Morphey landed in Mahé on 6 September 1756, renamed it Séchelles,[7] took formal possession on 1 November, and left on the 13th.[8] On 12 August

[1] *Census of Seychelles 1931*, p. 7.
[2] *Medical Report 1931*, p. 6.
[3] See Seychelles, *Census Report 1891*, p. 2.
[4] See Seychelles, *Blue Book 1931*, pp. 36–7.
[5] See Fauvel, *Unpublished Documents on the History of the Seychelles Islands* (1909), pp. 28–45, 104.
[6] See Bourde de la Rogerie, p. 197.
[7] In honour of the then Controller-General René Moreau des Séchelles; see ibid., p. 165.
[8] See Fauvel, pp. 75–6, 96–7, 104, 135–40. It has often been stated that Picault named the principal island Mahé and the group of islands Labourdonnais, that the name Mahé remained the name of the principal island, and that the group of islands was renamed Séchelles in 1756 (see,

1770 Des Roches, Governor of the Isle of France, Bourbon, and Dependencies, and Poivre, Commissary of the King, authorized Brayer du Barré 'to send to the Isles Trois Frères or Seychelles and other adjacent islands belonging to the King' and 'to make there an establishment of about 30 men under the command of Sieur Delaunay'.[1] Commander Delaunay landed on 27 August on the island St. Anne (near the Isle Séchelles) with 14 white men (including a surgeon and a master carpenter), 7 slaves, 5 Indians, and a negress.[2] But the establishment did not flourish[3] and was apparently abandoned after 18 months.[4] It seems that Delaunay had planned as early as April 1771 the creation of a considerable establishment in the Isle Séchelles.[5] Poivre, on 17 October 1771, gave the necessary orders.[6] The establishment was to be made at the expense of Brayer,[7] and the Government lent him a ship which apparently carried 40 white and black labourers, and altogether about 65 passengers to the Isle Séchelles.[8] But this first attempt to colonize the island was apparently a failure.[9] Poivre, on 29 June 1772, gave orders to make in the island a new establishment independent from that of Brayer.[10] It is safe to say, however, that the total population of all the islands of the group at the beginning of 1774 numbered less than 100.[11] On 11 December 1777 the chevalier de Ternay

for example, D'Unienville, vol. iii, pp. 196–8; *Almanach des Îles Séchelles 1840*, p. 1; Eugène de Froberville, 'Rodrigues', &c., 1848, p. 103; Sauzier, 'Contributions à l'Histoire et la Géographie de l'Archipel des Seychelles' (1894), p. 66; Pitot, *L'Île de France, 1715–1810*, p. 40; Bourde de la Rogerie, 1934, p. 165; Bradley, *History of Seychelles*, 1940, Part I, p. 16). But I found no evidence that the group was ever officially named Labourdonnais, and Morphey (who had been instructed to take possession of and name Isle of Séchelles that island where he would have the good luck of finding a good port; see de Froberville, p. 103) said explicitly in his Act of taking possession: '*Et, selon l'ordre de Monsieur Magon—Directeur Commandant Général des Isles de France et de Bourbon, nous avons pris possession de la ditte Isle et de son Port au nom du Roy et de la Compagnie des Indes sous le nom d'Isle Seychelles*' (Fauvel, p. 76). It seems that, before La Bourdonnais fell into disgrace, the group was called Isles Mahé and that soon after Morphey's journey it began to be called Isles Séchelles. I do not know when the principal island was first officially called again Mahé. An unsigned report of 20 May 1785 listed the inhabitants *de l'île principale de Mahé* (see Fauvel, p. 152). Captain Henry Newcome, on 16 May 1794, in his 'Summons' to Quéau de Quinssy, the French military commander of the Seychelles, said: 'I do in His Britannic Majesty's name demand an instant surrender of the Island of Mahé and its dependencies.' De Quinssy proposed the following day: '*Article 1er. La Colonie, place, et la batterie de l'Isle Mahé ou Séchelles, Praslin, et toutes ses dépendances, se rendent au Commodore Newcome. . . .*' Newcome answered: 'Article 1st. I shall take possession of the Colony of Mahé and its dependencies.' (See ibid., pp. 176–7.)

[1] Ibid., pp. 110–11. See also ibid., p. 108.

[2] See ibid., p. 115.

[3] See ibid., pp. 78–9, 113–14, 208–9.

[4] See ibid., pp. 90, 98, 108, 112. The reports concerning this enterprise are somewhat contradictory. W. E. Davidson, Introduction to Fauvel, p. xii, says that Brayer 'succeeded in bringing over a colony of fifty persons, white and black, from the Isle de Bourbon', but I found no evidence that so many went to St. Anne and that any came from Bourbon. Brayer himself wrote on 3 Apr. 1771 that there were '28 persons, black and white' (Fauvel, p. 81). Delaunay was still on 30 Jan. 1772 in St. Anne but left apparently soon (see ibid., p. 103).

[5] See ibid., p. 79.

[6] See ibid., pp. 95, 111–12.

[7] See ibid., p. 95.

[8] See ibid., pp. 80, 106–7, 112.

[9] See ibid., pp. 106–7.

[10] See ibid., pp. 113, 131.

[11] Bradley, *History of Seychelles* (1940), Part I, p. 24, it is true, says: 'On the 17th January 1774 there were in the colony 775 slaves (males and females) . . . and 200 slave children born to the slaves. . . .' But this is a mistake. Brayer sent on 17 Jan. 1774 to de Boyne a quite fantastic six-year plan (*l'État de Progression des plantations aux Seychelles calculé pour 6 ans*) which contained those figures as a target. See Fauvel, pp. 83, 117–19. (On 24 July 1771 he had offered to send every year from Mozambique 15,000 or 18,000 negro slaves to the Isle of France! See ibid., p. 84.)

wrote to the minister de Sartine that he had always considered it essential to permit a few inhabitants of Bourbon to settle in the Seychelles, and he recommended sending there an officer with 15 soldiers from the Regiment of the Isle of France to keep order and to distribute land to would-be settlers.[1] On 3 December 1778 a lieutenant, a surgeon, 15 soldiers, and 2 ships' carpenters were embarked.[2] According to an unsigned report of 20 May 1785, called *Renseignements sur l'archipel des Seychelles*,[3] there were then in the Seychelles 28 persons in the pay of the French King, viz. the commandant, 1 surgeon, a detachment of 12 men from the Regiment of Pondicherry (1 sergeant, 1 corporal, 10 fusiliers), 7 male and 7 female negro slaves. There were, in addition, 7 male inhabitants with 123 slaves, viz. in 'the principal island of Mahé' 4 white inhabitants with 109 slaves, and 1 free negro with his son and 1 slave, and in the Isle Praslin 1 white inhabitant with 13 slaves.[4]

A report from the Administrators of the Isles of France and Bourbon to the Minister of the Navy, dated 10 November 1786, states that in view of dissensions between the inhabitants and the Commandant of the Seychelles, and in view of the fact that the English had taken possession of Diego García, they had sent out the *ingénieur-géographe* Malavois to make an inquiry.[5] The instructions to Malavois,[6] dated 5 November, said, among other things, that he should make a count of the inhabitants and the slaves. An Ordinance for the administration of the Seychelles[7] of the same date stipulated that no concession should be granted in any of the other islands as long as land was available in the principal island, that no bachelor was eligible for a concession of land, that, as a rule, concessions should be granted only to married Creoles from the Isles of France[8] and from the Seychelles, and that a piquet in charge of a corporal from the detachment of the Isle Séchelles be posted in the Isle Praslin. Malavois, between 1 March and 2 April 1787, wrote eight comprehensive Memoranda.[9] In his Memorandum of 1 March 1787[10] he related that there were in the Isle Séchelles 12 or 13 habitations exploited by 8 white inhabitants and 4 free negroes and negresses and cultivated by 158 slaves fit for work,[11] and that in the Isle Praslin, which the only settler had left,[12] there was a corporal with 3 soldiers.[13] From his second Memorandum, dated 8 March,[14] it appears that the permanent Royal establishment consisted of 20 soldiers, 1 pilot-fisher, and 12 slaves, but that he temporarily employed, at the

[1] See Fauvel, pp. 142–3.

[2] See ibid., pp. 145–6. See also the Instructions to Lieutenant de Romainville, 1 Oct. 1778, ibid., pp. 146–8.

[3] Ibid., pp. 152–6.

[4] See ibid., pp. 151–3. The first settlement in the Isle Praslin was made in Dec. 1774; see ibid., p. 211. According to a Memorandum submitted in 1786 by De Saulx de Rosnevet to the Minister of the Navy, the population of the Isle Séchelles consisted then of 24 people in the pay of the King, viz. the Commandant, 11 military (1 sergeant, 1 corporal, 9 fusiliers), and 12 male and female negro slaves, and of 4 white inhabitants and 1 free negro who among them had 122 black slaves, while there was in the Isle Praslin 1 inhabitant with 12 or 13 slaves. See ibid., pp. 53–4; see also ibid., p. 162.

[5] See ibid., p. 156.

[6] Ibid., pp. 157–9.

[7] Ibid., pp. 159–61.

[8] This means probably persons born either in the Isle of France or in Bourbon.

[9] Reproduced in Fauvel, pp. 225–318.

[10] Ibid., pp. 225–47.

[11] See ibid., p. 233.

[12] He had gone to the Isle Séchelles; see ibid., p. 261.

[13] See ibid., pp. 240–1.

[14] Ibid., pp. 248–68.

expense of the King, 20 more slaves whom he had rented from the inhabitants.[1] He now lists for the Isle Séchelles 3 free negroes and 3 free negresses who were all unmarried, but of the white inhabitants 4 were married, 2 apparently with no child, and 2 with 4 children each. He reports that in the Isle St. Anne there were 2 black guards.[2] In 1788 the Administrators reported that the population of the Isle Séchelles (apart from the Royal establishment) consisted of 20 white persons, 9 free negroes and negresses, and 221 negro slaves. 'In order to avoid the loss of an officer and 30 good soldiers of the King' who might be made prisoners at the first attack by the enemy, they had withdrawn the white garrison and replaced it by black creole volunteers engaged for three years. Malavois was appointed Commandant of the Seychelles and went there with his wife and children and with the detachment of free negroes.[3] But when the British Captain Newcome appeared on 16 May 1794 with a squadron and summoned the Commandant to surrender, there was no garrison, and only about 20 of the 40 inhabitants were fit to bear arms. The Commandant, de Quinssy, capitulated the following day. The British squadron sailed on 1 June without actually taking possession of any of the islands.[4] 'The Seychelles remained under the protection of France, but pledged themselves to preserve neutrality between the belligerent powers.'[5]

It was under the rule of this treaty and under the wise and competent administration of Mr. de Quincy[6] that the archipelago prospered in a prodigious manner: its population, which before 1794 consisted of only 5 or 6 families and about 200 slaves, rose in less than 5 years to more than 80 families and nearly 2,000 blacks.[7]

One addition to the population caused some inconvenience. Davidson relates:[8]

The next trouble [after the capitulation of 1794] arose in consequence of the alleged attempt by means of an infernal machine on the life of the first Consul in the Rue St. Niçaise in Paris. The street was closed by the police and 130 persons were arrested and sentenced to be deported beyond French territory in Europe. Of these, 70 were sent to Seychelles, including the citizen Jean Rossignol notable for his part in the storming of the Bastille and as a revolutionary general in the quelling of the revolt in La Vendée. The prisoners were landed in July 1801 but so great was the fear of these men (who preached subversive doctrine, such as the liberty of the blacks,) among the residents that Rossignol, Léfèvre (a Colonel of gendarmerie), and 33 others were adroitly surprised by citizen Savy and citizen Mondon and removed without resistance on board the corvette 'Le Belier' and consigned to the tender mercies of the Sultan of Anjouan. This occurred in May

[1] See ibid., pp. 256–7, 265–6.
[2] See ibid., pp. 257–61.
[3] See ibid., pp. 162–6.
[4] See ibid., pp. 169–79.
[5] De Froberville, p. 106. See also Davidson, Introduction to Fauvel, p. xvi: 'After he [de Quinssy] was forced to capitulate, to superior forces—which he did on seven occasions—he flew French colours when a French ship appeared or hoisted the flag assigned to him in terms of his capitulation, viz. a blue flag bearing the words in white letters "Seychelles—Capitulation".'
[6] He 'had the honour of being the last French Commandant and first English Commandant of Seychelles' (Bradley, Part I, p. 53).
[7] De Froberville, p. 106. I doubt whether the increase was really as large. The number of slaves probably exceeded 200 before 1794. According to D'Unienville, vol. iii, p. 202, the Isle Séchelles comprised in 1790 'only half a dozen white families, few free [coloured] persons, and at the utmost 400 or 500 slaves'. It seems unlikely, moreover, that the number of white families and of blacks was as high in 1798 or 1799 as stated by de Froberville.
[8] Introduction to Fauvel, pp. xvii–xviii.

1802.[1] It is recorded in 1805, that 29 of these unfortunates died at Anjouan and that the remaining 6 had escaped. Those who remained at Mahé fared better. In 1805, 6 had died and 6 had escaped but 24 had settled down.[2]

When Decaen had become Captain-General of the Isles of France and Bourbon he asked Malavois a number of questions concerning the Seychelles. Malavois, who then was in the Isle of France,[3] answered in a Memorandum dated 15 October 1803.[4] He reported that only three islands —Séchelles, Praslin, and La Digue—were inhabited, that in the Isle Séchelles there were some 50 settlers owning 1,300 or 1,400 slaves, the white population amounting to not more than 200 and the free black population exceeding 100, and that in Praslin and La Digue there were scarcely some 20 whites and 150 slaves. He put the total population of the archipelago at about 1,820, viz. 220 whites, 100 free blacks, and 1,500 slaves.[5] Malavois's population figures were apparently fairly correct. A census taken a few months later showed a total population of 2,121, consisting of 215 whites, 86 (free) coloured, and 1,820 blacks (slaves).[6] By 1810 the number of whites had risen to 317 and the number of free coloured to 135.[7] The number of slaves exceeded 2,500.

Slaves	*A*[1]	*B*[2]	*C*[3]	*D*[4]
Males . . .	1,820	1,810	1,765	..
Females . .	713	950	977	..
Total . . .	2,533	2,760	2,742	3,015

[1] 'Taken from the French Commandant's report to General Decaen, dated the 1st of January 1810', Return by Government Agent at Seychelles, E. H. Madge, 29 Aug. 1826, *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), p. 30.

[2] 'Taken from the Returns themselves of January 1810, deposited in the archives of the Seychelles Islands', ibid.

[3] 'According to the general census of 1809, the last furnished under the French Administration', Return by D'Unienville 31 July 1826, ibid., p. 41. The figures probably refer likewise to the beginning of 1810.

[4] Return by D'Unienville, 12 Feb. 1828, Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 36. This figure is given for 1810; in D'Unienville's book (vol. iii, p. 202) it is said to refer to the Isle Mahé alone (which seems unlikely).

[1] See also Fauvel, pp. 179–80, 184–6, 189, 322–4, 359–60; Pitot, *L'Île de France (1715–1810)*, pp. 248–50; Bradley, Part I, pp. 73–82, 86, 88–95, 106–10.

[2] For further details concerning the fate of each of the 70 persons landed in the Isle Séchelles on 14 July and 4 Sept. 1801, see Fauvel, pp. 195, 198, 335–7, 339–40, 354–6; Bradley, Part I, pp. 96–106. Some of those who had stayed in the Isle Séchelles went later to the Isle of France or returned to France; see also de Froberville, p. 108; Prentout, pp. 326–7.

[3] See Prentout, p. 196. Malavois had been replaced as Commandant of the Seychelles by Esnouf in 1792, but remained there until 1802; see Davidson, p. xv.

[4] Fauvel, pp. 319–22.'

[5] See ibid., p. 319. He said, furthermore, that the Royal Establishment in 1789 comprised a military commandant, a store-keeper, a surgeon, and a dozen slaves, and that this was still the position in 1803 (see ibid., pp. 320–1). He does not mention the detachment of troops stationed in the Seychelles which according to an Order of Bonaparte dated 9 Mar. 1803 was to include a commandant and an artillery lieutenant (see ibid., pp. 223–4), but which according to an Order of Decaen dated 17 Oct. 1803 was to be withdrawn as incapable of resisting an attack (see ibid., p. 327).

[6] See 'Recapitulation of the census table of the Isles Seychelles, Year XII of the French Republic', signed by Quinsay, 22 Mar. 1804 (Fauvel, p. 341).

[7] Decaen had discouraged the enfranchisement of slaves in the Seychelles as in the Isle of France; see his letter of 4 Sept. 1804 to de Quinsay (Fauvel, p. 331).

TABLE 1. *Population of the Seychelles March 1804*[1]

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
Whites . . .	63	45	63	44	215
Free Coloured . .	17	20	28	21	86
Slaves	959	445	254	162	1,820
Total . . .	1,039	510	345	227	2,121

[1] See Fauvel, p. 341

2. *1811–34*

The surrender of Mauritius to the British, of course, affected the Seychelles too.

News of the capitulation of the Isle de France (December 3rd 1810), which signified the end of organised resistance in the Indian Ocean, was carried to Seychelles twenty days later by a British merchantman. In consequence of the surrender of Mauritius, Captain Beaver, commanding H.M.S. 'Nisus', was detached to visit Seychelles[1] and arranged for an organised form of government while awaiting the settlement which could only be finally concluded at a general peace. He left a wounded officer, Lieutenant Sullivan, on shore but without any force or credentials; consequently, Mr. Sullivan was treated as a protected guest and de Quincy (he has now adopted this spelling) continued to govern at discretion until 1815.[2]

On 28 July 1812 Governor Farquhar wrote to the Earl of Liverpool:

The Islands at present contain about four thousand Inhabitants, the sixth part of which are whites, and the population is rapidly increasing.[3]

Farquhar probably meant to say that one-sixth of the inhabitants were whites or free coloured. Even so the number of free persons, which in 1810 was 452, would have increased considerably, while the number of slaves, which for 1810 was given as 2,500 or 3,000, apparently did not rise very much. But it increased enormously in the following years. According to a Return prepared by the Government Agent at the Seychelles, E. H. Madge, the number of slaves had risen from 2,533 (or 2,760) in January 1810 to 6,950 in 1815.[4] His 'Observations explanatory of this Return', dated 29 August 1826, read as follows:

There are no documents deposited in the archives of the Seychelles Islands to show that any census of the slave population there was taken between January 1810 and the year 1815. The increase, nevertheless, during this interval will, at a first view, appear remarkable. But it should be considered that the inhabitants had not only the whole of the year 1810 to carry on this traffic legally, but it may be presumed that as soon as the information reached them of the capture of the colony in December 1810, and their consequent submission to the English laws for the abolition of the slave trade, they did not fail to take advantage of the moment to increase their stock while there existed no officer appointed by Government to check them. Lieutenant Sullivan of the Royal Marines was placed in charge of these

[1] He arrived on 21 Apr. 1811.

[2] Davidson, Introduction to Fauvel, pp. xix–xx. See also Fauvel, pp. 202–6.

[3] C.O. 167, vol. x; see also *Statement of the Slave Population in the Seychelles Islands* (1826).

[4] See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828); p. 71: 'In the Seychelles Islands, it appeared from the tax-rolls that 2,533 slaves had been returned in the year 1810, and in the year 1815 the number returned to the Slave Registry Office was 6,950. . . .'

islands on the 2d of June 1811. He was succeeded by Lieutenant Lesage of the 22d Regiment whom I found there on the 7th of November 1814, when I arrived to take the command as Government Agent, under an appointment by His Majesty's Minister for the Colonies.

In May 1815 I received from the Government of Mauritius the registration ordinance of the 24th September 1814, and having carried it into execution in the course of the same year, there appeared by the recensements a general total of the slave population as stated in the Return for that period.[1]

This explanation for the enormous increase in the number of slaves is not convincing. There is no reason to assume that importations were particularly numerous in 1810, and even if, which is unlikely, the inhabitants expected that the British would at once abolish the slave-trade to the Seychelles, they would not have been in a position to import thousands of slaves between December 1810 and June 1811. There is, moreover, the testimony of Governor Farquhar which indicates that until July 1812 the increase in the number of slaves was small. What probably happened was that when the inhabitants learned in 1812 that Governor Farquhar was beginning to interfere with the slave-trade to Mauritius, 'they did not fail to take advantage of the moment to increase their stock' and succeeded in doing so because the British Government Agent, as long as the war lasted, was not in a position to antagonize the settlers.[2]

Importations of slaves into the Seychelles continued, but the slave population did not increase because numerous slaves were transferred to Mauritius.[3] The number registered between 16 October 1826 and 16 January 1827 was 6,520. Of these, 2,231 were Creoles, 3,924 Mozambiques, 282 Malagasy, 38 Indians, and 2 Malays. But owing to the severe deterioration of economic conditions, many slaves were brought to Mauritius in 1827,[4] and the census of 2 January 1830 (which, it is true, was not quite complete) showed only 4,698 slaves. This was apparently also about the number at the time of the abolition of slavery.

The free population, which in 1810 amounted to 452, increased to 685 in 1818. According to the census of 16 October 1826 it was 1,140.

[1] *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), p. 548.

[2] See also *Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius* (1828), p. 71: 'The facilities which the situation of the islands afforded for the introduction and concealment of negroes, rendered the attempt to trace them in most instances ineffectual, and the Government agent for several years had no establishment which could enable him to effect a seizure when any resistance was offered. In the year 1822 some police officers were for the first time sent up, but their exertions were ineffectual, as even in the principal island of Mahé negroes were successfully introduced and concealed in the woods and caverns, and upon the habitations.' See also footnote 4 to p. 791 above.

[3] See Telfair, Acting Civil Commissioner of Seychelles, 25 Jan. 1859 (*State of Colonial Possessions 1868*, Part I, p. 126): '. . . an enquiry into the former and present state of the Dependency brings to light the fact that in the years 1824, 1825, and 1826, when the low price of cotton rendered its cultivation no longer remunerative, and a great impetus was given to the extension of the production of sugar by the admission into the home market of this staple commodity of Mauritius on an equal footing with the produce of the most favoured possessions of the Crown, the Seychelles Islands were in a measure depopulated by the transfer to Mauritius plantations of the able-bodied and working portion of the then slave population. . . .' See also footnote 5 to p. 79 above, and pp. 913–14 below.

[4] See footnote 5 to p. 791 above.

D'Unienville, in his Account signed 18 August 1826, describes 'these islands, thirty in number'.[1] I shall give a short extract.[2]

Island of Mahé. . . . 72,768 acres [*arpents*] of land being granted in it. . . . The total population of this island is 5,834[3] individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	208	142	113	110
Free Persons . .	112	102	59	55
Slaves . . .	2,722	1,364	540	533

Its civil establishment consists of an agent of government, whose authority extends to all the islands of this archipelago.

An under-agent, also collector of the revenues, and a clerk of the registry of slaves.

A justice of peace, two assessors, and a clerk.

A commissary of police.

A sworn surveyor.

Fifteen gensd'armes compose all the military force, under the orders of the agent of government.

Isle Ste Anne. . . . It is inhabited by 246 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	3	2	1	3
Free Persons . .	1	—	—	—
Slaves . . .	133	65	21	17

Isle aux Cerfs. . . . inhabited only by 33 persons; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	1	1	1	3
Slaves . . .	7	5	7	8

Isle Longue. This islet, with the following, called *Isles Ronde* and *Moyenne*, . . . form but one sole property, very inconsiderable; cultivated and inhabited by 22 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	3	2	1	2
Slaves . . .	8	5	—	1

L'Isle la Digue. . . . 1,454 [acres of land] are granted, and inhabited by 344 individuals[4]; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	20	13	23	18
Free Persons . .	4	10	7	9
Slaves . . .	114	56	41	29

A delegate of the civil agent, resident at Mahé, maintains in this place order and the police, under the honorary title of *commandant de quartier.*

[1] See *Return of the Number of Dependencies of Mauritius* (1827), French text, pp. 5–8; English translation, pp. 14–17. See also footnote 8 to p. 902 above.

[2] D'Unienville lists only 9 or 11 islands as inhabited. According to Table 8 below, there were some more where slaves were working. But D'Unienville may have allocated them to the islands where their proprietors resided.

[3] Should evidently read 6,060.

[4] 'The French made a settlement early in this island consisting of liberated blacks to whom slaves were given. . . . In 1777, there were twelve families who had "habitations" and who had settled down in the island with their slaves' (Bradley, Part II, p. 433). But Malavois did not mention this island as inhabited.

Isle Praslin. . . . The census gives 2,514 acres of land as granted. . . . The population is 408 individuals;[1] viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	16	10	13	14
Free Persons . .	12	13	16	4
Slaves . . .	151	87	41	31

Les Sœurs. . . . three islands . . . on which is a population of 15 individuals only;[2] viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	3	2	—	1
Slaves . . .	3	—	4	2

L'Isle Félicité. . . . having only 34 acres for cultivation, and a population of 52 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	3	1	2	5
Free Persons . .	1	—	—	1
Slaves . . .	13	14	5	7

L'Isle Curieuse. . . . without population . . . was accorded, in privilege, . . . to an inhabitant of the Mauritius, Monsieur Sériès.[3]

L'Isle Silhouette. . . . 1,515 acres of its land are divided between six proprietors. Its population consists of 136 individuals; viz.:—

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*
Whites . . .	7	8	2	6
Free Persons . .	1	—	—	—
Slaves . . .	74	26	6	6

The figures concerning the population may be summarized as follows:

Islands	*Whites*		*Free Coloured*		*Slaves*		*Total*		
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Mahé . . .	321	252	171	157	3,262	1,897	3,754	2,306	6,060
St. Anne . . .	4	5	1	—	154	82	159	87	246
aux Cerfs . . .	2	4	—	—	14	13	16	17	33
Longue, &c. . .	4	4	—	—	8	6	12	10	22
la Digue . . .	43	31	11	19	155	85	209	135	344
Praslin . . .	29	24	28	17	192	118	249	159	408
Les Sœurs . . .	3	3	—	—	7	2	10	5	15
Félicité . . .	5	6	1	1	18	21	24	28	52
Silhouette . . .	9	14	1	—	80	32	90	46	136
Total . . .	420	343	213	194	3,890	2,256	4,523	2,793	7,316

[1] 'In 1808 there were five or six families, and in 1819, 250 persons' (de Froberville, p. 98).

[2] An 'inhabitant of Mahé, who for ten years had used these islets with permission, was granted the concession on 30 November 1821' (D'Unienville, vol. iii, p. 206).

[3] See also Bradley, Part II, p. 431: 'This island was given as a concession to Sr. Sériès according to an act in date 29th October 1817, but later in 1827 the Government of Mauritius took back the island from Sr. Sériès to be converted into a leper camp for lepers transhipped from Mauritius. . . . All the lepers in Mauritius were rounded up and sent to Seychelles, and their upkeep was borne by the Government of Mauritius. The lepers arrived in 1833, and on the 1st August 1834, Dr. Patrick Robertson arrived from Mauritius to take charge of the leper settlement. . . . The leper settlement on this island was later on closed down and the island leased to a local landowner. Once more the Government in 1938, took back this island and again turned it into a leper camp. . . .' But see also p. 891 above.

TABLE 2. *Population of Seychelles 1810–26*

	1810[1]	*1818*[1]	*1822*[2]	*1824*[1]	*1825*[3]	*1825*[1]	*1826*[1]	*1826*[4]
White . .	317	471	282	739	582	759	790	733
Free Coloured	135	214		301	323	391	378	407
Slaves . .	3,015	6,638	6,740	5,755	6,058	5,920	6,069	6,525
Total . .	3,467	7,323	7,022	6,795	6,963	7,070	7,237	7,665

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Inquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 36. These figures were provided by D'Unienville. But according to his book, vol. iii, p. 202, the figures for 1810 refer to the Isle Mahé only.

[2] 'According to the Triennial Census of 1822', *Mauritius Blue Book 1823*, p. 250. The 'White and Free black population' is evidently understated.

[3] 'Returns of January 1825', *Statement of the Slave Population in the Seychelles Islands* (1826).

[4] Census 16 Oct. 1826; see *Mauritius Blue Book 1826*, folio 139.

TABLE 3. *Slave Population by Sex, Seychelles 1815–34*[1]

Year	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*Year*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*	*Year*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
1815[2]	4,960	1,990	6,950	1824*c*[7]	4,288	2,221	6,509	1826*b*[8]	3,975	2,177	6,152
1818[3]	..	..	6,638	1825*a*[8]	3,941	2,192	6,133	1826*c*[7]	4,054	2,184	6,238
1822[4]	4,574	2,166	6,740	1825*b*[8]	3,904	2,207	6,111	1830[10]	2,893	1,805	4,698
1824*a*[5]	3,598	2,157	5,755	1825*c*[7]	3,969	2,197	6,166	1834[11]	2,867	1,806	4,673
1824*b*[6]	4,143	2,209	6,352	1826*a*[9]	4,138	2,387	6,525				

[1] See for 1815, 1818, and 1825*a*, Commissioners of Eastern Inquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 28; (and *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France*, 1828, p. 30); for 1822, 1824*a*, 1826*a*, 1830, and 1834, *Mauritius Blue Book 1823*, p. 250, *1824*, p. 143, *1826*, folio 139, *1830*, pp. 501–2, *1834*, pp. 265–6; for 1824*b*, 1825*b*, and 1826*b*, *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), p. 8; for 1824*c*, 1825*c*, and 1826*c*, see ibid., pp. 32–40.

[2] 'Agreeably to the Recensements delivered in obedience to the Slave Registration Ordinance of the 24th September of 1814.' According to *Abstract of each Slave Population Return for the Seychelles* (1826), p. 9, there were 4,970 male and 2,008 female slaves in 1815. Of the 6,978 slaves, 1,147 were 'Creoles' and 5,831 'Foreign Slaves'.

[3] 'Agreeably to the General Census of this year, in which the sexes were not distinguished or imperfectly.'

[4] 'According to the Triennial Census of 1822.'

[5] 'According to declarations furnished by the Inhabitants in 1824.'

[6] 'Returns of the Inhabitants furnished to the Collector of Taxes at the Seychelles.'

[7] Returns prepared by the Acting Government Agent at Seychelles, 3 Feb. 1827.

[8] 'Taken from the Returns delivered to the Collector of Revenues at Seychelles.'

[9] Census 16 Oct. 1826.

[10] 'Number actually recensed at the Census of 2d January 1830.' Figures apparently incomplete; see also *Mauritius Blue Book 1832*, p. 440.

[11] Derived from 'Mutations'.

TABLE 4. *Slave Population between 7 and 60 Years of Age, Seychelles 1818–26*[1]

1818	*1819*	*1820*	*1821*	*1822*	*1823*	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*
6,305[2]	6,240	6,122	6,086	5,989	5,390	5,254	4,903	5,095

[1] See 'Returns of the Slave Population of the Seychelles . . . as stated in the Collector's Tax Roll (Blacks above Sixty years of Age and under Seven, not included)', *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), pp. 9–23, 26–8. A tax on slaves between 7 and 60 years of age had been imposed in the Seychelles as from 1 Jan. 1818 onwards by a Proclamation of 4 Nov. 1817 (French text *Code Farquhar*, pp. 181–4, No. 247).

[2] According to 'a List of the number of Slaves between seven and sixty years of age' headed *État général des Contribuables aux Isles Seychelles, et le Nombre de Noirs qu'ils possèdent pendant l'année 1818*', the number was 6,176; see ibid., p. 8.

TABLE 5. *Slave Population, Seychelles 1818 and 1825*[1]

Islands	*1818*[2]	*July 1825*[3]				
		7 years and over		*Under 7 years*		
		Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
Mahé	5,548	2,722	1,364	415	432	4,945[4]
La Digue	365	114	56	41	29	240
Praslins	554	151	87	41	31	310
Silhouette	68	74	26	6	6	112
St. Anne	40	133	65	21	17	236
Félicité	40	13	14	5	7	39
Les Sœurs	23	3	—	4	2	9
L'Isle Longue	..	8	5	—	1	14
Aux Cerfs	..	7	5	7	8	27
Total	6,638	3,225	1,622	540	533	5,920

[1] See Return by D'Unienville, 31 July 1826, *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), pp. 41–2.

[2] 'According to a general census of 1818, the only one available in the archives since the conquest until 1825.'

[3] Census of 1825.

[4] Should evidently read 4,933.

TABLE 6. *Population by Sex, Seychelles 1824 and 1826*[1]

Date	*Whites*		*Free Coloured*		*Slaves*		*Total*		
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1824	450	365	118	100	3,598	2,157	4,166	2,622	6,788
16 Oct. 1826	390	343	213	194	4,138	2,387	4,741	2,924	7,665

[1] See *Mauritius Blue Book 1824*, p. 143; *1826*, folio 139.

TABLE 7. *Slave Population according to Residence of Proprietors, Seychelles 1824–6*[1]

Residence	*1824*		*1825*		*1826*	
	Males	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*	*Males*	*Females*
Town of Mahé	804	415	747	385	685	356
Northern Distr. of Mahé	1,988	893	1,812	928	2,044	999
Southern Distr. of Mahé	1,110	719	1,013	661	975	642
Island of Praslin	207	114	190	119	175	111
Island of La Digue	154	69	136	67	102	45
Silhouette	25	11	71	37	73	31
Total	4,288	2,221	3,969	2,197	4,054	2,184

[1] See *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), pp. 32–40.

TABLE 8. *Slave Population according to Residence of Slaves, Seychelles 1824–6*[1]

Islands	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*	*Islands*	*1824*	*1825*	*1826*
Mahé	5,557[2]	4,990[3]	5,145[4]	Sœurs	8	9	9
Praslin	312	303	277	Curieuse	14	12	12
La Digue	220	196	143	Conception	7	7	7
Silhouette[5]	36	108	104	Cousin	2	2	2
Aux Frégates	70	55	55	Cousine	7	4	7
Ronde	30	45	45	Aride	3	7	4
St. Anne	74	70	70	Nord	40	40	40
Anonyme	6	4	4	St. Joseph Daros[6]	—	53	53
Longue	13	13	13	Poivre[6]	—	69	69
Aux Cerfs	27	27	27	Des Roches[6]	—	64	64
Sud Est	1	1	1	Alphonse[6]	—	31	31
Denis	48	—	—	Marie-Louise[6]	—	22	22
Félicité	34	34	34	Total	6,509	6,166	6,238

[1] Computed from *Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France* (1828), pp. 32–40.
[2] 1,185 in Town, 2,590 in Northern District, 1,782 in Southern District.
[3] 1,098 in Town, 2,409 in Northern District, 1,483 in Southern District.
[4] 1,007 in Town, 2,712 in Northern District, 1,426 in Southern District.
[5] The major part of the slaves employed in Silhouette are entered under Mahé.
[6] Amirantes.

TABLE 9. *Slaves Registered at Seychelles between 16 October 1826 and 16 January 1827*[1]

Age years[2]	*Creoles*		*Mozambiques*		*Malagasy*		*Indians*		*Total*		
	M.	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*M.*	*F.*	*Total*
Under 6	434	429	—	—	—	—	—	—	434	429	863
6–11	239	224	2	—	—	—	—	—	241	224	465
12–16	182	170	14	6	1	7	—	—	197	183	380
17–60	265	285	2,816	994	77	188	20	15[3]	3,178	1,482	4,660
61 and over	2	1	58	34	6	3	1	4	67	42	109
Total	1,122	1,109	2,890	1,034	84	198	21	19	4,117	2,360	6,520[4]

[1] See Commissioners of Eastern Enquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 30. 'The returns of the Amirante Iales (Dependencies of Seychelles and included in this return) were completed on the 16 March 1827.'
[2] See footnote 2 to table 16, p. 771 above.
[3] Including 2 Malays.
[4] Including 43 'Slaves whose casts, ages, &c. have not been specified on the Returns & the Required explanations, not yet Received'.

3. *1835–1946*

The population of the Seychelles, which according to the census of 16 October 1826 had amounted to 7,685 and had numbered nearly 6,000 during the last years before the abolition of slavery (1835), did not exceed 5,360 in 1840.[1] It rose to 5,986 in 1845 and to 6,811 in

[1] See Pridham (1846), p. 279: 'The population of the whole archipelago is stated by Mr. Harrison to have been eight thousand five hundred in 1830, since which it has considerably decreased, though births exceed deaths, in consequence of an emigration to the Mauritius, where labour,

TABLE 10. *Population by Sex, Seychelles 1842–5*[1]

Sex	*1842*	*1843*	*1844*	*1845*
Males . . .	3,243	3,400	3,460	3,496
Females . .	2,210	2,348	2,399	2,453
Total . . .	5,453	5,748	5,859	5,949[2]

[1] See *Mauritius Blue Book 1842*, pp. 322–3; *1843*, pp. 314–15; *1844*, pp. 206–7; *1845*, pp. 224–5.
[2] Excluding 37 European aliens.

1851.[1] But this increase—which was apparently due in a large measure to an excess of births over deaths—should not be accepted as a proof of satisfactory economic conditions. On 29 October 1850 the Civil Commissioner, Robert W. Keate, reported to the Colonial Secretary at Mauritius:

The actual state of depression and decay into which these islands have fallen has been so often described, and the burden that they are in consequence represented to be upon the Mauritius Government, has given rise to such repeated complaints, that a very brief reference to their present condition will be sufficient before attempting to demonstrate the causes which have conduced to it, and the capabilities which exist for improving it. With the exception of three estates, upon which rum and arrack and a small quantity of sugar are produced, two in Mahé and one in Frigate Island, and a few others on which cocoa trees have been planted, and already furnish a considerable quantity of oil, with a promise of future abundance, and certain small and unimportant plantations of cocoa, coffee, cloves, rice, and tobacco, scarcely any of the numerous habitations, as they are called, can be said to be under cultivation, or to furnish anything either for exportation or for home consumption.

It has been usual to refer to the period of the abolition of slavery as the one from which to date the decline in the prosperity which these islands once enjoyed; and to this day their inhabitants are determined to look upon that measure as the sole cause of their distresses. There can be no doubt that its operation, if it did not originate the present state of things, has at least a considerable influence upon the fortunes of the proprietors; but to look upon it as the only, or even as the prime cause of their altered condition, is simply to attempt to cast the whole blame upon others, much of which must be imputed to themselves, in matters over which, in many respects, neither they nor the authors of the Emancipation Act had any control.

Some time previous to that measure being finally put into execution a great diminution had already taken place in the quantity of the exports from this dependency, which at that time consisted chiefly of cotton, and in the profits derivable from them. Complaints had already been made of the impoverishment of the soil, owing to the heavy rains to which these islands are especially subject, having in course of time washed away the rich mould from the surface wherever the woods, which had been the principal cause of its fertility, had been cleared away; and the great fall in the price of cotton, which took place at the same time, owing to the introduction of that of America into the European markets, had already begun to render its cultivation unprofitable. Other sources of profit were even then in as bad a state: wood had already become scarce in the more accessible parts of the island;

from being more in demand, is better remunerated. The population of the archipelago did not, therefore, exceed five thousand three hundred and sixty in 1840.' But the population in 1830 was probably 6,000 at the utmost, and the bulk of emigration to Mauritius had occurred prior to 1828. (De Froberville, p. 109, says that the population in 1837 was 7,000. This too is certainly an overstatement.)

[1] The General Population comprised 1,129 males and 1,011 females, and the Ex-Apprentice Population 2,497 males and 2,174 females; see *Mauritius Blue Book 1851*, p. 307.

cloves and other spices produced but little; the amount of coffee grown hardly exceeded what was required for the consumption of the place; and sugar, for the production of which but few spots in the island are calculated, was, from the circumstances of the times, found not to be an advantageous branch of industry.

Owing to these causes the slaves, the absence of whose forced labour is now so much regretted, had already, before their final emancipation, become a burden upon, and not an assistance to the estates to which they were attached. The difficulties against which their owners had to contend had already had the effect of producing among them a state of indolence and apathy, instead of giving rise to increased energy and exertion to meet them. They no longer superintended the labour of their slaves or apprentices; and the system of giving them a piece of ground to cultivate on their own behalf, the evil effect of which is now so strongly felt, and so generally looked upon as one of the consequences of emancipation, had already commenced.

Such being the state of things the final emancipation certainly came upon them at a time when both masters and slaves were in the worst possible condition for undergoing such a change; the former from finding the production to which they had hitherto turned their attention no longer profitable, and either from the nature of the place, or from their own apathy, unable to substitute another for it, had already relaxed in their discipline, and ceased to demand from their slaves that regular and constant work to which they had previously been accustomed, and had thus given the first example of idleness; the latter who, if freedom had come upon them when in full work, and if adequate wages had at once been offered them, might possibly, from custom and from not having yet tasted the pleasures of idleness, have continued to work, had already contracted habits of indolence, which they soon began to look upon as identical with freedom, and had made the fatal discovery that in these islands life was sustainable almost without the necessity of exertion.

So long as the money received for indemnity lasted the proprietors lived on in idleness, making no exertions to discover new sources of industry or profit, or to rouse the emancipated population to fresh activity. When this eventually began to fail they found the labour to which they had perhaps unavoidably attached so little importance while in its apprentice state, had entirely ceased to be available; and it was then that they commenced throwing the blame of this state of things upon the Emancipation Act, and to demand that the immigration which had been conceded to Mauritius should be extended to them; confessing, however, at the same time that they had nothing left to pay wages with, and that if their demand was acceded to, a gift or a loan of money must accompany it.

The general effect then of all these concurring circumstances has been to reduce this dependency, at this late period of its existence as such, so far as its productiveness is concerned, very much to the state of a newly discovered country, or newly occupied colony, into which the three things absolutely necessary to be imported are energy, capital, and labour. The proprietors of the soil, though now, from the necessities of their case, beginning to be inspired to some extent with the first, are, generally speaking, very badly provided with the second, and the new population not having received with the benefits of emancipation those of religion, education, or civilization of any kind, except to a very small amount, occupies, as far as its usefulness for labour is concerned, much the same position as the Aborigines of New South Wales, or Van Diemen's Land, did at the period of their colonization. The work, so to say, of colonizing these islands has to be recommenced, their natural resources have to be developed, and if they are ever to attain to the rank for which those natural resources seem to fit them, assistance from external sources is just as necessary to them as if they had never been previously known but for their geographical position.[1]

Between 1851 and 1861 the population increased from 6,811 to 7,486. In the following decade immigration was evidently very large, since the

[1] *State of Colonial Possessions 1850*, pp. 282–3.

census of 1871 showed 11,082 inhabitants.[1] Many Liberated Africans had apparently been introduced in the 1860s.[2]

The continued importation of liberated African slaves, under proper restrictions, will materially add to the prosperity of this dependency, which has greatly increased in importance since the opening of the Suez Canal, being in the track of vessels from India and China, and offering as it does a most eligible situation for a sanitorium of H.M. ships in the Indian seas, and for a naval depot.[3]

The importation of Liberated Africans continued[4] and an estimate based on a census taken in 1876 in the Isles of Mahé, La Digue, and Praslin 'for the purpose of obtaining the religious creeds and domestic status of the population' showed 12,700 inhabitants, including 1,976 'natives of Africa liberated at Seychelles'.[5]

[1] The Civil Commissioner in his 'Annual Report, 1870' stated (*State of Colonial Possessions 1870*, Part II, p. 136):

'Without actually taking a census, I sent trustworthy persons at the close of the year 1869 to ascertain as near as possible the population of these islands: the result was 13,000.

'To this, there has been of course, some augmentation, but as a regular census is to be taken by Ordinance shortly, correct statements will be included in the statistics for the next Blue Book.'

When the census total was much smaller than had been expected the Civil Commissioner said in his next Annual Report (*Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part II, p. 80):

'To this may be added between 1,500 and 2,000 persons who escaped being registered from the unwillingness of the people to give the required information to the official enumerators.'

But I see no reason to assume that the population was much larger than ascertained at the census.

[2] The number of persons enumerated in all the Dependencies of Mauritius and reported as born on the mainland of Africa increased from 1,096 in 1861 to 2,204 in 1871. See Mauritius, *Census Report 1861*, Appendix No. 22; *1871*, Part II, pp. 17–18. On 11 Feb. 1870 the Civil Commissioner had reported to the Governor: '. . . I have ascertained the total population to be about 12,836, of which there are Africans, 2,396' (*State of Colonial Possessions 1869*, Part III, p. 76).

[3] Civil Commissioner, 'Annual Report 1870', ibid. *1870*, Part II, p. 137.

[4] From the census date 1871 (11 Apr.) to 31 Dec. 1872, 436 Liberated Africans were landed at Seychelles, in Sept. 1873, 43, and during the year 1874, 284 (see *Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part II, p. 82; *1875*, Part III, pp. 279–80; *Mauritius Almanac 1874*, p. 91; *1875*, p. 81; *1876*, p. 88). *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1905*, p. 34, speak of 'the Africans who were landed, to the number of 5,000 as liberated slaves at the period when the over-sea slave trade was rife'. The 'Liberated African Report' for 1877 stated (*Colonial Possessions Reports 1877*, p. 302):

'The deaths of liberated Africans in 1876 were 21. In 1877 they were 18, or a death rate of about 10 per 1,000 for these people for the wards of Mahé and Silhouette Islands; one of the lowest death rates ever recorded.

'In 1876 were 40 male and 36 female children, total 76, born in the wards of Mahé and Silhouette Islands from liberated African parents. In 1877 the numbers were 30 male and 51 female children, total 81. . . . In 1876 the births were 3½ to 1 death, in 1877 they were 4½ to 1 death.'

But though there may have been a marked longevity among the Liberated Africans (see *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1903*, p. 43), the above figures are misleading. 'The descendants of Africans born at Seychelles are merged in the Creole population' (*Colonial Possessions Reports 1876*, p. 170). The deaths of children of Liberated Africans, therefore, are not included in the above mortality figures. Similarly the high birth-rate among the African Population in 1889–91—the average yearly number of births was 64, and the population in 1891 was 1,754 (see *Colonial Reports, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1889 & 1890*, pp. 5, 15; ibid., *Mauritius, Seychelles 1891*, p. 6; Seychelles, *Census Report 1891*, p. 39)—is to be explained by the fact that the African Population did not include the Colony-born children of Liberated Africans. Even so the proportion of the present population who are the descendants of Liberated Africans must be considerable. But it has sometimes been over-estimated. See, for example, *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1937*, p. 5: 'Their descendants to-day form the large majority of the population of the Colony.'

[5] See *Colonial Possessions Reports 1876*, p. 170.

	Men	*Women*	*Boys*	*Girls*	*Total*
General Population .	3,088	2,996	2,297	2,343	10,724
Liberated Africans .	919	758	205	94	1,976
Total . . .	4,007	3,754	2,502	2,437	12,700

But a report 'by the Chief Civil Commissioner of the Seychelles Islands on the condition of liberated Africans during the year 1877' put the number of Liberated Africans for 1876 at 2,444, and for 1877 at 2,421.[1]

The census of 1881 showed 14,081 inhabitants, the population having nearly doubled in twenty years. In the following decades the increase was much smaller. The census of 1931 showed 27,444 inhabitants, the population having nearly doubled in the intervening fifty years. The increase was particularly small between 1911 and 1921. The Census Commissioner listed the following causes:[2]

(*a*) Emigration, chiefly to British East Africa.[3]
(*b*) Enlistment in the Seychelles Labour Corps which proceeded to British East Africa, a great number of labourers having died.[4]
(*c*) The Spanish Influenza Epidemic which proved fatal, particularly to a great number of children.

The area of the Colony is 156¼ square miles, and the number of inhabitants per square mile in 1931 was about 175. Mahé Island with an area estimated at 55½ square miles[5] had in 1931 a population of 21,712 (including the Town of Victoria with 5,420 people), or about 390 inhabitants per square mile, while all the other 91 islands combined, with a total area of about 100 square miles, had a population of only 5,732, or less than 60 inhabitants per square mile.

[1] See ibid. *1877*, p. 296. These figures, which were based on the registers, were somewhat too high, as not all the deaths and departures were properly recorded ('the whereabouts of 305 Africans was not known in 1877', ibid., p. 297).

[2] Seychelles, *Census Report 1921*, p. 2.

[3] *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1914*, p. 16, mentions 'some slight migrations to Madagascar, the French guano islands, and the east coast of Africa'.

[4] See also Seychelles, *Medical Report 1917*, pp. 1–2:

'This force was organised as a general labour force to work in connection with the campaign in what was then German East Africa.

'The force consisted of 791 men, of these the majority left for East Africa in December 1916 and the remainder in February 1917.

'In May 1917 it was notified that the greater part of the force was being repatriated on account of ill-health, 250 (37·25%) had already died. . . .

'The men arrived on May 17th, on board the hospital-ship "*Guildford Castle*". Information had been received by telegram that there were 50 cot cases, but this number was found to have been greatly underestimated as apart from 60 cases of men who were acutely ill there were another 50 who were suffering from beri-beri, the greater part of these were paralysed and completely helpless.

'The number who arrived was 359, their general health was deplorable in the extreme, apart from the acute cases mentioned above they were practically all infected with malaria, large numbers were suffering from foul septic ulcers of the feet and legs and with few exceptions they had some degree of bronchitis. . . .

'In all there were 327 deaths amongst the force, a mortality of 41%.'

Those who had died, before repatriation began, were apparently 32 (not 37) per cent. of the original number.

[5] See *Dominions and Colonial Office List 1940*, p. 472.

TABLE 11. *Population of Seychelles 1851–1901*[1]

Islands	*1851*	*1861*	*1871*	*1881*	*1891*	*1901*
MAHÉ AND OUTLYING ISLANDS						
Mahé	5,541	6,118	9,006	11,436	13,394[2]	15,230[3]
North	35	24	62	23	51	79
Eagle or Remire	..	..	..	..	..[4]	91
Silhouette	127	197	399	489	377	370
Thérèse	12	..	12	19	4	6
Conception	..	..	..	..	3	4
St. Anne	10	35	65	51	35	65
Moyenne	..[5]	..[6]	7	..	6	7
Round	..	..	..	..	..[7]	1
Long	2	7	6	5	2	7
Aux Cerfs	53	27	63	60	51	61
Anonymous	5	5	1	..	11	11
South East	..	..	..	..	6	2
Bird or Sea Cow	..[5]	..[6]	3	..	7	126
Flat	..[5]	11	6	7	8	65
Denis	..[5]	4	30	29	31	34
Alphonse	..	..	..	40	27	11
Providence	..	..	..	28	29	29
Aldebra, &c.[8]	..	..	..	..	25	102
Amirantes[9]	..	..	..	..	81	67
PRASLIN WARD						
Praslin	461	503	708	974	1,235	1,621
La Digue	442	472	576	742	866	1,074
Frégate	60	25	52	44	61	34
Aride	..[5]	2	5	5	7	7
Cousin	..	16	13	11	5	5
Cousine	..	..	..	11	4	3
Curieuse	42	17	34	23	35	11
Félicité	21	12	17	29	42	27
Marianne	..[5]	4	10	29	16	23
Les Sœurs	..[5]	7	7	26	21	36
Round	..	..	..	..	..[4]	28
TOTAL						
	6,811	7,486	11,082	14,081	16,440	19,237

[1] See Seychelles, *Census Report 1891*, pp. 38–9; *1901*, pp. 6, 28, 32.
[2] Including 43 'Merchant Shipping'.
[3] Including 64 population at sea.
[4] 'Not given, probably not inhabited then.'
[5] Not enumerated in 1851.
[6] Not enumerated in 1861.
[7] 'Not given.'
[8] Aldebra, Cosmoledo, Marie Louise, Astove, Desroches; for 1851–81 see p. 892 above.
[9] Poivre, St. Joseph, Darros; for 1851–81 see p. 892 above.

TABLE 12. *Population of Seychelles 1901–31*[1]

Section	*1901*	*1911*	*1921*	*1931*
CENTRAL DISTRICT				
Town of Victoria[2]	3,291[2]	4,128[3]	5,013[4]	5,420[5]
NORTH DISTRICT				
Section II.—Anse Etoile	841	1,032	1,107	1,076
,, III.—Glacis	1,522	1,837	1,721	2,034
,, IV.—Anse Major	1,601	2,183	1,891	2,254
,, V.—Port Glaud	514	609[6]	519[6]	568
,, VI.—Barbarrons	901	1,045	1,234	1,584
,, VII.—Cascade	2,357	2,964	3,337[7]	3,715
St. Anne Island	65	75	62	37
Moyenne Island	7	2	5	3
Round Island	1	—	11	10
Cerf Island	61	94	67	106
Long Island	7	15	2	7
SOUTH DISTRICT				
Section VIII.—Anse-aux Pins	580	515	408	385
,, IX.—Anse Royale	1,082	1,337	1,477	1,684
,, X.—Anse Forbans	1,126	696	1,407	1,578
,, XI.—Baie Lazare	908	770	882	964
,, XII.—Takamaka	507	429	430	450
Recifs Island	—	—	—	2
Frigate Island	34	45	61	62
Anonyme Island	11	..	..	17
South East Island	2	..	..	6
Conception Island	4	..	..	3
Thérèse Island	6	..	..	12
PRASLIN DISTRICT				
Praslin Island	1,621	1,985	1,999	2,476
La Digue Island	1,074	1,364	1,303	1,255
Curieuse Island	11	73	52	47
Félicité Island	27	66	90	65
Marianne Island	23	26	57	36
Aride Island	7	13	33	25
Cousin Island	5	14	22	9
Cousine Island	3		14	20
Two Sisters Island	36	47	55	16
Round Island	28	33	4	26

[1] See Seychelles *Census Report 1901*, pp. 6, 8, 28–33; *1911*, p. 5; *1921*, p. 7; *1931*, pp. 8–9.
[2] Including 64 population at sea; see ibid. *1901*, p. 28.
[3] Including 141 population at sea; see ibid. *1911*, p. 19.
[4] Including 50 population at sea; see ibid. *1921*, p. 20.
[5] Including population at sea.
[6] Including Thérèse and Conception Islands.
[7] Including Anonyme and South East Islands.

[*continued overleaf*

TABLE 12 (*continued*)

Section	1901	1911	1921	1931
THE OUTLYING ISLAND DISTRICT				
Marie Louise Island	20	17	11	16
Desneufs Island	—	26	—	34
African Banks Island	—	—	—	8
Alphonse Island	11	56	45	76
Astove Island	29	32	97	80
Aldabra Island	13	82	17	101
Assumption Island	—	138	43	161
Cosmoledo Island	22	33	25	51
Providence Island	29	31	45	65
Coëtivy Island	..	102	109	122
Farquhar Island	..	..	—	94
Darros Island	18	33	75	56
Des Roches Island	18	30	74	23
Poivre Island	32	52	62	61
St. Joseph Island	17	—	—	—
Remire Island	91	11	5	22
Dénis Island	34	30	68	79
North Island	79	62	54	28
Silhouette Island	370	412	415	357
Bird or Seacow Island	126	4	47	12
Flat Island	65	13	20	21
St. Pierre Island	—	130	48	25
TOTAL SEYCHELLES ISLANDS				
	19,237	22,691	24,523	27,444

TABLE 13. *Population by Sex, Seychelles 1851–1931*[1]

Sex	1851	1861	1871	1881	1891	1901	1911	1921	1931
MAHÉ ISLAND[2]									
Males	2,908	3,008	4,644	5,761	6,625	7,583	8,619	9,219	10,196
Females	2,633	3,110	4,362	5,675	6,769	7,647	8,926	10,207	11,516
Total	5,541	6,118	9,006	11,436	13,394	15,230	17,545	19,426	21,712
SEYCHELLES, CURRENT CENSUS AREA									
Males	3,626	3,767	5,793	7,179	8,302	9,805	11,557	11,974	13,289
Females	3,185	3,719	5,289	6,902	8,138	9,432	11,134	12,549	14,155
Total	6,811	7,486	11,082	14,081	16,440	19,237	22,691	24,523	27,444
SEYCHELLES, 1931 CENSUS AREA									
Males	3,738	3,846	5,951	7,335	8,362	9,955	11,613	12,003	13,289
Females	3,192	3,750	5,358	6,998	8,168	9,500	11,177	12,557	14,155
Total	6,930	7,596	11,309	14,333	16,530	19,455	22,790	24,560	27,444

[1] See Mauritius, *Census Report 1881*, Appendices, pp. 482–3; Seychelles, *Census Report 1891*, pp. 41–2; *1901*, pp. 28–33; *1921*, p. 7; *1931*, pp. 8–9; Table 75, p. 893 above.

[2] See for 1911 and 1921 footnotes 6 and 7 to Table 12.

The official intercensal estimates have been made by adding to the census population the recorded births and arrivals and deducting the recorded deaths and departures. This method, as a rule, has led to overstatements of the population.

When the census of 30 May 1901 had shown a population of 19,237, while the Chief Officer of the Civil Status had computed it for 31 December 1900 at 20,275 or 1,038 more,[1] this officer, who then was Census Commissioner, attributed the difference in part to the following facts:[2]

(1) The Civil Status Officer (his predecessor) had started from a census population of 16,440 in 1891, which included 43 persons on board vessels, of whom only 19 'were returned as born in Seychelles'.
(2) He had reckoned with a natural increase of 261 for 1891, although it amounted to only 180 for the period from the census date to the end of the year.
(3) He had not taken account of the (unknown) number of arrivals and departures in 1891 and 1892.

Having regard to these errors and omissions and to the fact that it may have happened that the Departures from this Colony from 1893 to 1900 were not regularly registered at the Port Office, for one reason or other, as for example when the Indian labourers who had been introduced into the Colony, left it, the difference between the estimated number of the population and the number given as the result of the Census, is, I consider, sufficiently explained.

The estimate for 31 December 1910 (22,620)[3] was almost identical with the result of the census taken on 2 April 1911 (22,691).

The estimate for 31 December 1920 (24,811) was only slightly higher than the result of the census taken on 24 April 1921 (24,523).

The difference between these two figures . . . would have accounted for the number who have disappeared either by drowning (their deaths not being registered) or as stowaways or otherwise.[4]

When the census of 1931 showed '1,103 less than the figures given by the Chief Civil Status Officer of the estimated population up to the date of the Census', the Census Commissioner attributed the difference in part to the non-registration of deaths of persons drowned and to defective emigration records.[5] He added:

On reference to the reports of the Census as far back as 1901 I have noticed that there has always been a difference between the figures shewn by the Census and those given by the Chief Officer of the Civil Status as estimated population of the Colony.[6]

I shall, therefore, give the estimated figures for 31 December 1931–46[7] with all due reserve. (See table overleaf.)

[1] On the basis of the census the population for 31 Dec. 1900 was only 19,011, the difference being 1,264. See *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1901*, p. 41.

[2] See Seychelles, *Census Report 1901*, pp. 23 5.

[3] See *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1910*, p. 19.

[4] *Census Report 1921*, p. 9. [5] See p. 902 above. [6] *Census Report 1931*, p. 7.

[7] See *Seychelles Blue Book 1931*, p. 95; *1932*, pp. 101–2; *1933*, pp. 101–2; *1934*, pp. 106–7; *1935*, pp. 104–5; *1936*, pp. 104–5; *1937*, pp. 104–5; *1938*, pp. 104–5; *1939*, pp. 104–5; *Report of Central Civil Status Office 1942*, p. 4; *1943*, p. 4; *1944*, p. 4; *1945*, p. 3; *Medical Report 1943*, p. 2; *1943*, p. 2; *1944*, p. 3; *1945*, p. 3. Appendix A; *Annual Report for 1946 of the Colony of Seychelles*. No account was apparently taken of arrivals and departures in 1945.

Years	Excess of births over deaths	Excess of arrivals over departures	Population at end of year	Years	Excess of births over deaths	Excess of arrivals over departures	Population at end of year
1931	..	..	27,786	1939	468	61	32,015
1932	511	−62	28,235	1940	474	−384	32,105
1933	475	21	28,731	1941	447	102	32,654
1934	545	130	29,406	1942	347	25	33,026
1935	399	−2	29,803	1943	449	146	33,621
1936	523	135	30,461	1944	355	−57	33,919
1937	387	92	30,940	1945	500	859	34,419
1938	434	112	31,486	1946	..	..	35,327

These figures indicate an increase of 27 per cent. in 15 years.

III. Composition of the Population

The census reports of Mauritius and Dependencies do not contain separate data concerning the composition of the population of Seychelles, except as regards sex. But such data are given in the census reports of Seychelles from 1891 onwards.

Race. The 1891 census report distinguished:

1. The General Population, composed of Natives of these Islands, Europeans, Asiatics, Natives of Mauritius, Réunion, Cape Verd, Americans and Natives of New Zealand, and
2. The African Population, Natives of Africa.[1]

The latter, numbering 1,754, included merely the persons of British nationality born in 'Mozambique, Zanzibar, &c.'.[2]

The 1901 census report distinguished between 'the General population, being composed of persons of all nationalities, and . . . the African population, being composed of persons born in Africa and being either African Liberated Slaves or African Political Prisoners'.

The Census Commissioner stated:[3]

It must be observed that in the 1,256 Africans are included the African Political Prisoners and their followers amounting to 56 persons,[4] so that the exact number of African Liberated Slaves is reduced to 1,200.

This number compared with that given in the Report of the Census of 1891, when the African population was reported to amount to 1,754 persons, shows that this section of the population has diminished, either by death or by departure from this Colony, by 554 during the last ten years.

As I have already stated in one of my annual reports [on Vital Statistics] it is not possible to distinguish the descendants of the African Liberated Slaves from the other sections of the population either by name or by any other distinctive sign as many Africans on accepting christianity changed their native names and assumed European or Christian names.

As a matter of fact, 'the African population' was not identical with those 'born in Africa', but with those 1,256 persons entered under Africans by nationality, as distinguished from British, Zanzibaris, &c.[5]

[1] *Census Report 1891*, p. 6. [2] See ibid., p. 48. [3] Ibid. *1901*, p. 11.

[4] '. . . ex-King Prempeh of Ashanti who arrived on the 11th September 1900 . . . accompanied by fifty-five followers . . .' (Bradley, Part II, p. 302).

[5] See *Census Report 1901*, pp. 36–46.

The 1911 census report abandoned the earlier classification, 'as it was not considered necessary to make a distinction between the General Population and the African Population, the number of which has since greatly diminished. . . .[1] Nor did it introduce any new distinction by race.

. . . the general population includes the white, coloured and black people living in Seychelles, as it was found impossible, and it would certainly have been invidious to classify the population according to colour.[2]

The 1921 report gave likewise no data concerning race. But the 1931 census report states:[3]

As regards races they have been classified under three categories viz.: Class I composed of (a) European, (b) European descent and Africans, Class II, Indians and Class III Chinese.

The whole population of the Colony can come under these headings; it was found impossible, and it would certainly have been invidious, to classify the population according to colour.

It should be noted, however, that this classification resulted merely in giving separate figures for the 503 Indians and the 235 Chinese, while the 26,706 'Europeans and persons of European descent and Africans' were all lumped together.

The European population consists of a few Government Officials, members of the Eastern Telegraph Company with their wives and families, the Priests, Marist Brothers, and Nuns of the Roman Catholic Church, a couple of English planters, and a few American and English sailors, that have deserted from ships.[4]

Birthplace. Prior to the abolition of the slave-trade the bulk of the population was born outside Mauritius and Dependencies. In 1815, out of 6,978 slaves, only 1,147, or one-sixth, were Creoles. By 1827 the proportion had risen to one-third (2,231 out of 6,520). The percentage of Colony-born continued to increase, but declined again when the Seychelles were chosen as a refuge for African slaves captured on the high seas by the Navy. During the last quarter of the nineteenth century the proportion rose again. At the decennial censuses of 1891–1931 the percentage of persons born in Seychelles was 83, 86, 90, 94, and 95 respectively.

Of the 26,706 'Europeans and persons of European descent and Africans'

[1] Ibid. *1911*, p. 6. [2] Ibid., p. 8. [3] Ibid. *1931*, p. 4.

[4] *Medical Report 1929*, p. 6. The Medical Reports for 1923–30 showed for the town of Victoria the numbers of male and female 'Europeans' and of male and female 'Natives' (see *Medical Report 1923*, p. 9; *1924*, p. 14; *1925*, p. 23; *1926*, p. 20; *1927*, p. 24; *1928*, p. 32; *1929*, p. 10; *1930*, p. 9). The totals for 1923 and 1924 were identical with the total number of inhabitants enumerated at the census of 1921. The number of Europeans given was: for 1923 and 1924, 391 (177 males and 214 females); for 1925 and 1926, 406 (186, 220); for 1927, 578 (211, 367); for 1928 and 1929, 599 (218, 381); and for 1930, 626 (225, 401). The meaning of these figures is not clear. Of the 'Europeans and persons of European descent and Africans' enumerated in 1931 in Victoria all but 69 were born in Africa (see *Census of Seychelles 1931*, p. 75). There were in addition 337 East Indians and Chinese (of whom 291 were born in Asia), who, in the Medical Reports must have been included either among the 'Europeans' or among the 'Natives'. It may be that the figures for 'Europeans' in the Medical Reports were meant to cover all 'Whites' including Creoles born in Seychelles. But how would it be possible to explain the enormous increase in their numbers and the ever-increasing preponderance of females? *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1901*, p. 39, said: 'At the outside the white population [of Seychelles] cannot exceed one fourth of the total population, and many persons put the proportion far lower.' The proportion must actually have been far lower.

enumerated in 1931, 26,015 were born in Seychelles, 195 in Mauritius and Rodrigues, 336 elsewhere in Africa,[1] 69 in the United Kingdom (including Guernsey), 78 elsewhere in Europe, and 13 elsewhere. Of the 503 Indians 343 were born in Asia, 128 in Seychelles, 31 in Mauritius, and 1 in France. Of the 235 Chinese 192 were born in Asia and 43 in Seychelles.

TABLE 14. *Population by Birthplace, Seychelles 1891–1931*[1]

Year	*Seychelles*	*Mauritius and Dep.*	*Elsewhere Africa*	*Asia*	*United Kingdom*	*France*	*Elsewhere Europe*	*America*	*Oceania*	*Total*
1891	13,639	391	1,901	293	87	76	33	19	1	16,440
1901	16,550	523	1,430	559	52	69	36	17	1	19,237
1911	20,532	410	1,075	520	49	51	29	15	1	22,691
1921	22,989	292	693	388	67	46	35	12	—	24,523[2]
1931	26,186	226	336	543	68	35	45	4	1	27,444

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, pp. 2, 47–9; *1901*, pp. 42–5; *1911*, pp. 15–18; *1921*, pp. 13–14; *1931*, pp. 13, 43 -60.
[2] Sum of items is 24,522.

TABLE 15. *Population, excluding Indians and Chinese, by Birthplace, Seychelles 1931*[1]

Birthplace	*Persons*	*Birthplace*	*Persons*	*Birthplace*	*Persons*
Seychelles	26,015	England	42	Aden	1
British Guinea	2	Scotland	8	Burma	1
Mauritius	193	Ireland	18	Ceylon	2
Rodrigues	2	Guernsey	1	Bombay	4
St. Helena	1	Denmark	2	Asia Total	8
Zanzibar	8	France	36		
Abyssinia	5	Germany	1	West Indies	3
Algeria	1	Italy	3	Brazil	1
Egypt	1	Norway	2	America Total	4
Madagascar	14	Poland	1		
Réunion	33	Portugal	6	Oceania	1
'Africa'	271	Spain	2		
Africa Total	26,546	Switzerland	24		
		Turkey	1		
		Europe Total	147		

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 13.

Nationality. The proportion of persons returned as non-British has been negligible according to all the census reports from 1891 onwards. Of the 26,706 'Europeans and persons of European descent and Africans' enumerated in 1931, 26,585 were British born, 6 British naturalized, and 115 foreigners (80 French, 23 Swiss, 3 Italian, 3 Portuguese, 2 Norwegian, 2 Spanish, 1 Danish, and 1 German).[2] Of the 503 Indians 483 were British born, 2 British naturalized, 14 French, and 4 Portuguese.[3] Of the 235 Chinese 42 were British born, 2 British naturalized, and 191 Chinese.[4]

Sex. From the beginning of settlement until the First World War the number of males always exceeded the number of females. But, owing to numerous casualties among the Seychelles Labour Corps and apparently

[1] Of these 336 persons, 271 were returned as born in 'Africa'. Since altogether only 121 were returned as not of British nationality by birth (most of whom were French creoles) nearly all the 271 persons returned as born in 'Africa' must have been born in British Territory.
[2] See *Census Report 1931*, p. 15. [3] See ibid., p. 45. [4] See ibid., p. 62.

also to emigration to British East Africa,[1] there were in 1921, 104·8 females to 100 males. By 1931 there were 106·5 (110·4 amongst Europeans and Africans, but only 26 for Indians, and 19 for Chinese).

Age. The census reports for 1891 and 1901 show the males and females aged under 1, 1–4, 5–9, 10–14, &c. The reports for 1911 and 1921 merely subdivide the total population into those aged 0–4, 5–9, 10–14, &c. The report for 1931 gives, separately for male and female Europeans and Africans, Indians, and Chinese, those aged 0–9, 10–19, 20–39, 40–59, and 60 and over. The percentage of children under 15 among the total population in 1891–1921 was 35·1, 37·0, 34·7, and 34·8 respectively.[2] The percentages of children under 10 in 1891–1931 were 24·1, 25·3, 23·8, 23·2, and 25·3. The percentages of persons over 60 were 5·1, 5·1, 7·2, 7·8, and 6·9.

Conjugal condition. The census reports for 1891 and 1901 show the males and females among the general and among the African population according to conjugal condition (Unmarried, Married, Widowed). The reports for 1911 and 1921 give merely the total population by conjugal condition (Unmarried, Married, Widowed). The report for 1931 shows, separately for male and female Europeans and Africans, Indians, and Chinese, the Single, Married, Widowed, and Divorced. The proportion of husbands and wives among the adult African population is small.[3] The great majority of Indian and Chinese husbands had apparently left their wives in their home country.

[1] See p. 917 above.

[2] The food-rationing register for 1946 showed 13,055 such children among a total population of 35,589, or 36·7 per cent.; see *Annual Report for 1946 of the Colony of Seychelles.*

[3] As a consequence of the small proportion of civilly married adult people the proportion of illegitimate births is high. But the scanty data available suggest that it has changed considerably in the course of time. The proportion of children born out of wedlock and acknowledged by their natural father in accordance with the French code has apparently also varied notably.

	Illegitimate births					*Illegitimate births*			
			Acknowledged					*Acknowledged*	
Years	*Number*	*Per cent. of births*	*Number*	*Per cent.*	*Years*	*Number*	*Per cent. of births*	*Number*	*Per cent.*
1872	302	65	30	10	1928	343	43	85	25
1879	215	45	..	..	1929	392	46	99	25
1881	219	44	..	..	1930	340	43	79	23
1889	131	26	16	12	1931	337	41	84	25
1890	165	26	46	28	1932	346	40	86	25
1891	184	30	43	23	1933	314	38	79	25
1912	258	36	104	40	1935	306	37	73	24
1913	273	35	74	27	1936	337	38	74	22
1914	255	36	47	18	1937	303	37	..	..
1915	243	36	73	30	1938	322	39	..	..
1916	270	36	..	..	1942	338	41	66	20
1923	376	49	102	27	1943	330	39	57	17
1924	308	51	89	24	1944	333	39	55	17
1925	361	49	89	25	1945	342	39	48	14
1926	323	45	73	23					

See *Mauritius Almanac 1874*, p. 92; *Colonial Possessions Reports 1879*, p. 262, *1880–2*, p. 226; *Colonial Reports, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1889 & 1890*, pp. 5, 15; ibid. *Mauritius, Seychelles 1891*, p. 6; ibid. *Seychelles 1912*, p. 18, *1913*, p. 16, *1914*, p. 16, *1915*, p. 12, *1916*, p. 10; *Report of Central Civil Status Office 1923*, p. 2, *1924*, p. 2, *1925*, p. 4, *1926*, p. 4, *1933*, p. 4, *1935* Annexure IIA, *1936*, Annexure IIA, *1942*, Annexure II, to *1945*, Annexure II; *Medical Report 1928*, p. 5, *1929*, p. 5, *1930*, p. 5, *1931*, p. 7, *1932*, p. 4, *1938*, p. 3.

TABLE 16. *Population by Age, Seychelles 1891–1921*[1]

Age Years	1891 M.	1891 F.	1891 Total	1901 M.	1901 F.	1901 Total	1911 Total	1921 Total
Under 1	260	237	497	253	274	527	2,762	2,767
1–4	805	833	1,638	961	919	1,880		
5–9	894	930	1,824	1,223	1,229	2,452	2,627	2,906
10–14	938	862	1,800	1,195	1,044	2,239	2,475	2,837
15–19	764	918	1,682	776	891	1,667	2,440	2,497
20–4	838	814	1,652	895	840	1,735	1,992	2,092
25–9	733	678	1,411	899	881	1,780	1,945	2,094
30–4	614	552	1,166	732	662	1,394	1,521	1,697
35–9	582	588	1,170	631	582	1,213	1,469	1,379
40–4	563	452	1,015	519	452	971	1,234	1,271
45–9	393	378	771	480	475	955	1,001	1,210
50–4	308	272	580	450	385	835	887	1,045
55–9	195	171	366	315	256	571	696	780
60–4	171	173	344	194	182	376	665	568
65–9	89	104	193	106	123	229	389	486
70 and more	135	161	296	163	221	384	573	844
Not stated	20	15	35	13	16	29	15	50
Total	8,302	8,138	16,440	9,805	9,432	19,237	22,691	24,523

[1] See *Census Report 1901*, p. 13; *1921*, p. 4.

TABLE 17. *Population by Conjugal Condition, Seychelles 1891–1921*[1]

	1891 M.	1891 F.	1891 Total	1901 M.	1901 F.	1901 Total	1911 Total	1921 Total
Single	5,518	5,164	10,682	6,422	5,817	12,239	15,352	16,915
Married	2,628	2,616	5,244	3,148	3,060	6,208	6,303	6,195
Widowed	154	357	511	235	555	790	1,036	1,413
Not stated	2	1	3	—	—	—	—	—

[1] See *Census Report 1891*, p. 43; *1901*, pp. 68–9; *1911*, p. 11; *1921*, p. 10.

TABLE 18. *Population by Race, Sex, and Age, and by Race, Sex, and Conjugal Condition, Seychelles 1931*[1]

Age Years	Europeans and Africans M.	Europeans and Africans F.	Indians M.	Indians F.	Chinese M.	Chinese F.	Total M.	Total F.	Total Total
0–9	3,463	3,333	49	44	26	15	3,558	3,392	6,950
10–19	2,654	2,914	69	24	45	7	2,768	2,945	5,713
20–39	3,658	4,382	173	24	87	16	3,918	4,422	8,340
40–59	2,048	2,382	87	9	34	—	2,169	2,391	4,560
60 and more	851	1,001	20	4	5	—	876	1,005	1,881
Total	12,694	14,012	398	105	197	38	13,289	14,155	27,444
Single	8,879	9,186	233	67	123	18	9,235	9,271	18,506
Married	3,457	3,732	158	30	73	20	3,688	3,782	7,470
Widowed	355	1,086	7	8	1	—	363	1,094	1,457
Divorced	3	8	—	—	—	—	3	8	11

[1] See *Census Report 1931*, pp. 19, 49, 66.

IV. Birth and Death Registration

When in 1890 Mauritius enacted 'An Ordinance to consolidate and amend the Law relating to the Civil Status', Seychelles had already a special Administrator and an Executive and Legislative Council, and the Ordinance for Mauritius was not applied to Seychelles:

3. (1) This Ordinance shall apply to Mauritius and the Dependencies thereof other than the Seychelles Islands. Any enactment now applicable to Seychelles which may be repealed by this Ordinance shall continue in force in Seychelles as if this Ordinance had not been passed.

Thus the French Civil Code regulated birth and death registration for a few years more in Seychelles.[1] But in 1893 Seychelles followed the example of Mauritius and repealed the old law. The 'Civil Status Ordinance 1893'[2] has been amended eleven times.[3] The main provisions for ensuring birth and death registration, as they stand to-day, are as follows:

Registration Offices

3. (1)—There shall be in *Port* Victoria a public office where births, marriages and deaths and other matters concerning the Civil Status of persons shall be registered in accordance with the provisions of this Ordinance, which office shall be called the 'Central Civil Status Office'.

(2) There shall be a branch Civil Status Office at Praslin, which shall be called the Civil Status Office of the Praslin ward. Such Office shall be the Office for all Civil Status matters concerning the following Islands:—Praslin, Aride, Ile aux Fous or Booby Island, Ile Curieuse, Ile Ronde, Ile Cousin or North Cousin, Ile Cousine or South Cousin, Two Sisters Island, Félicité, Marianne, La Digue.

(3) The Governor in Executive Council may from time to time order that additional Civil Status offices be established in any District or Island at such places, for such time and under such conditions as may seem fit, and may appoint officers for such additional offices who shall receive such salaries as may be voted by the Legislative Council and approved of by the Secretary of State. The Governor in Executive

[1] An early document concerning the introduction of civil birth and death registration (letter from General Decaen to the commandant of the Isles Seychelles, 25 Oct. 1805) is reproduced in Fauvel, pp. 336–7.

[2] No. 4 of 1893, Ordinance 'To consolidate and amend the law relating to the Civil Status', *Government Gazette*, 22 Apr. 1893, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. ii, 1872–98, pp. 867–909. It came into force on 22 Apr. 1893.

[3] See Ordinances No. 11 of 1893, *Government Gazette*, 30 Sept. 1893, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. ii, 1872–98, p. 910; No. 7 of 1904, 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1904', *Government Gazette*, 23 July 1904, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. iii, p. 1583; No. 4 of 1911 (2 Aug.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1911', *Government Gazette*, 5 Aug. 1911, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. iv, 1907–11, pp. 189–91; No. 14 of 1916 (13 Sept.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1916', *Government Gazette*, 16 Sept. 1916, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1916*, p. 35; No. 4 of 1917 (2 Mar.), 'The Police Court (Amendment) Ordinance, 1917', *Government Gazette*, 7 Mar. 1917, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1917*, pp. 5–7; No. 14 of 1917 (3 Sept.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1917', *Government Gazette*, 8 Sept. 1917, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1917*, p. 24; No. 9 of 1919 (5 July), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1919', *Government Gazette*, 5 July 1919, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1919*, p. 28; No. 11 of 1925 (19 June), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1925', *Government Gazette*, 27 June 1925, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1925*, pp. 21–2; No. 1 of 1934 (2 Mar.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance 1934', *Government Gazette*, 3 Mar. 1934, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1934*, pp. 1–2; No. 21 of 1938 (22 Dec.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1938', Seychelles, *Ordinances 1938*, pp. 113–14; Government Notification No. 179 of 1945 (30 July), 'Defence (Amendment of Laws) (No. 2), Regulations, 1945', *Government Gazette*, 30 July 1945, p. 163.

Council may abolish any such additional office. Any order for the creation or abolition of an additional Civil Status office shall be gazetted.

4.—The Civil Status Office, existing at *Port* Victoria at the commencement of this Ordinance shall be deemed the Central Civil Status Office for the Seychelles Islands, and any branch, additional or other civil Status Office, existing shall be deemed a branch, additional or other Civil Status Office referred to in this Ordinance.

Registration of Births and Deaths

In case of a birth the father or mother, any medical practitioner, midwife, or other person having been present at the birth, or the owner or occupier of the premises on which the birth occurred shall within 30 days make a declaration concerning the birth before the civil status officer of the District. The father or mother who shall fail within 3 months to declare the birth shall be liable to a fine not exceeding Rs.100.

The owner or occupier of any premises in which any death occurs shall within 24 hours give notice thereof to the civil status officer of his ward and shall send two persons who have been present at the death, or in attendance during the last illness of the deceased, to declare such death. No penalty is provided for a neglect of this duty.

Burials

Whoever shall bury or otherwise dispose of any human body without having obtained a permit from a civil status officer shall be punished by a fine not exceeding Rs.500 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months.

Most of the provisions are identical with those in Mauritius,[1] and the headings of the registration forms are also the same in both colonies.

Registration of births and deaths is free of charge. But fees have to be paid for the search of an act of birth or death (50 c.),[2] for every extract from or copy of an act of the Civil Status (1 R.), and for registering any rectification of an Act of the Civil Status (1 R.).

As in Mauritius, the Civil Status Ordinance does not contain rules concerning medical certificates of causes of death, but unlike in Mauritius there has apparently been no other Ordinance containing such provisions.

In 1898[3] an Ordinance was passed 'To make special provision concerning tardy registration of births and deaths occurring in Outlying Islands'. This Ordinance provided:

Whereas the Civil Status Ordinance 4 of 1893 provides that tardy declarations of births and deaths shall only be made upon an order of the Judge of Seychelles;

Whereas the said Ordinance further provides that no interment shall take place except upon a permit from an officer of the Civil Status;

And whereas, in view of the distance of some of the Islands of the Seychelles group from the Court of Seychelles, and of the fact that there is no officer of Civil Status resident on most of the Islands, it is expedient to make special provision concerning the registration of births and deaths in outlying Islands.

[1] It should be noted, however, that the time-limit for declaring a birth which was extended to 45 days in Mauritius is still 30 days in Seychelles.

[2] It is stated in *Abstract of Arrangements respecting Registration* (1915), p. 44, that no fee is payable for a search, but this is a mistake.

[3] No. 16 of 1898 (29 Oct.), 'Outlying Districts Civil Status Ordinance, 1898', *Government Gazette*, 5 Nov. 1898, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. ii, 1872–98, pp. 983–5.

Be it therefore enacted, &c. . . .

1.—The order for tardy registration of births mentioned in section 33 paragraphs 2 & 3 of Ordinance 4 of 1893, may be given either by the Judge of Seychelles, or within the limits of his jurisdiction by the Justice of the Peace for the outlying Islands.

2.—(*a*) Whenever any death shall occur on La Digue Island or on any of the adjacent Islands, during the absence of the Officer of Civil Status from La Digue Island, it shall be lawful for the officer for the time being in charge of the Police Station at La Digue, to issue a permit for interment without previous registration of the declaration of death by an officer of the Civil Status.

(*b*) The Police Officer shall report in writing to the Civil Status Officer, on each visit of the latter to La Digue, all permits issued by him since the last visit.

(*c*) The formal declaration of the death required by sections 86 and 88 of Ordinance 4 of 1893 shall be made to the Civil Status Officer at latest on his first visit to La Digue Island after the date of the death.

3.—(*a*) On all Islands of the Seychelles group, other than those adjacent to Mahé, Praslin, and La Digue, permits for interment before registration of death may be delivered by the manager or occupier of the estate or property on which the death shall have occurred.

(*b*) The said manager or occupier shall report all such cases to the nearest Civil Status Officer by first opportunity.

(*c*) The formal declaration of death required by sections 86 and 88 of Ordinance 4 of 1893 shall be made to a Civil Status Officer within 48 hours of the arrival at Mahé of the first boat which shall have left the Island after the death.

4.—It shall be the duty of all persons empowered by this Ordinance to issue permits of interment to satisfy themselves as far as possible as to the cause of death before granting such permit

5.—No permit shall be issued under this Ordinance by a manager or occupier for the burial of any person who shall have died from any of the causes mentioned in section 87 of Ordinance 4 of 1893 without reference to the nearest Police Authority, unless such reference is absolutely impossible on account of distance or impossibility of communication.

Provided that whenever such reference is impossible, the manager or occupier shall inquire carefully into the circumstances of the death and note appearances of the body before permitting interment, and shall draw up a memorandum of the same and forward such memorandum by the earliest opportunity to the nearest Police Authority.

6.—(1) (*a*) It shall be lawful for the Governor upon the recommendation of the Inspector of Police and of the Chief Officer of Civil Status for the Seychelles Islands to appoint any non-commissioned Officer in charge of a Police Station on any outlying Islands to be an Officer of the Civil Status for such Island and adjacent Islands for the purpose of registering deaths.

(*b*) Such appointment shall be personal to the officer appointed and shall terminate with his transfer to another station.

(*c*) Any officer so appointed shall before exercising the functions of Officer of Civil Status take the oath of office, as such, before the Judge of Seychelles in Chambers, and shall in matters connected with such functions be amenable to the instructions of the Officer of Civil Status having jurisdiction under the Civil Status Ordinance, 1893, over the Island to which he shall be appointed.

(2) The Officer of Civil Status having jurisdiction under the Civil Status Ordinance, 1893, shall on each visit to the Island to which such non-commissioned Officer shall be appointed, examine all entries made by such officer and shall initial the same, and he shall report any irregularities discovered to the Chief Officer of Civil Status at Mahé.

7.—The Governor shall further have power, subject to the conditions mentioned in the preceding section, to appoint any non-commissioned Officer in charge of a

Police Station at Mahé, to act as Officer of Civil Status for the purpose mentioned in such section.

'Provided that every such officer shall, between the 1st and 6th day of each month, produce his Registers of Deaths to the Chief Officer of the Civil Status to inspection and such Chief Officer shall initial each act registered therein.

In 1900 records of births and deaths had been burnt, and an Ordinance was passed 'To provide for the Re-Registration of Births, Deaths, Still-Births, and Marriages that have taken place in the Praslin Ward and of Births that have taken place at La Digue from the 1st of January 1900 to the 13th February 1900'.[1] Its main provisions concerning birth and death registration were:

Whereas the Registers of the Civil Status at Praslin and the Registers of Births at La Digue for the year 1900 were destroyed by fire on the 13th February 1900:

Whereas there exist no official records of the Births, Deaths, Still-Births, and Marriages that have taken place in the Praslin Ward and of the Births that have been declared at La Digue during the period extending from the 1st January 1900 to the 13th February 1900 inclusive:

And whereas it is expedient to provide for the Re-Registration of such Births, Deaths, Still-Births, and Marriages as have taken place during the aforesaid period:

1. It shall be the duty of the officer of the Civil Status of the Praslin Ward to register, in two special duplicate Registers which shall be sent to him for that purpose by the Chief Officer of the Civil Status, the Births, Deaths, Still-Births, and Marriages that have taken place in the Praslin Ward, and the Births that have taken place at the Island of La Digue during the period included between the 1st January 1900 and the 13th February 1900.

2. (1) For the purpose of such Registration it shall be lawful for the Civil Status Officer of the Praslin Ward to cause such inquiries to be made by the Police as he may deem necessary into any declaration of birth or death or still birth alleged to have taken place during the aforesaid period which he may be asked to register by any interested party or person mentioned in section 4.

(2) In case where the Civil Status Officer of the Praslin Ward shall be dissatisfied with, or shall have a doubt as to the sufficiency of, the information before him, or obtained at his request, it shall be his duty to refer the interested party or parties to the Court of Seychelles. Provided that nothing herein contained shall prevent any interested party from applying directly to the Court of Seychelles for the registration of any birth, death, or still birth alleged to have taken place within the aforesaid period.

(3) All proceedings before the Court of Seychelles shall be free of stamp, Registration, and Court dues, and shall be by way of ordinary plaint with summons against the Civil Status Officer of the Praslin Ward. Provided that in no case the Civil Status Officer of the Praslin Ward shall be liable to any costs.

4. It shall be the duty (i) of any person whose duty it was under Ordinance No. 4 of 1893 to declare any birth, death or still birth which may have taken place at the Praslin Ward, and of any birth which may have taken place at La Digue, within the period mentioned in section 1 of this Ordinance (ii) of any person who made at the time any such declaration of birth, death, or still birth, (iii) of any witnesses to any such declaration of birth, death, or still birth, (iv) of the parties to any marriage celebrated within the Praslin Ward and within the period mentioned in section 1 of this Ordinance, and (v) of any witnesses to such marriage to report themselves to the Officer of the Civil Status Office of the Praslin Ward within a delay of two months from the promulgation of this Ordinance, and to give him all such informa-

[1] No. 28 of 1900 (27 Oct.) 'Praslin and La Digue Civil Status Registers Ordinance, 1900'. *Government Gazette* 27 Oct. 1900, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. III, 1899–1906, pp. 1133–5.

tion in their possession as may lead to the due registration of any such birth, death, still-birth, or marriage.

(2) Any person neglecting to comply with the provisions of subsection 1 of this section, without sufficient excuse or justification for such non-compliance, shall be liable, on conviction before the Court of Seychelles, to a fine not exceeding Rs.500.

In 1907 'The Presumption of Deaths Ordinance, 1907'[1] was passed, which enabled the Civil Status Officer to register the deaths of persons who have disappeared. The Ordinance provided:

1. The Crown Prosecutor, the relatives of a person who has disappeared, or anyone interested in the property of the person who has disappeared, may, whenever he or any of them have reason to believe that such person is dead, but such death cannot be proved or registered because the dead body has not been found or else because it is not possible to give formal proof of such death, lodge a petition at the Registry of the Supreme Court of Seychelles requesting the Chief Justice to order an enquiry in order to ascertain whether such person is dead.

5. If the Chief Justice declares a person dead and is satisfied as to the time and date of such death, he shall state in his judgment when the person died—otherwise he shall simply declare such person's death.

6. A judgment declaring a death shall be sufficient authority to the officer of Civil Status to register the death. If the judgment states any time or date of death, the record shall also state the exact date and time that such death has been declared to have taken place. The Registrar of the Supreme Court shall, on application of the applicant, furnish a copy of the judgment to the Civil Status officer for registration purposes.

In 1917 an Ordinance[2] was passed which made the following special provisions for the registration of deaths of members of the Seychelles Labour Contingent who died while outside the Colony:

2. The Chief Officer of Civil Status, on being satisfied that any member of the Seychelles Labour Contingent, which was engaged to service in East Africa, died whilst on such service out of this Colony, shall register the death of such person in conformity with the provisions of the Civil Status Ordinance, 1893, in a special register kept for that purpose.

3. Application for the registration of the death of any person, whose death may be registered under this Ordinance, may be made by the Crown Prosecutor, the Assistant Superintendent of Public Works, the relatives of the person whose death is sought to be registered or by any one interested in the property of any such person, whenever he, or any of them, has reason to believe that such person is dead.

4. Any person authorised under this Ordinance to make the said application may, if he feels himself aggrieved by the refusal of the Chief Officer of Civil Status to be satisfied that a member of the said contingent died whilst on the said service in East Africa or to register the death of any such member under the provisions of this Ordinance, petition the Chief Justice for an order that such death be registered under the provisions of this Ordinance. If the applicant is not the Crown Prosecutor, then the Crown Prosecutor shall be served with a copy of the petition and made a party to such application and be furnished with a copy of the evidence proposed to be put before the Chief Justice on the application.

5. The Chief Justice may after hearing the application in open Court and after making any enquiry that he may deem desirable either refuse the petition or direct the Chief Officer of Civil Status to register the death of any person in respect of whose death such petition is made.

[1] No. 10 of 1907 (2 July), *Government Gazette*, 6 July 1937, reprinted in *Laws of Seychelles Revised*, vol. iv, 1907–11, pp. 13–21.

[2] No. 14 of 1917 (3 Sept.), 'The Civil Status (Amendment) Ordinance, 1914', *Government Gazette*, 8 Sept. 1917, reprinted in Seychelles, *Ordinances 1917*, p. 24.

It is difficult to say when birth and death registration became adequate. In his Annual Report for 1871, the Civil Commissioner said:

> The registry of births shows 496, but, of course, many more may be calculated in a population scattered over these islands, of which no account has been given.[1]

Since, however, the census of 1871 showed only 11,082 inhabitants, it is hard to believe that 'many more' births actually occurred.

As stated above, 'there are a certain number drowned each year whose deaths are not registered'. Otherwise registration has been described in recent reports as most satisfactory (though no penalty is provided for neglecting to notify deaths).

> Registration of deaths and still-births is compulsory, and the Civil Status law with regard to registration is based on the old French laws and all declarations are carefully scrutinized and examined, and therefore [for] statistical purposes are reliable.[2]
>
> Registration of births and deaths is compulsory all over the colony, and a very careful and reliable index of births and deaths is kept by the Civil Status Department. The laws are those of the old French Napoleonic Code, modified when necessary by local ordinances.[3]
>
> It is impossible to bury a body without a medical certificate, except in the Outlying Islands.[4]
>
> Registration of births, still-births and deaths is compulsory and these returns can be taken as correct.[5]

V. Birth and Death Statistics

Vital statistics prior to the 1870s are extremely scanty. Some birth and death figures are available for the slave population in 1816–29,[6] but they are untrustworthy and they are quite incomplete concerning deaths, at least until 1828.

	Births			*Deaths*		
Years	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*	*Males*	*Females*	*Total*
1816–18	223	193	416	17	5	22
1819–21	355	234	589	11	14	25
1822–4	192	191	383	59	37	96
1827	61	63	124	48	23	71
1828	55	52	107	70	42	112
1829	44	50	94	82	50	132

For the whole period from 1830 to 1871 I found only the following figures (relating to the total population of Seychelles):[7]

	1842	*1843*	*1844*	*1845*	*1862*	*1863*	*1865*	*1866*	*1869*	*1870*	*1871*
Births . .	43	335	208	194	..	275	294	342	377	422	496
Deaths . .	23	..	97	104	268	158	180	171	286	182	209

[1] *Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part II, p. 80.

[2] *Medical Report 1925*, p. 13. See also ibid. *1926*, p. 8; *1927*, p. 10. [3] Ibid. *1928*, p. 5.

[4] Ibid. *1929*, p. 5. See also *Report of Central Civil Status Office 1935*, p. 6: 'No burial can take place prior to the registration of the death. The longest delay a body is allowed to be kept being 36 hours after death.'

[5] *Medical Report 1934*, p. 7. Literally the same, ibid. *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 5; *1937*, p. 6; *1938*, p. 5.

[6] See Commissioners of Eastern Inquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns*, No. 29; *Mauritius Blue Book 1828*, pp. 408–9; *1829*, pp. 517–18. See also p. 843 above.

[7] See *Mauritius Blue Book 1842*, pp. 322–3; *1843*, pp. 314–15; *1844*, pp. 206–7; *1845*, pp. 224–5;

For 1872 the Registrar-General of Mauritius submitted 'the first Annual Report on the Vital Statistics of the Seychelles Archipelago, and of the Island of Rodrigues'.[1] Extracts from subsequent reports of the Registrar-General were published in the Reports on the annual Blue Books and in the Mauritius Almanac. I shall summarize here the results for 1872–83:[2]

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Births*[1]	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1872	462[2]	238[3]	38·4	19·8	1878	428	329	32·8	25·2
1873	..	223	..	18·1	1879	478[4]	266	36·1	20·0
1874	432	254	33·4	19·6	1880	410[5]	207	29·3	15·3
1875	464	318	35·5	24·2	1881	502[6]	255[7]	35·4	18·0
1876	487	296	38·3	23·3	1882	..	..	32·4	21·6
1877	487	242	37·6	18·6	1883	..	..	31·0	26·3

[1] Still-births in 1878–82 numbered 30, 33, 20, 38, and 30 respectively.
[2] 237 male, 225 female; in addition 20 still-births.
[3] 118 male, 120 female.
[4] 250 male, 228 female.
[5] 194 male, 216 female.
[6] 242 male, 260 female.
[7] 139 male, 116 female.

For 1884–8 no data seem to be available for the whole Colony. Figures for 1889–91 and 1894–1901[3] are as follows:[4]

Year	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*	*Year*	*Births*	*Deaths*	*Birth-rate*	*Death-rate*
1889	508[1]	368	31·7	23·0	1897	618[4]	342	33·8	18·7
1890	623[2]	257	44·2	18·3	1898	596[5]	342	32·0	19·4
1891	619[3]	302	37·5	18·4	1899	635	275	32·5	14·1
1894	636	..	36·1	14·8	1900	598[6]	335	30·5	18·3
1895	657	..	36·5	15·2	1901	620[7]	357	32·6	18·8
1896	615	..	33·6	16·0					

[1] 272 male, 236 female.
[2] 319 male, 304 female.
[3] 327 male, 292 female.
[4] 302 male, 316 female.
[5] 286 male, 310 female.
[6] In addition 37 still-births.
[7] In addition 52 still-births.

From 1902 on, the data appear to be more ample. I have summarized them in Tables 19 and 20.

State of Colonial Possessions 1863, Part I, pp. 128–9; *1866*, Part III, p. 58; *1869*, Part III, p. 76; *1870*, Part II, p. 136; *Papers relating to Colonial Possessions 1873*, Part II, p. 80. Figures for 1842 are evidently incomplete.

[1] Reprinted in *Mauritius Almanac 1874*, pp. 91–6.

[2] See ibid. *1874*, pp. 92–3; *1877*, p. 85; *1878*, p. 80; *1879*, p. 83; *1880*, p. 84; *1881*, p. 76; *Colonial Possessions Reports 1875–7*, p. 163; *1876*, p. 170; *1877*, p. 284; *1878*, p. 270; *1879*, p. 262; *1879–81*, p. 216; *1880–2*, p. 226; *1881–3*, p. 282; *1883–5*, p. 5; Meldrum, *Weather, Health, and Forests* (1881), p. 121. The figures vary somewhat in the various documents. I have taken the numbers of deaths and the death-rates for 1872–80 from Meldrum, and have computed the birth-rates for those years by relating the birth figures given (only) in the other sources to the population figures given by Meldrum.

[3] I found no data for 1892–3.

[4] See *Colonial Reports, Mauritius, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1889 & 1890*, pp. 5, 15–16; ibid. *Mauritius and Seychelles, 1891*, pp. 6–7; ibid. *Seychelles 1894*, p. 4; *1895*, p. 4; *1896*, p. 4; *1897*, p. 4; *1898*, p. 4; *1899*, p. 42; *1900*, pp. 39–40; *1901*, pp. 40–1; *1902*, p. 37; *Seychelles Blue Book 1901*, section P, p. 1. Some of the official rates are evidently wrong. (Thus, the births and deaths for 1900 were related to the population of 1881.)

TABLE 19. *Births and Deaths, Seychelles 1902–46*[1]

Year	Live-born			Still-born	Total deaths			Deaths under 1 year	Birth-rate	Death-rate	Infant mortality rate
	M.	F.	Total		M.	F.	Total				
1902	363	326	691[2]	53	171	148	319	75	35·7	16·5	109
1903	..	..	667	53	..	..	465	..	33·8	23·5	..
1904	366	332	698	49	169	153	322	61	34·9	16·1	87
1905	..	..	680	54	..	..	306	85	33·3	15·0	125
1906	..	..	719	38	..	..	359	..	34·6	17·3	..
1907	359	329	688	56	178	130	308	52	32·0	14·3	76
1908	..	..	708	47	..	..	357	78	32·2	16·2	112
1909	392	361	753	46	186	161	347	57	33·6	15·5	76
1910	368	341	709	54	207	161	368	96	31·3	16·3	135
1911	362	376	738	60	202	163	365	79	31·9	15·8	107
1912	352	374	726	59	165	182	347	69	30·9	14·8	95
1913	386	392	778	67	190	173	363	66	32·7	15·3	85
1914	345	364	709	65	173	199	372	61	29·7	15·4	86
1915	362	317	679	72	225	174	399	55	27·8	16·3	81
1916	373	362	735[2]	53	211	194	405	54	30·9	16·6	72
1917	353	366	719	55	309	197	506	81	29·3	20·6	113
1918	..	..	641	..	..	..	418	49	26·1	17·0	76
1919	315	303	618	38	214	200	414	41	25·2	16·8	67
1920	354	381	735	37	189	174	363	51	29·8	14·7	69
1921	360	349	709	53	201	191	392	73	28·6	15·8	103
1922	394	359	753	51	174	170	344	52	30·5	13·9	69
1923	389	382	771	36	147	150	297	36	30·6	11·8	47
1924	371	352	723	52	200	178	378	57	28·0	14·6	79
1925	359	374	733	50	196	196	392	70	28·0	15·0	95
1926	377	340	717	56	251	219	470	69	27·2	17·8	96
1927	383	376	759	44	244	182	426	58	28·3	15·9	76
1928	398	393	791	53	226	213	439	54	29·0	16·1	68
1929	429	415	844	54	231	264	495	121	30·6	17·9	143
1930	409	381	790	56	185	210	395	68	28·0	14·0	86
1931	437	392	829	56	195	181	376	68	29·8	13·5	82
1932	449	425	874	59	182	181	363	72	31·0	12·9	82
1933	425	396	821	51	188	158	346	67	28·6	12·1	82
1934	421	443	864	57	171	146	317	42	29·4	10·8	49
1935	420	399	819	46	233	187	420	89	27·5	14·1	108
1936	440	437	877	41	190	164	354	49	28·8	11·6	56
1937	432	395	827	37	216	224	440	67	26·7	14·2	81
1938	396	435	831	52	206	191	397	76	26·4	12·6	91
1939	426	449	875	..	205	202	407	75	27·3	12·7	86
1940	424	415	839	..	200	165	365	..	26·0	11·4	..
1941	416	409	825	45	201	177	378	..	25·3	11·6	..
1942	435	391	826	41	245	234	479	80	25·0	14·5	97
1943	467	387	854	52	226	179	405	55	25·4	12·0	64
1944	427	419	846	42	281	210	491	63	24·9	14·5	74
1945	453	422	875	44	187	188	375	52	25·4	10·9	59
1946	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	28·4	11·3	..

[1] See *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1902*, p. 37; *1903*, p. 43; *1904*, pp. 42-3; *1905*, pp. 41-2; *1906*, p. 28; *1907*, p. 25; *1908*, pp. 18-21; *1909*, pp. 16, 19; *1910*, pp. 16, 19; *1911*, pp. 15, 18; *1912*, p. 18; *1913*, pp. 16–17; *1914*, p. 16; *1915*, p. 12; *1916*, p. 10; *1917*, p. 8; *1918*, p. 8; *Medical Report 1902*, pp. 1, 6; *1904*, pp. 1, 6; *1907*, pp. 1–2, 8; *1908*, p. 1; *1909*, pp. 1, 6; *1910*, pp. 1, 8; *1911*, pp. 1, 9; *1912*, pp. 1, 5; *1913*, pp. 1, 5; *1914*, pp. 1, 4; *1915*, pp. 1, 4; *1916*, pp. 1, 4; *1917*, pp. 1, 4; *1919*, pp. 1, 4; *1920*, pp. 1, 3; *1921*, pp. 1, 3; *1922*, pp. 1, 3; *1923*, pp. 3, 8; *1924*, pp. 4, 13; *1925*, pp. 12, 22; *1926*, pp. 4, 19; *1927*, pp. 5, 23; *1928*, pp. 4, 31; *1929*, pp. 4, 31; *1930*, p. 4; *1931*, pp. 6, 29; *1932*, pp. 3, 20; *1933*, pp. 3, 16; *1934*, pp. 6–7; *1935*, pp. 6–7; *1937*, pp. 4–6, 19; *1938*, pp. 2–5, 15; *1939*, p. 2; *Report of Central Civil Status Office 1923*, p. 2; *1924*, p. 2; *1929*.

[*For continuation of notes see opposite*

TABLE 20. *Deaths of Children under Six, by Age, Seychelles 1920–45*[1]

Year	Under 1 mth.	1 to 11 mths.	1 year	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 yrs.	Year	Under 1 mth.	1 to 11 mths.	1 year	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.	5 yrs.
1920	27	24	19	10	8	7	9	1932	37	35	17	7	7	3	1
1921	25	48	25	21	16	2	5	1933	37	30	15	10	5	3	2
1922	22	30	15	8	8	2	3	1934	21	21	18	7	4*	1	—
1923	21	15	14	13	5	4	7	1935	27	62	17	8	10	4	3
1924	23	34	26	14	7	2	3	1936	22	27	15	9	3	1	1
1925	27	43	32	10	9	6	1	1937	29	38	27	20	8	7	2
1926	24	45	25	18	12	7	5	1938	31	45	12	13	3	3	3
1927	20	38	38	13	6	4	1	1939	29	48	27	7	8	3	6
1928	17	37	16	11	3	3	4	1942	35	45	34	16	9	3	6
1929	41	80	46	22	10	4	5	1943	29	26	16	5	6	3	7
1930	23	45	28	13	5	5	1	1944	27	36	21	6	2	3	4
1931	31	37	28	8	10	8	5	1945	28	24	28	10	2	2	—

[1] See *Blue Book 1920–9*, Section 15, p. 2; *1930*, p. 95; *1931*, p. 95; *1932*, p. 102; *1933*, p. 102; *1934*, p. 107; *1935*, p. 105; *1936*, p. 105; *1937*, p. 105; *1938*, p. 105; *1939*, p. 105; *Report of Central Civil Status Office 1942*, Annexure IV to *1945*, Annexure IV.

VI. FERTILITY AND MORTALITY

Fertility. In the 1830s it was said repeatedly that the free population of Seychelles had numerous children.[1] The scanty birth figures for the latter part of the nineteenth century do not suggest that fertility of women was particularly high, and it has been rather low during the last 40 years. The number of births oscillated in 1894–1927 between 596 and 778 and in 1928–45 between 790 and 877.[2] The official birth-rate varied in 1894–1913 from 30·5 to 36·5, in 1914–34 from 25·2 to 31·0, and in 1935–46 from 24·9 to 28·8. The average birth-rates in these three periods were 33·2, 28·9, and 26·4. Quoting the birth-rate of 31·0 in 1932, the Financial Commissioner T. Reid reported: 'No class practises or is likely to practise birth control. . . .'[3] But the birth-rate was higher in 1932 than in any other year between 1914 and 1946, and it was then not very high either, considering that the proportion of young women among the total population was apparently large. If actually no birth control is practised in the Seychelles, the low fertility may be due to venereal disease. According to a recent report 'gonorrhoea and syphilis are widely prevalent and it is estimated that 70% and 20% of the adult population have suffered from these diseases respectively'.[4]

The proportion of still-births was 7·1 per cent. in 1900–17, 5·9 per cent. in 1919–38, and 5·0 per cent. in 1941–5.

General Mortality. From the beginning of colonization the Seychelles have been considered to be an extraordinarily healthy place, free from

[1] See Martin, *History of the British Colonies*, vol. iv (1835), pp. 199–200; de Froberville, 'Rodrigues, Galéga, Séchelles', p. 95.

[2] It was apparently much higher in 1946.

[3] *Financial Situation of Seychelles* (1933), p. 8.

[4] *Annual Report for 1946 of the Colony of Seychelles.*

Continuation of notes to table opposite]

Annexure VI; 1936, Appendixes B, C, D; *1942*, p. 3, Annexure IV; *1943*, p. 3, Annexure IV; *1944*, p. 2, Annexure IV; *1945*, p. 2, Appendixes B, C, D, E, Annexure IV; *Blue Book 1930*, p. 95; *1935*, p. 105; *Annual Report for 1946 of the Colony of Seychelles*. The data concerning deaths under one year vary considerably in the various sources.

* Totals do not agree with items.

epidemics, with a very low mortality.[1] Two quotations from more recent reports may illustrate prevailing opinion:

1894. This low death-rate [14·8] speaks volumes for the healthiness of these islands, indeed it would not be possible to find a more healthy spot than Seychelles.[2]

1933. The Colony is free at present from most of the usual deadly tropical diseases, such as plague, cholera, smallpox, dysentry, malaria and epidemic thereof.[3]

On the other hand, it is true, the Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire reported (1939):

The state of nutrition of the majority of the people is poor. There is much chronic ill-health, low resistance to disease and incapacitating sickness, which is a constant source of economic loss to employers of labour. Neuritis and the disease locally known as 'decoque' are regarded as evidence of vitamin deficiency. Beriberi is still seen occasionally even in the outlying islands where unpolished rice is used. Pulmonary tuberculosis is very prevalent and chronic ulcers are exceedingly common.[4]

The scanty death figures for the latter part of the nineteenth century suggest that mortality, on the whole, was fairly low, and it has improved since. The number of deaths oscillated in 1897–1945 between 275 (1899) and 506[5] (1917).[6] The official death-rate varied in 1897–1917 between 14·1 and 23·5, in 1918–29 between 11·8 and 17·9, and in 1930–46 between 10·8 and 14·5. The average death-rates in these three periods were 16·9, 15·6, and 12·6 respectively.

Infant Mortality. Complaints about high mortality among infants and children under five years were frequent in former times.

1879. The rate of mortality of young children is very high.[7]

1899. The Chief Government Medical Officer in referring to the high rate of infant mortality states that it is due to the ignorance of parents more than anything else, and to the difficulty of obtaining medical advice in the country districts.[8]

But there is no evidence that mortality of children under one was excessive at any time. In 1907–39 the infant mortality rate oscillated between 49 and 143 and exceeded 100 only in 7 years. It averaged 86 in the 40 years for which I found the relevant data.[9]

[1] For the period of French Administration see documents of 1772, 1788, 1801, 1803, and 1804, reproduced in Fauvel, pp. 98, 163, 180, 320, 341. For the 1830s see Martin, *History of the British Colonies*, vol. iv, p. 199; de Froberville, 'Rodrigues, Galéga, Séchelles', p. 95. For the 1860s see *State of Colonial Possessions 1863*, Part I, p. 128; *1866*, Part III, p. 58. In his Annual Report for 1863 the Civil Commissioner, after having shown the number of deaths in 1862 and 1863, said: 'a very small average for a tropical country where cleanliness is quite unknown, where vast quantities of pork and salt fish are daily eaten, and where the average annual consumption of rum, fresh from the still and proportionately rank, is nearly a gallon and a half for every man, woman, and child' (ibid. *1863*, p. 129).

[2] *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1894*, p. 4. See also ibid. *1899*, p. 42; *1900*, p. 40.

[3] *Financial Situation of Seychelles*, p. 8.

[4] *First Report*, Part II, p. 78.

[5] The number of deaths of 'Europeans' in 1923 was given as 0, in 1925–31 as 0, 0, 0, 2, 3, 1, and 1 respectively, and in 1933–8 as 3, 4, 4, 1, 3, and 2 respectively (see *Medical Report 1923*, p. 3; *1925*, p. 13; *1926*, p. 8; *1927*, p. 10; *1928*, p. 3; *1929*, p. 3; *1930*, p. 3; *1931*, p. 3; *1933*, p. 3; *1934*, p. 7; *1935*, p. 7; *1936*, p. 5; *1937*, p. 7; *1938*, p. 5).

[6] The high figure for this year was due to the numerous deaths of members of the Seychelles Labour Contingent returned from East Africa; see p. 917 above.

[7] *Colonial Possessions Reports 1879*, p. 262.

[8] *Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1899*, p. 42. See also ibid. *1900*, p. 39; *1901*, p. 41; *1902*, p. 37.

[9] 1902, 1904–5, 1907–39, 1942–5.

SOURCES QUOTED

MAURITIUS

DELALEU, *Deuxième Supplément du Code de L'Isle de France, contenant le Recueil des Loix publiées en cette Isle depuis le premier Janvier 1783, jusqu'au premier Juillet 1787*, &c. Isle de France, 1787.

—— *Code des Iles de France et de Bourbon*. 2nd ed. Port-Louis, 1826.

Code Civil des Français, Édition originale et seule officielle. Paris, 1804.

Recueil complet des Lois et Réglemens de L'Ile Maurice, Quatrième Partie, connu sous le nom de Code Decaen.

Recueil complet des Lois et Réglemens de L'Ile Maurice, ou Ile de France, Cinquième Partie [Code Farquhar]. Port-Louis, 1823.

A Collection of the Laws of Mauritius and its Dependencies (1 Jan. 1722–31 Dec. 1865). Compiled with Notes by John Rouillard, Published by Authority of the Government. 9 vols. Mauritius, 1866–8.

T. BONNEFOY, *Table générale alphabétique et analytique pour servir aux recherches à faire au greffe de la Cour Suprême de l'Ile Maurice, concernant les lois*, &c. Port-Louis, 1853.

Recueil des Lois, Proclamations, Arrêtés, Règlemens, Ordres et Avis émanés du Gouvernement de l'Isle Maurice, pendant l'année 1819. Mauritius.

Recueil des Lois, Proclamations, Notes & Avis du Gouvernement, Publiés à Maurice pendant les neuf derniers mois de l'année 1820; pendant l'année 1821 to 1826. Mauritius.

Recueil des Lois, Ordonnances, Proclamations, Notes & Avis du Gouvernement, Publiés à Maurice pendant l'année 1827 to 1832; depuis le 15 septembre 1832 [jusqu'au 31 décembre 1833]; pendant l'année 1834 to 1846. Mauritius.

Collection of Laws, Ordinances, Proclamations, Government Notices, &c., Published at Mauritius during the Year 1851; 1855. Mauritius.

A Collection of the Ordinances Enacted by His Excellency the Governor of Mauritius with the Advice and Consent of the Legislative Council of Government, Anno Domini 1853–5; 1861; 1871; 1876. Mauritius.

A Collection of Ordinances Passed by the Legislative Council of Mauritius A.D. 1880. Mauritius.

A Collection of the Ordinances Passed by the Council of Government during the Year 1890 to 1945. Port Louis.

A Collection of the Proclamations Published at Mauritius during the Year 1890; 1891; 1899 to 1901; 1909; 1910; 1914. Port Louis.

Colony of Mauritius, *A Collection of the Proclamations and Government Notifications for the Year 1919; 1920; 1931*. Port Louis, 1920–1, 1932.

Colony of Mauritius, *A Collection of Proclamations and Government Notices Published during the Year 1939; 1944*. Port Louis, 1940, 1945.

Colony of Mauritius, *The Laws of Mauritius (Revised to 1920)*, edited by Sir Furcy Alfred Herchenroder and Etienne Kœnig. 7 vols. Port Louis, 1922–3.

Colony of Mauritius, *The Laws of Mauritius (1921–9)*, edited by Sir Furcy Alfred Herchenroder. Port Louis, 1930.

Colony of Mauritius, *Statutory Regulations, Rules, &c.*, vol. ii, revised to December 31st 1924, edited by Sir Furcy Alfred Herchenroder. Port Louis, 1925.

Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Take a Census of the Island of Mauritius and its Dependencies, April 1861. Mauritius.

Census of Mauritius & its Dependencies Taken on the 11th April 1871. Two Parts. Mauritius.

Census of Mauritius and its Dependencies Taken on the 4th April 1881. Mauritius, 1881.

Census of Mauritius and its Dependencies Taken on the 6th April 1891. Mauritius, 1892.

Census of Mauritius and its Dependencies Taken on the 1st April 1901, G. A. L. Banbury, Registrar General and Census Commissioner. Mauritius, 1902.

Report on the Census Enumeration Made in the Colony of Mauritius and its Dependencies on the Night of 31st March, 1911, by A. Walter, Census Commissioner of Mauritius and its Dependencies. Mauritius.

Preliminary Report on the Census of the Population of Mauritius Made on the Night of Friday May 20th 1921.

Final Report on the Census Enumeration Made in the Colony of Mauritius and its Dependencies on the Night of the 21st of May, 1921, by A. Walter, Census Commissioner for Mauritius and its Dependencies. Port Louis, 1926.

Final Report on the Census Enumeration made in the Colony of Mauritius and its Dependencies on April 26th, 1931, under the Direction of M. Kœnig, Census Commissioner for Mauritius and its Dependencies. Port Louis, 1933.

Final Report on the Census Enumeration made in the Colony of Mauritius and its Dependencies on 11th June, 1944, under the Direction of M. Kœnig, Census Commissioner for Mauritius and its Dependencies. Port Louis, 1945.

Mauritius Estimates 1931–2.

Colony of Mauritius, *Annual Report on the Medical and Health Department for 1919* to *1946*. Port Louis, (1920)–1947.

'First Annual Report of the Registrar-General on Births, Deaths and Marriages during 1872 in Mauritius and its Dependencies', *The Mauritius Almanac and Colonial Register 1874*, pp. 80–96.

Colony of Mauritius, *Annual Report of the Registrar General on Births, Deaths and Marriages for 1919* to *1939; 1945; 1946*. Port Louis, 1920–39, 1946–7 (*Report 1939* typescript).

Colony of Mauritius, *Blue Book 1823* to *1870* (1823–57 manuscript).

Blue Book of the Colony of Mauritius and its Dependencies 1935 to *1940, 1942* to *1944*. Port Louis, 1936–40 (B.B. 1939–40, 1942–4 manuscript).

Colony of Mauritius, *Brown Book* (*Statistical Tables*) *1826* to *July to Dec. 1831* (Public Record Office, Colonial Office 172, vols. xlix, lv).

The Mauritius Almanac and Colonial Register for 1869 to *1881; 1885* to *1888*. Mauritius, 1869–81, 1885–8.

The Mauritius Almanac for the Year 1889 to *1916*. Mauritius 1889–1916.

The Mauritius Almanac and Commercial Handbook for 1920 to *1922; 1923–4* to *1938–9; 1939–41*. Port Louis, 1920–41.

Report of the Committee appointed by Government to investigate the History and particular Conditions of the Cholera-Epidemic of 1854. Port Louis, 1856.

Report of the Committee appointed by His Excellency the Governor, to inquire into and report upon the probable cause or causes of the recent outbreak of Cholera in the Island of Mauritius in March 1856. Port Louis, 1857.

Mauritius, *Report of the Fever Enquiry Commission 1866 & 1867*. Mauritius, 1868.

Colony of Mauritius, *Report on Health Conditions in Mauritius*, by Dr. A. Rankine, Director, Medical and Health Department. Port Louis, March 1944.

Colony of Mauritius, *Interim Report on the Detainment Camp for the period 26th Dec., 1940, to 30th Sept., 1941; 1st Oct., 1941, to 30th Sept., 1942; 1st Oct., 1943 to 30th Sept., 1944.* Port Louis, 1941–2, 1945.

Colony of Mauritius, *Final Report, Nutritional Investigations in Mauritius 1942–45.* Port Louis, 1946.

Colony of Mauritius, *Report on Estate Housing, Slum Clearance and Town and Regional Planning in the Island of Mauritius, First Report* by P. M. Aldred, Town Planning Officer to the Government of Southern Rhodesia. Port Louis, 1946.

Colony of Mauritius, *Memorandum by Dr. A. E. Chazal on Proposed Scheme for Improvement and Expansion of Medical and Health Services in Mauritius.* Port Louis, 1946.

Mauritius, *Council of Government Debates* 1943–4, *A Statement on Public Health in Mauritius by Major A. E. de Chazal.* Port Louis, 1943.

The Reports Made for the Year 1845 to the Secretary of State having the Department of the Colonies: in continuation of the Reports annually made by the Governors of the British Colonies, with a view to exhibit generally The Past and Present State of Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions, Transmitted with the Blue Books for the Year 1845. Same for *1846* to *1863.* London, 1846–65.

Reports Showing the Present State of Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions, Transmitted with the Blue Books for the Year 1864 to *1870.* London, 1866–72.

Papers relating to Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions 1873 to *1876.* London, 1873–6.

Papers relating to Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions, Reports for 1875–6 and 1877 to *1884, 1885, and 1886.* London, 1877–87.

Statistical Tables relating to the Colonial and other Possessions of the United Kingdom, Part VI.

Reports on Blue Books, Mauritius, Seychelles and Rodrigues 1886 to *1888.* London 1888, 1890.

Colonial Office, *Annual Colonial Reports, Mauritius 1889* to *1894, 1896, 1901* to *1938*: *Seychelles and Rodrigues 1889 & 1890*; *Mauritius, Seychelles 1891*; *Rodrigues 1891* to *1893, 1896*; *Mauritius 1895*; *Rodrigues 1894 and 1895*; *Mauritius and Rodrigues 1897* to *1900.* London, 1891–1939.

The Dominions Office and Colonial Office List for 1940. London.

The Colonial Office List for 1946. London, 1946.

Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, *First Report,* Part II. Cmd. 6051. London, 1939.

Labour Conditions in Ceylon, Mauritius, and Malaya, Report by Major G. St. J. Orde Browne. Cmd. 6423. London, 1943.

Mauritius, *Despatches from Secretary of State to Governor of Mauritius 1811–1813*; *1814–1819* (C.O. 168, vols. ii and iii).

Mauritius, *Despatches from Governor Farquhar, Year 1812*; *June to Dec., 1815* (C.O. 167, vol. ix, x, xxvi).

Mauritius, *Three Years Administration of the Isle of France (otherwise called Mauritius), &c., with some Reference to the whole Administration of Sir R. Farquhar since the Commencement of his Government* (C.O. 172, vol. xxxviii).

Commissioners of Eastern Inquiry 1828, *Mauritius Slave Trade Returns, Appendix to Report 12 March 1828* (C.O. 167, vol. cxli).

Papers and Returns relating to the Slave Population of Dominica, &c., and Mauritius (*Parliamentary Papers England* 1823, vol. xviii, pp. 61–190).

Returns from the Mauritius under the Registry Act, &c. (*P.P.* 1825, vol. xxv, pp. 909–12).

Returns of the Amount of the Slave Population at the Cape of Good Hope and in the Mauritius, &c. (*P.P.* 1825, vol. xxv, p. 985).

Correspondence relative to Slaves, including Copy of the Order in Council for the Registration of Slaves in the Mauritius (*P.P.* 1826, vol. xxvi, pp. 487–510).

Papers and Communications relative to the Slave Trade at the Mauritius and Bourbon, and the Seychelles, from the Time of their Capture to the present Time: 1811–1817; 1818–1825 (*P.P.* 1826, vol. xxvii, pp. 131–448).

Correspondence respecting the Slave Trade, received from the Governor of the Mauritius (Nov. 1825 to Oct. 1826) (*P.P.* 1826–7, vol. xxii, pp. 139–72).

The Original Order in Council for the Registration of Slaves at the Mauritius (1814) (ibid., pp. 177–98).

Return of Slaves on the Bel Ombre Estate; also, Order in Council for the Registration of Slaves in Mauritius (ibid., pp. 199–262).

A Return of the Number of all the Islands which come under the denomination of Dependencies of Mauritius, &c. (*P.P.* 1826–27, vol. xviii, pp. 407–26).

Returns from all His Majesty's Colonies in the West Indies, and The Isle of France, and the Cape of Good Hope, &c. (*P.P.* 1828, vol. xxv, pp. 1–152).

Returns of the Number of Slaves belonging to Government at the Mauritius and its Dependencies, &c., March 1828 (ibid., pp. 361–432).

Return of the Slave Population of the Seychelles and of the Isle of France, &c. (ibid., pp. 519–66).

Returns of the Number of Government Slaves in the Island of Mauritius, &c., July 1828 (*P.P.* 1828, vol. xxvi, pp. 39–84).

Report of the Commissioners of Inquiry upon the Slave Trade at Mauritius (*P.P.* 1829, vol. xxv, pp. 49–93).

Correspondence between Sir Robert Farquhar and the Colonial Department, upon the subject of certain Charges contained in a Publication, intituled, 'The Anti-Slavery Reporter, No. 42' (ibid., pp. 95–102).

Copy of the Ordinance for the Government and Protection of Slaves in the Mauritius; with the Observations of the Commissioners appointed to inquire, among other subjects, into the State of Slavery, &c. (ibid., pp. 103–34).

Papers in Explanation of the Measures Adopted by His Majesty's Government for the Melioration of the Condition of the Slave Population in His Majesty's Possessions in the West Indies, on the Continent of South America and at the Mauritius (*P.P.* 1829, vol. xxv, pp. 153–254).

Correspondence between His Majesty's Secretary of State and the Governor of the Mauritius, respecting the Slave Registry of that Island, since 1st January 1826, &c. (*P.P.* 1831–2, vol. xlvii, pp. 401–87).

Appendix to Report from Select Committee on the Colonial Military Expenditure (*P.P.* 1834, vol. vi, pp. 187–301).

Papers relative to the Abolition of Slavery in the British Colonies 1833–1835, Part II, Section I (*P.P.* 1835, vol. l, pp. 121–511).

Statistical Reports on the Sickness, Mortality, & Invaliding, among the troops in Western Africa, St. Helena, the Cape of Good Hope, and the Mauritius; prepared from the records of the Army Medical Department and War-Office Returns [by Major Alex. M. Tulloch] (*P.P.* 1840, vol. xxx, pp. 135–252).

Despatches from Sir William Nicolay on the subject of Free Labour in the Mauritius (*P.P.* 1840, vol. xxxvii, pp. 455–538).

Correspondence addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonial Department, relative to the Introduction of Indian Labourers into the Mauritius, &c. (*P.P.* 1840, vol. xxxvii, pp. 539–739; *1841* (2), vol. iii, pp. 137–250; 1842, vol. xxx, pp. 187–224).

Report of the Royal Commissioners [William Edward Frere and Victor Alexander Williamson] *appointed to enquire into the Treatment of Immigrants in Mauritius*. C. 1115 (*P.P.* 1875, vol. xxxiv).

Dr. Daniel E. Anderson, *The Epidemics of Mauritius, with a Descriptive and Historical Account of the Island*. London, 1918.

D. Drysdale Anderson, 'The Point of Population Saturation, Its Transgression in Mauritius', *Human Biology*, Dec. 1929, pp. 528–43.

H. C. M. Austen, *Sea Fights and Corsairs of the Indian Ocean, being the Naval History of Mauritius from 1715 to 1810*. Port Louis, 1935.

Georges Azéma, *Histoire de L'Ile Bourbon depuis 1643 jusqu'au 20 décembre 1848*. Paris, 1862.

Dr. Mazaé Azéma, *La Variole à l'île de la Réunion, évolution, prophylaxie* (published in Paris, 1883); first part reprinted in *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 19 Apr. to 10 May 1891, pp. 545–9, 558–64, 576–80, 584–90.

James Backhouse, *A Narrative of a Visit to the Mauritius and South Africa*. London, 1844.

Dr. Andrew Balfour, Director-in-Chief, Wellcome Bureau of Scientific Research, *Report on Medical and Sanitary Matters in Mauritius, 1921*. London, 1922.

Eugène Bernard, *Essai sur les nouveaux affranchis de l'île Maurice* (first published in 1834); reprinted in *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 23 Mar. to 1 Aug. 1889.

A. J. Bertuchi, *The Island of Rodriguez, A British Colony in the Mascarenhas Group*. London, 1923.

Auguste Billiard, *Voyage aux Colonies Orientales, ou Lettres écrites des Îles de France et de Bourbon pendant les années 1817, 1818, 1819 et 1820, à M. le Comte de Montalivet*. Paris, 1822.

Prince Roland Bonaparte, *Le Premier Établissement des Néerlandais à Maurice*. Paris, 1890.

L. C. Mahé de la Bourdonnais, *Mémoires historiques de B. F. Mahé de la Bourdonnais, Gouverneur des Îles de France et de Bourbon; recueillis et publiés par son petit-fils*. Paris, 1827.

H. Bourde de la Rogerie, *Les Bretons aux Iles de France et de Bourbon (Maurice et La Réunion) au XVII^e^ et au XVIII^e^ siècle*. Rennes, 1934.

Sir Charles Bruce, 'The Evolution of the Crown Colony of Mauritius', *Scottish Geographical Magazine*, Feb. 1908, pp. 57–78.

P. Brunet, *Voyage à l'Isle de France, dans l'Inde*, &c. Paris, 1825.

S. B. de Burgh-Edwardes, *The History of Mauritius (1507–1914)*. London, 1921.

Ch. Chapotin, *Topographie médicale de l'Ile de France*. Paris, 1812.

Joseph-François Charpentier-Cossigny, *Voyage à Canton*, &c., *par Gorée, le Cap de Bonne-Espérance, et les Iles de France et de la Réunion*, &c. Paris, An VII (1798–9).

—— *Moyens d'amélioration et de restauration, proposés au Gouvernement et aux habitans des Colonies*, &c. 3 vols. Paris, 1802.

Hilaire Coqueval, *Précis de l'histoire de l'île Maurice ou île de France*, MS.

published in *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 6 Sept., 1 and 16 Oct., 1 and 16 Nov. 1893, pp. 234–9, 241–6, 257–66, 273–81, 289–94.

PIERRE CREPIN, *Mahé de La Bourdonnais, Gouverneur Général des Iles de France et de Bourbon (1699–1753)*. Paris, 1922.

DR. ANDREW DAVIDSON, *Geographical Pathology: An Inquiry into the Geographical Distribution of Infective and Climatic Diseases*. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1892.

ADRIEN D'EPINAY, *Renseignements pour servir à l'histoire de l'Ile de France jusqu'à l'année 1810*, &c. Mauritius, 1890.

A. A. FAUVEL, *Unpublished Documents on the History of the Seychelles Islands anterior to 1810*, &c. Mahé, 1909.

H. CASTONNET DES FOSSES, *Pierre Poivre, Sa vie & ses voyages*. Reprint from *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie de Lyon*. Lyons, 1889.

MAJOR C. E. P. FOWLER, Royal Army Medical Corps, *Malarial Investigations in Mauritius from November, 1907, to February, 1908*. London, 1908.

(BARTHÉLEMY HUET DE FROBERVILLE), *Ephémérides Mauriciennes 1827–1834*, edited by L. H. de Froberville. Port Louis, 1906.

EUGÈNE DE FROBERVILLE, 'Rodrigues, Galéga, Les Séchelles, Les Almirantes, etc.', *L'Univers, Iles de l'Afrique*, Part iii, pp. 65–114.

LÉON HUET DE FROBERVILLE, 'La Variole à l'Île de France en 1771', *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 1 Aug. 1889, pp. 93–6.

—— 'Le premier Apôtre de l'Ile de France, Le Père Gabriel Igou', ibid., 10 and 17 Aug. 1890, pp. 123–5, 133–8.

ALPH. GAUD, 'Nos premiers Gouverneurs hollandais et français', ibid., 8 Apr. 1888, pp. 501–8.

—— 'Destruction des noirs marrons, Une Délibération du Conseil de l'Ile Bourbon', ibid., 13 and 20 July 1890, pp. 78–9, 92–3.

CHARLES GRANT, VISCOUNT DE VAUX, *The History of Mauritius, or the Isle of France, and the Neighbouring Islands*, &c., *composed principally from the Papers and Memoirs of Baron Grant*, &c. London, 1801.

I. GUÉT, Archiviste-Bibliothécaire de l'Administration centrale des colonies, *Les Origines de L'Ile Bourbon et de la Colonisation française à Madagascar*, &c. New ed. Paris, 1888.

DR. K. HEERINGA, 'De Nederlanders op Mauritius en Madagascar', *De Indische Gids*, June, July 1895, pp. 864–92, 1005–36.

EVENOR HITIÉ, *Histoire de Maurice (ancienne Ile de France)*, vol. i, Port Louis, 1897.

W. H. INGRAMS, 'Some points of contact between Mauritius and East Africa', paper read on 11 May 1932, *Transactions of the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences of Mauritius, 13th November 1929 to 11th May 1932*, pp. 37–68. Port Louis, 1932.

PAUL KAEPPELIN, *Les Escales françaises sur la route de l'Inde 1638–1731*. Paris, 1908.

FRANÇOIS LEGUAT, *Voyage et Avantures* (sic.), &c., *en deux Isles désertes des Indes Orientales*, &c. 2 vols. London, 1708.

LEUPE, 'De Vestiging der Hollanders op Mauritius, in 1638', *Verhandelingen en Berigten betrekkelijk het Zeewezen en de Zeevaartkunde*, New Series, 1854, 2nd Part, pp. 265–81. Amsterdam, 1854.

MALCOLM E. MACGREGOR, *Report on the Anophelinae of Mauritius*, &c. (1922).

A. MACQUET, 'Étude historique sur les commencements de l'administration de l'Ile de France', *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 21 Sept. 1890, pp. 193–9.

PIERRE MARGRY, 'Les Iles de France et de Bourbon sous le gouvernement de Mahé de La Bourdonnais (1735–1740)', *Revue Maritime et Coloniale*, vol. vi, Oct. 1862, pp. 334–83. Paris.

ROBERT MONTGOMERY MARTIN, *Statistics of the Colonies of the British Empire*, &c., London, 1839.

CHARLES MELDRUM, *Weather, Health, and Forests: A Report on the Inequalities of the Mortality from Malarial Fever and other Diseases in Mauritius*, &c. Mauritius, 1881.

M. J. MILBERT, *Voyage pittoresque à L'Ile de France*, &c. 2 vols. Paris, 1812.

JACQUES NECKER, *De l'Administration des Finances de France*. 3 vols. Paris, 1784.

GEORGE NEWTON, *Modifications apportées au Code Civil Français par la législation de l'Ile Maurice*. Paris, 1907.

NICHOLAS PIKE, *Sub-Tropical Rambles in the Land of the Aphanapteryx, Personal Experiences, Adventures, & Wanderings in and around the Island of Mauritius*. London, 1873.

EUGÈNE PISTON, *Chronique de l'Ile de France, La Bourdonnais, 1735* (first published in 1847); reprinted in *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 1 June to 8 July 1887, pp. 1–8, 13–22, 25–31, 37–46, 49–72.

ALBERT PITOT, *T'Eylandt Mauritius, Esquisses historiques (1598–1710)*. Port Louis, 1905.

—— *L'Ile de France, Esquisses historiques (1715–1810)*. Port-Louis, 1899.

—— *L'Ile Maurice, Esquisses historiques*, vol. i (*1810–23*), vol. ii (*1823–8*), vol. iii (*1828–33*). Port-Louis, 1910–14.

P. POIVRE, *Œuvres complettes, précédées de sa vie, et accompagnées de Notes*. Paris, 1797.

HENRI PRENTOUT, *L'Ile de France sous Decaen 1803–1810*, &c. Paris, 1901.

CHARLES PRIDHAM, *England's Colonial Empire: An Historical, Political and Statistical Account of the Empire, its Colonies, and Dependencies*, vol. i, *The Mauritius and its Dependencies*. London, 1846.

HERVÉ DE RAUVILLE, 'Population de l'Ile de France de 1782 à 1788', *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 1 June 1890, pp. 1–3.

—— *L'Ile de France contemporaine*. Paris, 1908.

(GUILLAUME-THOMAS RAYNAL), *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissemens & du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes*. 7 vols. Hague, 1774. Another edition, 7 vols., Paris, 1778. Another edition, 4 vols., Geneva, 1780.

(RAYNAL), *A Philosophical and Political History of the Settlements and Trade of the Europeans in the East and West Indies*. Translated from the French by J. Justamond. 4 vols. London, 1776.

RONALD ROSS, *Report on the Prevention of Malaria in Mauritius*. London, 1908.

—— *Memoirs, with a full Account of the Great Malaria Problem and its Solution*. London, 1923.

JOHN ROUILLARD, 'Relation de l'Isle Rodrigues', *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice*, 8, 16, 23, and 29 June 1890, pp. 13–18, 25–9, 37–40, 49–51.

FERDINAND MAGON DE SAINT-ELIER, *Tableaux historiques, politiques & pittoresques de l'Ile de France, aujourd'hui Maurice*, &c., vol. i. Port-Louis, 1839.

SAINT ELME LE DUC, *Ile de France, Documents pour son histoire civile et militaire* (MS. Paris, 1844). Port-Louis, 1925.

(J. H. Bernardin de Saint Pierre) *Voyage à l'Isle de France, à l'Isle de Bourbon, au Cap de Bonne-Espérance, &c. avec des Observations nouvelles sur la Nature & sur les Hommes*, par un Officier du Roi. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1773.

—— *A Voyage to the Island of Mauritius (or Isle of France), the Isle of Bourbon, the Cape of Good Hope, &c.*, by a French Officer. Translated from the French by John Parish. London, 1775.

E. Stirling, *Cursory Notes on the Isle of France, made in 1827*. Calcutta, 1833.

Victor Tantet, Archiviste-Bibliothécaire du Ministère des Colonies, *Survivance de l'esprit français aux colonies perdues: La Louisiane, l'Ile de France, Saint-Domingue*. Paris, 1900.

Charles Telfair, *Some Account of the State of Slavery at Mauritius, since the British Occupation, in 1810*, &c. Port-Louis, 1830.

George McCall Theal, *History of South Africa under the Administration of the Dutch East India Company (1652 to 1795)*. 2 vols. London, 1897.

Auguste Toussaint, *Port-Louis, Deux siècles d'histoire (1735–1935)*. Port-Louis, 1936.

—— *Les Missions d'Adrien d'Epinay (1830–1834)*. Port-Louis, 1946.

Baron D'Unienville, *Statistique de L'Isle Maurice cy devant Isle de France et de Ses Dépendances, 1825*. MS. C.O. 172, vols. xxxix–xlii.

—— *Statistique de l'Ile Maurice et ses Dépendances, suivie D'une Notice historique sur cette Colonie et d'un Essai sur l'Ile de Madagascar*. 4 vols. Paris, 1838.

Comte de Villèle, *Mémoires et Correspondance*. 5 vols. Paris, 1880–90.

Annonces, Affiches et Avis Divers pour les Colonies des Isles de France et de Bourbon 1773 to *1775*. Isle de France, 1773–5.

Mémoire pour les Habitans de l'Ile Maurice, &c., *par un Colon*. Port-Louis, 1836.

Emigration from India: The Export of Coolies, and other Labourers, to Mauritius. London, 1842.

Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice, 1887–8 to 1894. Port Louis.

'Formation du Conseil d'Administration des Isles de Bourbon et de France, Extrait du Règlement Général pour les Isles de Bourbon et de France', ibid., 16 and 23 June 1887, pp. 32–6, 46–8.

'Instructions au Sieur Dufour en novembre 1717', ibid., 23 Jan. 1888, pp. 379–80.

'Lettre des Directeurs de la Compagnie des Indes du 31 mai 1721', ibid., 16 Feb. 1888, pp. 422–4.

'Les Compagnies de troupes aux Iles de France et de Bourbon (1723)', ibid., 16 Apr. 1888, pp. 515–17.

'Lettre des Directeurs de la Compagnie des Indes au Conseil Provincial de Bourbon, 31 mai 1721', ibid., 16 Sept. to 8 Oct. 1889, pp. 165–8, 179–82, 192–6, 207–10.

'Un Règlement du Conseil Provincial de l'Ile Bourbon du 20 février 1715', ibid., 24 May 1891, pp. 605–9.

'Voyages du Sieur D. D. L. M. [de La Motte], contenant dix-neuf Lettres écrites sur les lieux à un de ses amis en Europe dans les années 1754 à 1757', ibid., 4 Oct. to 6 Dec. 1891, pp. 205–9, 220–3, 231–5, 243–6, 257–60, 270–2, 284–8, 297–300, 304–7, 319–23.

'Envoi de noirs à l'Ile de France, Délibération du Conseil Provincial de Bourbon du 2 octobre 1722', ibid., 13 Dec. 1891, p. 336.

L. F., 'Notes sur les premiers colons (Ile de France — 1732)', ibid., 27 Mar. 1892, pp. 505–6.

'Les Iles de France et de Bourbon en 1757, Extraits de la Relation (inédite)

d'un voyage aux Indes Orientales par M. de Maudave, chevalier de St. Louis', ibid., 7 and 16 June 1894, pp. 145–52, 161–8.

Mauritius Illustrated, Historical and Descriptive, Commercial and Industrial Facts, Figures & Resources, compiled and edited by Allister Macmillan. London, 1914.

SEYCHELLES[1]

The Seychelles Government Gazette.

Seychelles Ordinances 1898–1901 (Colonial Office Library).

The Laws of Seychelles Revised, vol. i, *Mauritius Laws Applicable Down to the Year 1903*; vols. ii–iv, *Seychelles Local Laws 1872–1898, 1899–1906, 1907–1911*. Vols. i, ii by Furcy Alfred Herchenroder; vols. iii, iv by Walter Lockhart Rind. Mahé, 1904–12.

Seychelles, *Ordinances Passed by the Legislative Council during the Year 1916; 1917; 1919; 1925; 1934.*

Colony of Seychelles, *A Collection of the Ordinances of the Governor in Council 1938.* Victoria, 1939.

Colony of Seychelles, *A Collection of the Proclamations, Regulations and Notices of the Governor in Council 1921.* Victoria, 1921.

Colony of Seychelles, *Annual Volume of Proclamations 1931.*

Census of the Seychelles Islands 1891. Mauritius, 1892.

Report and General Abstracts of the Census of the Seychelles Islands of 1901 by V. Boullé, Census Commissioner.

Report and General Abstracts of the Census of the Seychelles Islands of 1911 by L. A. Tonnet, Superintendent of Census.

Report and General Abstract of the Census of the Colony of Seychelles of 1921 by N. G. Bonnetard, Census Commissioner. Victoria, 1921.

Colony of Seychelles, *Census for the Year 1931.* Victoria.

Central Civil Status Office, *Report 1923* to *1926*; *1929*; *1933*; *1935*; *1936*; *1942* to *1945* (1929 MS., all others typescript).

Annual Reports of the Medical Department in Seychelles for the Year 1902; 1904.

Colony of Seychelles, *Annual Report on the Medical Department for the Year 1907* to *1917; 1919* to *1933.* Victoria, 1908–34.

Colony of Seychelles, *Annual Report of the Medical and Health Department for the Year 1934* to *1945.* Victoria, 1935–46. *The Seychelles Blue Book for the Year 1899* to *1939.* Victoria, 1900–40.

Statement of the Slave Population in the Seychelles Islands, at the time of its Capture, at the time of the last Census, &c. (*Parliamentary Papers England*, 1826, vol. xxvii, pp. 449).

Abstract of each Slave Population Return for the Seychelles; Distinguishing, the Name of each Individual making such Return, &c. (ibid., pp. 451–61).

Colonial Office, *Annual Colonial Reports, Seychelles 1894* to *1938.* London, 1896–1939.

Annual Report for 1946 of the Colony of Seychelles (typescript).

Colonial Office, *Financial Situation of Seychelles, Report of the Commissioner* [T. Reid] *Appointed by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, July, 1933.* Colonial No. 90. London, 1933.

Abstract of Arrangements respecting Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages in Great Britain, &c., *and the British Dominions beyond the Seas*, Issued by the Registrar-General [for England and Wales]. London, 1915.

[1] See also under Mauritius.

Almanach des Iles Séchelles, pour l'année bissextile 1840. (Mahé.)

J. T. Bradley, *The History of Seychelles.* Two Parts. Mahé, 1940.

Robert Montgomery Martin, *History of the British Colonies.* 5 vols. London, 1834–5.

Th. Sauzier, 'Contributions à l'Histoire et à la Géographie de l'Archipel des Seychelles', *Revue Historique et Littéraire de l'Ile Maurice,* 1 and 16 Mar. 1894, pp. 65–72, 81–92.

INDEX[1]

Abercorn District *N.R.* 423, 431, 454, 494, 497, 506.

Abortions:
- Deliberate *K.* 188; *M.* 747, 869; *N.R.* 496–8; *Ny.* 613, 617; *T.T.* 378; *Z.* 670–3. *See also under* Fertility.
- Factors Causing or Promoting:
  - Hookworm *Ny.* 613.
  - Low vitality of wives *Ny.* 614.
  - Malaria *Ny.* 613.
  - Native medicine *Ny.* 613, 617.
  - Venereal diseases *Ba.* 60; *Be.* 72; *Ny.* 613; *U.* 278–9.
  - Yaws *Ny.* 613.
- Incidence *Be.* 45, 72; *K.* 185, 188–9, 195; *M.* 869; *Ny.* 617; *Sw.* 45, 81; *T.T.* 374, 379, 393; *U.* 278–9, 288, 315; *Z.* 668–70.

Abraham, John C., 514, 566, 687.

Absentees:
- Children *N.R.* 418, 446, 449, 456; *Ny.* 559, 581.
- Demographic effects *K.* 187; *N.R.* 437, 471, 473, 482–3, 493–4, 496–9, 501, 512–13; *M.* 814, 831; *Ny.* 549–52, 559–61, 592, 611, 613, 617–18, 633, 637.
- Duration of absence *Ba.* 17, 19; *N.R.* 405, 437, 440–2, 451–8, 460, 462, 464, 466, 468, 470–4, 494, 497–8, 513; *Ny.* 513, 551, 554–5, 557, 559, 562–3, 566–72, 577–81, 589, 611, 613, 633.
- Juveniles *N.R.* 444, 459, 466; *Ny.* 555–6, 581.
- Methods of ascertaining numbers *Ba.* 8–9, 15, 22; *Be.* 8, 10, 15; *E.A.* 97; *N.R.* 97, 416–17, 440–1, 443–74, 589; *Ny.* 97, 432–6, 531, 550–81; *Sw.* 9; *T.T.* 432–3.
- Numbers *Ba.* 17–22, 27–8, 31, 63; *Be.* 24–5; *M.* 778; *N.R.* 407–8, 416–18, 437, 440–75, 494, 496, 501, 512–14; *Ny.* 98, 431–6, 536, 550–1, 553–60, 562–81, 589, 636–7; *Sw.* 26, 34.
- Occupation *Ba.* 8, 15, 17, 21–2; *Be.* 8, 10, 15; *N.R.* 442, 445, 452, 454–62, 467, 472; *Ny.* 431–2, 436–7, 550, 553–4, 563, 565, 570–1, 578; *Sw.* 9.
- Sex ratio *Ba.* 20–2, 27; *N.R.* 417–18, 445–6, 449; *Ny.* 553–4, 559, 579–80, 591–2; *Sw.* 26.
- *See also under* Migrant Labourers, Mine Labourers.

Abyssinia:
- Born in, *K.* 162; *Sey.* 924; *So.* 642; *U.* 259, 261.
- Italian internees from, *T.T.* 355; *U.* 251.

Abyssinians *K.* 157; *So.* 642.

Acholi District U. 281, 291–3.

Acholi (tribe) *U.* 304.

Addis, W., 668.

Aden, born in, *K.* 161–2; *M.* 812; *Sey.* 924; *U.* 261.

Afghan *K.* 157.

Afghanistan, born in, *K.* 162.

African Advisory Council, 79–81, 92.

African Banks Island *Sey.* 920.

African Labour Advisory Board, 513.

Agalega *M.* 736, 885–6, 889, 891–3, 900; *Sey.* 902.

Age-composition *Ba.* 27–9; *Be.* 29, 31; *E.A.* 102; *K.* 97, 142–4, 153–4, 225; *M.* 760, 768–9, 815–27, 836–7, 895–6; *N.R.* 102, 404, 406, 475; *Ny.* 102, 117, 526–8, 531, 582–6, 589–91, 616; *Sey.* 925–6; *Sw.* 29, 34; *T.T.* 102, 325–6, 330–2, 334, 348–52, 374, 399; *U.* 102, 231, 255–6; *Z.* 652–5, 670, 674, 682. *See also under* Asiatics, Children, Coloured, Europeans, Indians, Non-Africans, Slaves.

Age, difficulty of determining, *Be.* 31; *E.A.* 102; *K.* 155, 185; *N.R.* 475, 484; *Ny.* 582–5, 589–90; *T.T.* 349, 373–4; *U.* 255–6, 304. *See also under* Children, Infants.

Ainsworth, Sub-Commissioner, *E.A.* 120, 122, 192–7, 216–17.

Akamba (tribe) *K.* 196.

Akikúyu *K.* 191, 692.

Alcoholism *Ba.* 69; *K.* 215; *Sw.* 25.

Aldabra *M.* 892; *Sey.* 918, 920.

Aldred, P. M., 939.

Algeria, born in, *M.* 812; *Sey.* 924.

Alphonse Island *M.* 890; *Sey.* 913, 918 920.

Alsace, born in, *M.* 894.

Amanganja (tribe) *Ny.* 576.

American Capital *N.R.* 509.

Amirantes Islands *M.* 885–6, 890, 892; *Sey.* 913, 918, 942.

Andaman Islands, born in, *K.* 161.

Anderson, C., 792, 800.

Anderson, Dr. Daniel E., 874–5, 877, 881, 941.

Anderson, D. Drysdale, 877, 880, 941.

[1] *Ba.* = Basutoland; *Be.* = Bechuanaland; *E.A.* = British East Africa; *K.* = Kenya; *M.* = Mauritius and Dependencies; *N.R.* = Northern Rhodesia; *Ny.* = Nyasaland; *Sey.* = Seychelles; *So.* = Somaliland; *Sw.* = Swaziland; *T.T.* = Tanganyika Territory; *U.* = Uganda; *Z.* = Zanzibar.

Angola, *see under* Portuguese West Africa.
Angoni (tribe) *N.R.* 500.
Angoniland, importation of natives from, *N.R.* 440. *See also under* Estimates of Population, *Ny.*
Anguru, *see under* Portuguese East Africa.
Ankole District *U.* 237–8, 245–6, 248, 252, 254–5, 266, 269, 276, 281–3, 285, 287, 293, 298, 302–3, 305, 307, 316–17, 320, 322.
Ankori, *see under* Usagara.
Ankylostomiasis, *see under* Helminthic diseases.
Anonyme Island *Sey.* 913, 918–19.
Anse-Anse Pins *Sey.* 919.
Anse-aux-Etoile *Sey.* 919.
Anse Forbans *Sey.* 919.
Anse Major *Sey.* 919.
Anse Royale *Sey.* 919.
Ante-natal care, *see under* Infant Mortality.
Antigua, born in, *M.* 812; *U.* 260.
Antilles, emigration, *M.* 789.
Arabia, born in, *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104, 156–8, 161–2; *So.* 104, 642; *T.T.* 104, 356; *U.* 104, 260–1, 264.
Arabs *E.A.* 101, 103, 121; *K.* 101, 103, 105, 127, 147, 151, 156–9, 161–2, 164–5, 167–8, 170, 190–2, 339; *N.R.* 101, 478; *Ny.* 101, 592; *So.* 101, 641–3; *T.T.* 101, 105, 352, 356–62; *U.* 101, 105, 233–4, 251, 259, 261–2, 264–5, 279, 304; *Z.* 101, 650, 653, 659, 664, 669, 671, 675, 680–1, 685.
Area *Ba.* 16, 18, 22; *Be.* 24–5; *K.* 149–50, 194, 198; *M.* 888; *N.R.* 409, 423, 437; *Ny.* 532, 632; *Sey.* 917; *So.* 641; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 326, 328, 332, 339–42; *U.* 236–7, 239, 252, 318, 321–2; *Z.* 651.
ARGENTINA:
Born in, *K.* 161; *M.* 812; *Ny.* 593, 598; *U.* 260.
Nationality *T.T.* 358.
Aride Island *Sey.* 913, 918–19.
Armenia, born in, *U.* 260.
Arning, Wilhelm, 326, 697.
Arthur, Dr. J. W., 129, 131, 217, 219.
Arua District *U.* 295.
Arusha District *T.T.* 327, 336, 386, 392.
Ascension, born in, *K.* 161.
Ashanti, migration from, *Ny.* 550.
Ashe, Robert P., 118, 120, 235, 313, 314, 316, 318, 695.
Ashton, Mr., 45.
ASIATICS:
Age-composition *Ba.* 38–9; *K.* 165–8; *N.R.* 478; *Ny.* 594–5, 598–9; *T.T.* 359–61; *U.* 262, 264.
Arrivals and departures *E.A.* 101; *K.* 148–9, 157–9; *Ny.* 592, 599; *T.T.* 356; *U.* 251; *Z.* 683.
Birth and Death Registration *E.A.* 110, 112; *K.* 110, 112, 170–1, 174, 177–81, 227–9; *N.R.* 110, 112, 489–93; *Ny.* 110, 112, 609–10, 639; *T.T.* 110, 112, 378, 399–401; *U.* 110, 112, 272–5, 322, 324.
Birthplace *Ba.* 38; *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104–5, 159, 161–2, 164, 168; *N.R.* 104, 476; *Ny.* 104, 592, 597; *So.* 104, 642; *T.T.* 104–5, 356; *U.* 104–5, 259, 261, 264.
Births *K.* 228–9; *N.R.* 493; *Ny.* 638–9; *T.T.* 399–400; *U.* 323.
Census, special provisions for, *Ba.* 6–7; *Be.* 6–7; *K.* 126; *N.R.* 412–14; *Sw.* 6–8.
Child marriage *K.* 168.
Children *Ba.* 38–9; *K.* 165, 168; *N.R.* 478; *Ny.* 594–5, 598–9; *T.T.* 359–61; *U.* 262, 264.
Conjugal condition *Ba.* 40; *K.* 166–8, 170; *Ny.* 595–6, 598–9; *T.T.* 360–2; *U.* 262, 265.
Deaths *K.* 229; *N.R.* 493; *Ny.* 638–9; *T.T.* 378, 400–1; *U.* 323.
Definition, South Africa High Commission Territories, 34.
Fertility *Ny.* 639; *U.* 324.
Health and Morbidity *E.A.* 119; *K.* 227, 229; *T.T.* 401.
Housing *K.* 213.
Infant mortality *K.* 180, 229.
Length of residence *Ba.* 38; *N.R.* 477.
Malnutrition *K.* 210.
Mortality *T.T.* 378, 401; *U.* 324.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *K.* 105, 164; *N.R.* 105, 478; *Ny.* 105, 592, 596–7; *So.* 105, 643; *T.T.* 105, 357; *U.* 105, 261, 264.
Natural increase *K.* 123, 148–9; *Z.* 683.
Number *Ba.* 23, 35; *Be.* 23, 40; *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 101, 104, 148, 151, 156, 159, 162; *M.* 758; *N.R.* 101, 104, 416, 423–4, 476, 478; *Ny.* 101, 104, 531, 536, 592, 594–7, 599; *So.* 104, 642; *Sw.* 23; *T.T.* 101, 104, 352–3, 356–62; *U.* 101, 104, 251, 259, 261–5; *Z.* 103, 654, 680–1.
Sex *Ba.* 23, 38; *Be.* 23, 41; *K.* 164–7; *N.R.* 478; *Ny.* 531, 536, 594–5, 597, 599; *Sw.* 23; *T.T.* 358, 360–1; *U.* 262, 264. *See also under* Arabs, Goans, Indians, Non-Africans, Syrians.
Asir, Arabs born in, *K.* 157.
Asisya (tribe) *Ny.* 608.
Askari *N.R.* 501.
Assumption Island *M.* 892; *Sey.* 920.
Astove Island *M.* 890, 892; *Sey.* 918, 920.

Atonga (tribe) *Ny.* 543, 552, 605, 608, 616–17, 624, 627.
Austen, H. C. M., 747, 757, 941.
AUSTRALIA:
Aborigines, 671.
Baby bonus, 671.
Born in, *Ba.* 35–6; *K.* 161; *M.* 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
Nationality *T.T.* 357.
AUSTRIA:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *M.* 812–13; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
Nationality *M.* 813–14; *Ny.* 597; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Austrian refugees *T.T.* 355.
Awemba Province *N.R.* 404, 418, 442, 454–5, 457, 475, 494.
Azéma, Dr. Mazaé, 873–4, 941.
Azéma, Georges, 747–9, 757, 941.

Backhouse, James, 772, 941.
Bagamoyo District *T.T.* 327, 340, 389.
Baganda *E.A.*, *see under* Buganda.
Bagishu (tribe) *U.* 246.
Baha (tribe) *T.T.* 350.
Bahima (tribe) *U.* 316–17.
Baie Lazare *Sey.* 919.
Ba-Ila (tribe) *N.R.* 497–500.
Baila, *see under* Ba-Ila (tribe).
Bairu (tribe) *U.* 233.
Bakalahari (tribe) *Be.* 25.
Baker, A. G., Director of Land Surveys, Kenya, 689.
Balfour, Dr. Andrew, 849, 877, 883, 941.
Ballinger, W. G., 22, 40, 69, 71, 91.
Balovale District *N.R.* 403, 408, 424–6, 428, 430, 436–7, 497.
Balovale Hospital *N.R.* 506–7.
Baluchis *K.* 156–7.
Banbury, G. A. L., Registrar-General Mauritius, 938.
Bantu *Ba.* 27; *K.* 195; *South Africa High Commission Territories* 23, 34–5; *Sw.* 8, 26; *U.* 278.
Bantu-Kavirondo (tribe) *K.* 217, 245, 692.
Banyankole (tribe) *U.* 246, 278.
Banyaruanda, *see under* Ruanda-Urundi.
Banyoro (tribe) *U.* 246, 278, 280, 304.
Baptisms *M.* 805, 839–40, 850.
Barbados, born in, *M.* 812.
Barbarons *Sey.* 919.
Barberton, migration from, *Ny.* 563.
Bari (tribe) *U.* 304.
Bari District *U.* 315, 319.
Baringo District *K.* 150.
Barkly, Governor Sir Henry, 781, 787, 800, 876.
Barolong (tribe) *Ba.* 19.
Barotse (tribe) *N.R.* 439, 461, 700.
Barotse District *N.R.* 415.
Barotse Province *N.R.* 405, 408, 418, 424–7, 429–31, 460–1, 465, 467–8, 473–5, 485–6, 494, 497–8, 508–9.
Barotseland *N.R.* 424–6, 437–8, 440, 452, 455, 460, 467, 499, 501, 514.
Barth, Sir J. W., 689.
Barundi, *see under* Ruanda-Urundi.
Basoga (tribe) *E.A.* 120; *U.* 278, 304.
Basutoland, 1–3, 5–24, 27–40, 42–4, 49–50, 58–75, 87–91, 476, 598, 812.
Basutos, *see under* Basutoland.
Batavia, Dutch leaving *M.* for, 746; convicts from, *M.* 797.
Bathoen, Chief, 92.
Bathurst, Earl of, 713, 715, 721–3, 727, 729, 759, 762, 767, 791–2, 842, 874.
Batoka (tribe) *N.R.* 440.
Batoka District *N.R.* 440.
Batoka Province *N.R.* 404–6, 418, 475, 494.
Batonga (tribe) *N.R.* 440.
Batoro (tribe) *U.* 278.
Batusi (tribe) *U.* 233.
Bax, S. Napier, 207, 687.
Bazinza (tribe) *T.T.* 345.
Beauvolier de Courchant, Governor of Réunion, 748, 752.
Beaver, Captain, 907.
Bechuanaland, 1, 3, 5–6, 8–16, 23–5, 28–9, 31, 36–7, 40–52, 72–81, 87–9, 92, 419, 438, 462, 467, 470, 476, 598.
Bechuanas, *see under* Bechuanaland.
Beira, migration from, *Ny.* 550.
Bel Ombre Estate *M.* 723, 729, 940.
Belgian, 241–7, 249–50, 343–4, 457, 461, 550.
BELGIAN CONGO:
Born in, *K.* 160, 162; *M.* 811; *Ny.* 598; *U.* 259, 261.
Migration from *N.R.* 405, 427, 429–31, 442, 448, 450–63, 465, 468–9, 471–3; to *N.R.* 405, 424, 426–8, 430–3, 436; from *Ny.* 457, 550, 554–5, 557, 563, 566, 569–72; to *U.* 241–2, 245–50.
Slaves from *E.A.* 121.
Belgian Mandated Territory, *see under* Ruanda-Urundi.
BELGIUM:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *M.* 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *M.* 813; *Ny.* 592, 597; *T.T.* 358.
Bell, Dr., 500.
Bell, Sir H. Hesketh, 289–90, 321, 695.
Bell Commission, 278, 436, 548, 567, 569, 619, 629, 687.
Bemba (tribe) *N.R.* 471, 498, 700.
Bena (tribe) *T.T.* 350–1.
Bengal, slaves from, *M.* 757.
Berbera Township *So.* 640–1, 644–8.
Beres District *Ba.* 19.

Beriberi *M.* 879, 899; *Ny.* 625; *Sey.* 917; *T.T.* 391; *U.* 299.
Bernard, Eugène, 767, 869, 941.
Bertuchi, A. J., 886–7, 941.
Biharamulo District *T.T.* 330, 340, 345.
Billiard, Auguste, 793, 798, 941.
Bimbechi, *see under* Missionaries, *Ny.*
Bird or Sea Cow Island *Sey.* 918, 920.
Birth and Death Registration:
Area *E.A.* 112; *K.* 171, 176–81; *M.* 840, 845; *N.R.* 483–8; *Sey.* 927; *So.* 646–7; *T.T.* 367, 372, 375; *U.* 112, 265–6; *Z.* 656.
Attitude to, *K.* 171; *N.R.* 483–4, 486–8; *Ny.* 601–2, 604–5, 608; *So.* 646; *T.T.* 367–8; *U.* 269–70; *Z.* 662–3.
Compulsory *Ba.* 49–50; *Be.* 46, 49; *E.A.* 110, 114; *K.* 110, 112, 170–2, 180–1, 187; *N.R.* 110, 112, 486; *Ny.* 110, 112, 604–5; *Sey.* 928, 932; *So.* 646; *Sw.* 43; *T.T.* 110, 112, 366–7, 369; *U.* 110, 112–14, 265–6; *Z.* 110, 112, 656, 659, 661, 663.
Fees *Be.* 47–8, 51–2; *K.* 177–8, 186; *M.* 846; *Ny.* 111, 488–90, 492, 609–10; *Sey.* 928; *So.* 111, 644–5; *Sw.* 53, 57; *T.T.* 376–8; *U.* 274–6; *Z.* 656–7.
Forms *Be.* 46, 51–2; *E.A.* 110–11; *K.* 110–11, 176–7; *M.* 845–6; *N.R.* 110–11, 490–2; *Ny.* 110–11, 609–10; *Sey.* 928; *So.* 110–11, 644–5; *Sw.* 52–7; *T.T.* 110–11, 376–7; *U.* 110–11, 113, 265–7, 273, 275; *Z.* 110–11, 657–8.
Informant *Be.* 46–7, 50–1; *E.A.* 110–11; *K.* 110–11, 176–7, 181–2; *M.* 845, 848; *N.R.* 110–11, 487–8, 490–2; *Ny.* 110–11, 610; *Sey.* 928; *So.* 110–11, 644, 646; *Sw.* 53–7; *T.T.* 110–11, 370, 376; *U.* 110–11, 265, 273, 275; *Z.* 110–11, 656–9, 664.
Introduced upon requests by Native Chiefs *K.* 186–7.
Legislation *Ba.* 1, 43; *Be.* 1, 43, 45; *E.A.* 110–12; *K.* 110, 170–83, 186–7, 609; *M.* 840–5, 847–8, 897–8; *N.R.* 110, 482, 484–8; *Ny.* 110, 600, 602, 604–5, 607, 609–10; *Sey.* 927–32; *So.* 110, 643, 646; *Sw.* 1, 43, 52–7; *T.T.* 110, 363–4, 366, 370; *U.* 110, 265–8; *Z.* 110, 656–9, 661–2.
by Native Authorities *Ba.* 44; *Be.* 43–4; *E.A.* 113; *K.* 113, 172, 186–7; *N.R.* 113, 483–5; *Ny.* 113, 600–7; *Sw.* 44; *T.T.* 113, 366–7, 372; *U.* 112–14, 240, 265–72.
Penalties for neglect *Be.* 46, 51; *E.A.* 111; *K.* 111, 177, 181; *M.* 845, 848, 850; *N.R.* 111, 487, 491–2; *Ny.* 111, 606, 610; *Sey.* 928; *So.* 111, 644; *Sw.* 56–7; *T.T.* 111, 372, 376; *U.* 111, 265–6, 275; *Z.* 111, 656–8, 663–4.
Rules and Regulations *Be.* 50–1; *K.* 176, 178–9, 181–3; *M.* 840; *N.R.* 482, 489–90; *Ny.* 609–10; *So.* 644; *Sw.* 52–6; *T.T.* 375–7; *U.* 273–4.
Voluntary *Ba.* 49–50; *Be.* 43, 47–50; *E.A.* 110; *K.* 170, 173, 178; *N.R.* 482, 489; *Ny.* 600, 605; *So.* 643, 645; *Sw.* 43, 52, 56; *T.T.* 377; *U.* 265, 268, 272, 275. *See also under* Asiatics, Indians, Europeans, Non-Africans, Slaves.
Birthplace *Ba.* 17, 21, 27–8; *M.* 793, 801, 805–13; *Sey.* 916, 923–4; *Sw.* 28, 34. *See also under* Asiatics, Birth and Death Registration (Forms), Coloured, Countries, Enumeration (Forms), Europeans, Indians, Migrant Labourers, Non-Africans, Origin, Slaves.
Birth-rate:
Computed from recorded births and estimated population *Ba.* 65–6, 72; *K.* 184; *M.* 851, 862–3, 868, 870; *N.R.* 493–7, 501, 516, 518; *Ny.* 616; *Sey.* 933–4; *T.T.* 367–72; *U.* 279–84, 286–7, 306; *Z.* 665–7, 672.
Derived from ratio of infants to total population *Ba.* 65–6; *Sw.* 82.
Estimated from the age-composition of the population *Ny.* 635; *Z.* 670–1.
Inflated by inclusion of births occurring outside registration-area by inclusion of still-births *Ny.* 616—by under-statement of population *M.* 871; *U.* 280.
Reduced by incomplete registration *M.* 869; *U.* 279; *Z.* 665–7—by absence of parents *N.R.* 493, 496—by over-statement of population *N.R.* 518; *U.* 281—by preponderance of men *M.* 869; *Z.* 666, 673—by return of pregnant women to native villages *Z.* 666, 672, 678.
Birth Registration:
Defective *Ba.* 43–4; *Be.* 43–4; *E.A.* 112; *K.* 112, 179–80, 187, 190, 212; *M.* 784, 841–3, 848–9, 854, 868–70, 885; *N.R.* 483–5, 493–4; *Sw.* 43–4; *T.T.* 363, 367–73, 378, 393; *U.* 112, 268–72, 279–81, 284, 320; *Z.* 112, 652, 661–8, 671–3, 678, 681–4. *See also under* Still-births.
Delayed *Be.* 47–8, 51–2; *K.* 177–8, 184; *M.* 784, 848; *N.R.* 490, 492; *Sey.* 928; *Sw.* 57; *T.T.* 377; *U.* 273, 275; *Z.* 656.
Time limit *Be.* 47, 50–1; *E.A.* 110; *German East Africa* 375; *K.* 110,

Birth Registration (*cont.*)
173–4, 176–7; *M.* 840, 842, 845, 848, 850, 928; *N.R.* 110, 487–8, 491; *Ny.* 110, 610; *Sey.* 928; *So.* 110, 644; *Sw.* 56; *T.T.* 110, 370, 376; *U.* 110, 265, 273, 275; *Z.* 110, 656, 658. *See also under* Birth and Death Registration.
Births:
Early notification demanded *M.* 847–8.
Illegitimate *K.* 177–8, 188; *M.* 828, 830–1, 838, 850; *N.R.* 489, 491; *Ny.* 610; *Sey.* 925; *So.* 644; *Sw.* 55; *T.T.* 376; *U.* 275; *Z.* 658.
Multiple *Sw.* 55; *U.* 117, 276–7.
Numbers ascertained at census *M.* 714, 817–18; *N.R.* 518–19.
Numbers ascertained at routine tours *K.* 185, 189–90; *Ny.* 607.
Numbers ascertained by questioning women about total births *Ba.* 44, 58; *Be.* 44–5, 72, 80; *E.A.* 114–15; *K.* 115, 185, 188–9; *N.R.* 493; *Ny.* 602–4, 608, 614–15, 617; *Sw.* 45, 81, 86; *T.T.* 373–4, 379–81, 392; *Z.* 115, 667–9, 678.
Numbers derived from informal records of missions *Ny.* 601–2, 608, 611–12, 627.
Numbers derived from informal records of Native Authorities *N.R.* 482–4, 493–5; *Ny.* 600–2, 605–8, 616, 627; *So.* 647; *T.T.* 367.
Numbers derived from records of baptisms *Ny.* 608.
Numbers registered *K.* 181, 184, 187, 190; *M.* 817–18, 842–3, 849–50, 852–4, 856–63, 869–72, 898–900; *Sey.* 933–4; *T.T.* 367–71, 393–4; *U.* 240, 271, 279–84, 286–7, 302, 320; *Z.* 660–4, 666, 672–3, 678, 683–4.
Sex *M.* 851–4, 856–63, 871–2; *N.R.* 495; *Ny.* 618; *Sey.* 934; *So.* 647; *T.T.* 349, 372; *U.* 116–17, 284, 286–7. *See also under* Europeans, Fertility, Indians, Still-births.
Bisa (tribe) *N.R.* 498.
Bismarckburg *K.* 327.
Blackwater fever *E.A.* 119; *see also under* Europeans.
Blantyre *Ny.* 530, 533–4, 536–7, 539, 547, 551, 555, 564, 569, 580, 588–9, 594, 609, 615, 620–1, 627, 630.
Bledisloe Commission, 119, 423, 461–2, 501, 506–7, 514, 572, 594, 636, 686.
Bloemfontein, 441.
Blunt, W., Acting Deputy Director of Agriculture *K.* 223.
Boedeker, Dr. H. A., 197–8.
Boer, Dr. H. S. de, 694.
Boer War, 19–20, 35, 41, 86.
Bokalaka (area) *Be.* 80.
Bombay, born in, *Sey.* 924; *see also under* Indians, *M.*
Bombo, Internees Camp, *U.* 251.
Bompar, Comptroller of the Navy, *M.* 758.
Bonaparte, Napoleon, 722, 790.
Bonaparte, Prince Roland, 743–4, 941.
Bonnefoy, T., 707–8, 711, 715, 723, 752, 754, 790, 840, 937.
Bonnetard, N. G., 945.
Booby Island *Sey.* 927.
Bordeaux, prostitutes from, *M.* 753.
Borneo, born in, *K.* 157.
Botlete River *Be.* 25.
Boullé, V., Census Commissioner *Sey.* 945.
Bourbon, *see under* Réunion.
Bourde de la Rogerie, H., 710–12, 745, 747–8, 753, 755–7, 760, 839, 902–3, 941.
Bourdonnais, B. F. Mahé de La, 750, 752–6, 789, 793, 879, 902–3, 941–3.
Bourdonnais, L. C. Mahé de La, 941.
Bouvet, Acting Governor *M.*, 707.
Bown, Herbert, 689.
Boyanke-Tsau *Be.* 79.
Boyne, de, 903.
Bradley, J. T., 903, 905–6, 909–10, 922, 946.
Brayer du Barré, 903.
Brazil, born in, *K.* 161; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sey.* 924; *U.* 260.
Bremersdorp, Maternity and Child Welfare Centre *Sw.* 45, 81, 86.
Bretons *M.* 710.
British *Ba.* 27, 38; *E.A.* 103, 105; *K.* 105, 158, 163–4; *M.* 813–14, 895; *N.R.* 105, 477–8; *Ny.* 105, 592, 597; *Sey.* 922, 924; *So.* 103, 105, 643; *Sw.* 41–2; *T.T.* 103, 105, 345, 355, 357–8, 384; *U.* 105, 261, 264; *Z.* 100, 654, 681.
British East Africa Company, 236.
British Guiana, born in, *K.* 161; *M.* 812; *Ny.* 593, 597; *Sey.* 924.
British Honduras, born in, *K.* 161.
British Oceania, born in, *Ba.* 36; *E.A.* 103; *K.* 159, 161, 164; *M.* 811; *N.R.* 475; *Ny.* 592; *T.T.* 356; *U.* 259.
British South Africa Company, 402, 414–15, 417, 419, 438–43, 505, 520, 550, 552, 630.
British West Indies, born in, *K.* 161; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 597–8; *U.* 260–1.
Broken Hill *N.R.* 403–4, 420, 424, 436–7, 453–4, 487, 502–3, 506–7, 511.
Bronchitis *Sey.* 917.
Broome, Lieutenant-Governor *M.*, 743, 783, 787, 801.
Bruce, Sir Charles, 744, 797, 941.
Brunet, P., 761, 941.

Buckingham and Chandos, Duke of, 781, 787, 876.
Budâma District *U.* 245, 252, 269, 281, 285, 288, 302, 305.
Buell, Raymond Leslie, 201, 279, 442, 452, 688.
Buganda *E.A.* 112, 116–17, 119–20; *U.* 231, 234–6, 239–41, 245–7, 251, 253–4, 256–8, 265–6, 268–9, 271, 276–80, 282, 284–7, 289–93, 296, 300, 302, 304–6, 309–11, 313–17, 320–2, 695.
Buganda Kingdom, *see under* Buganda.
Buganda Province, *see under* Buganda.
Bugerere, County of, *U.* 293.
Bugishu District *U.* 245, 252, 281, 302, 305.
Bugomba Sultanate *T.T.* 332–3, 371.
Bugufi *T.T.* 385.
Bugwere District *U.* 245, 252, 269, 281, 287, 302, 305.
Bukedi District *U.* 296.
Bukoba (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Bukoba District *T.T.* 247, 327, 340, 345, 349, 371, 381–3, 394–5.
Bulawayo Labour Bureau *N.R.* 438–40.
Bulemezi County *U.* 293.
BULGARIA:
Born in, *K.* 160.
Nationality *T.T.* 358.
Bulbar *So.* 640.
Bulungwa Sultanate *T.T.* 332, 371.
Bumbireh *U.* 237.
Bumbuli Mission Hospital *T.T.* 383.
Bunyoro District *E.A.* 113; *U.* 232, 252, 266, 280, 282, 284–5, 288, 291–3, 303–6, 315, 320–2.
Bunyoro Kingdom *U.* 321.
Bura area *K.* 213.
Buramo Township *So.* 646–7.
Burao Township *So.* 646–7.
Burden, G. N., 559, 565–6, 576, 702.
Burgh-Edwardes, S. B. de, 745, 748–9, 755, 873–5, 941.
BURIALS:
and death registration *Be.* 51; *E.A.* 111; *K.* 111, 177, 184; *M.* 783, 850; *N.R.* 111, 491; *Ny.* 610; *Sey.* 929, 932; *So.* 111, 644, 646; *Sw.* 507; *T.T.* 111, 376, 378; *U.* 111, 275; *Z.* 111, 656–7.
Numbers *M.* 843, 850, 879; *So.* 645–6.
Outside authorized cemeteries *K.* 184; *T.T.* 368.
Permits *German East Africa* 363; *K.* 173, 177, 181–4; *M.* 845; *N.R.* 493; *Sey.* 928–9, 932; *So.* 646–7; *T.T.* 363, 378; *Z.* 657, 659, 664.
Registration *M.* 839–40.
Burma, born in, *M.* 812; *Ny.* 593, 597–8; *Sey.* 924.
Burton, Richard Francis, 680.
Buruli Subdivision *U.* 293, 316.
Busago District *U.* 266.
Busangi Sultanate *T.T.* 332, 371.
Bushmen *Be.* 25.
Busoga District *U.* 232, 235, 238–9, 245, 252, 276, 282, 285, 289–93, 296–8, 302, 305, 316, 318–22, 695.
Bussy, de, 873.
Butala *U.* 249.
Butiaba *U.* 310.
Buvuma Island *U.* 292.
Buxton, Major, 135–6.
Bwana-Mkubwa Mine *N.R.* 420, 453–4, 511.
Bwera *U.* 237.

Caille, Abbé de la, 746.
Calcutta, *see under* Indians.
Calder, Mr., 398.
Caltaux, L., 742.
'Camp of the Blacks' *M.* 758.
Campbell, District Commissioner *K.* 134.
Canada, born in, *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *K.* 161; *M.* 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *U.* 260.
Canadians *Ba.* 38; *T.T.* 357.
CAPE COLONY:
Basutoland annexed to, 1.
Birth and Death Registrations Act in force in *Be.* 43, 45–51.
British Bechuanaland handed over to, 24.
Dutch leaving *M.* for, 744–5.
Legislation applied to *Ba.* 43, 49.
Model for *Ba.* census, 10.
Smallpox brought from *Ba.* 68.
Tuberculosis brought from *Ba.* 70.
Typhus brought from *Ba.* 70.
Venereal disease brought from *Ba.* 59, 62.
See also under Union of South Africa.
Capitation Tax, *see under* Poll-tax.
Cardwell, Secretary of State, 787, 800.
Cargados Carayos *M.* 888.
Carrier Corps *K.* 201.
Carter, W. Morris, 692.
Casalis, E., 17, 68, 91.
Cascade *Sey.* 919.
Cave, Basil S., 661, 670–1.
Cemeteries, *see under* Burials.
Censuses:
Definition, 95.
Legislation *Ba.* 1–3, 5, 12; *Be.* 1, 3, 5–6, 12; *E.A.* 95; *K.* 95–7, 126; *M.* 709–11, 713, 724–7, 729–41, 747, 885; *N.R.* 95, 410–14; *Ny.* 95, 522–4, 529–30; *Sey.* 885, 901; *So.* 95, 640–1; *Sw.* 1–6, 12–13; *T.T.* 95, 325, 335–8; *U.* 95–7, 230; *Z.* 95–7, 650.
METHODS AND RESULTS:
Basutoland *1875*: 1, 10, 17, 23, 35; *1891*: 1, 10, 18–19, 23, 28–9, 35, 38;

Censuses (*cont.*)
1904: 1, 10–11, 20, 23, 28–9, 35; *1911*: 1, 11, 20, 23, 27–31, 35, 65; *1921*: 1, 11, 21, 23, 27–31, 35–6, 38–40, 65–6; *1936*: 1–3, 5, 21–3, 27–31, 35–6, 38–41, 66; *1946*: 12.
Bechuanaland *1936*: 1, 3, 5–6, 23–4, 40–1, 73; *1946*: 12–13.
Kenya *1911*: 95, 147, 159; *1921*: 95, 147–8, 156–61, 164–6, 168; *1926*: 95, 131, 147–8, 156–61, 164–6, 168; *1931*: 95, 100–1, 104–8, 126–7, 132, 147, 156–68, 170.
Mauritius, general, 712; *1735*: 753; *1811*: 713; *1836*: 774; *1846*: 773, 777–8, 800, 803, 806; *1851*: 773, 777–8, 800–1, 803, 888, 891; *1861*: 741–2, 778, 783, 800–1, 806; *1871*: 742, 778, 782–3, 801, 806, 813; *1881*: 742, 778, 801, 806, 813, 891; *1891*: 742, 778, 801, 813, 891; *1901*: 742, 778, 802, 813; *1911*: 778, 803–4, 814, 817–18; *1921*: 778, 784, 804–5, 814, 817–18, 833, 837, 891; *1931*: 778, 805–6, 814, 817–18, 833, 835, 837, 891; *1944*: 778, 787, 806–7, 817–18, 833–7, 888, 891.
Mombasa *1926*: 156; *1931*: 95, 126–7, 132, 151, 156, 339.
Nairobi *1931*: 95, 126–7, 132.
Northern Rhodesia *1911*: 11, 95, 410, 417, 419; *1921*: 95, 410–11, 416–17, 419, 423, 476, 478; *1931*: 95, 104–8, 409–13, 416–17, 419, 421, 423–4, 432–3, 436, 474–80, 482, 518; *1946*: 413–14.
Nyasaland *1911*: 95, 522, 592; *1921*: 95, 523–4, 532, 592–4, 596–7; *1926*: 95, 524, 532, 592–4; *1931*: 95, 104–8, 524, 532, 592–9; *1945*: 95, 100–1, 524, 529–30, 532, 596–7.
Seychelles *1809*: 906; *1826*: 913; *1881*: 917, 921; *1891*: 922; *1901*: 921–2; *1911*: 921, 923; *1921*: 921, 923; *1931*: 902, 917, 921, 923.
Somaliland *1911*: 640–1; *1921*: 640–2; *1931*: 104–6, 108, 640–3.
Swaziland *1904*: 1, 23, 26, 29, 34, 42; *1911*: 1, 12, 23, 26, 29–30, 34, 42; *1921*: 1, 12, 23, 26, 29–31, 34, 37, 42–3, 82, 87; *1936*: 1, 3–6, 23, 26, 29–30, 34, 37, 42–3, 82; *1946*: 13.
Tanganyika Territory *1921*: 95, 100–1, 335, 339, 352–3, 358, 360; *1931*: 95, 100–1, 104–7, 336–41, 352–3, 356–62.
Uganda *1911*: 95, 230–1, 250–1, 264; *1921*: 95, 230, 250–1, 259–60, 264; *1931*: 95, 101, 104–7, 230, 233–4, 250–2, 259–65.
Zanzibar *1921*: 95, 101, 650, 682.
Need for *E.A.* 97, 125; *K.* 128–33, 138, 143, 146, 154, 210, 215, 218–19; *M.* 725, 732; *N.R.* 405, 517; *T.T.* 335.
Unpopularity of Census Officers *M.* 742.
See also under Enumerations, Enumerators, Slaves.
Central Africa, venereal diseases, 672.
Central Alien Tax Bureau, number of adult foreigners based on, *N.R.* 445.
Central Development Committee *T.T.* 342, 381–2, 384, 386.
Central District (Uganda), 281, 291.
Central Kavirondo, *see under* Kavirondo.
Central N'goniland, *see under* N'goni.
Central Province (Kenya), 205–6, 320.
Central Province (Northern Rhodesia), 427, 431, 465, 468, 473, 485.
Central Province (Nyasaland), 532, 534–5, 554, 580, 590–1, 600, 604, 613, 627.
Central Province (Tanganyika), 327–8, 340, 342, 346–7, 385, 387, 390–1.
Central Province (Uganda), 320.
Central Shire, *see under* Shire.
Central Shire District, *see under* Shire.
Cerebrospinal meningitis *German East Africa* 619; *K.* 201–2, 205; *Ny.* 619; *T.T.* 386–7; *U.* 295–7.
Cerfs Island *M.* 909–10, 912–13, 918–19.
Ceylon, born in, *K.* 157–8, 161–2; *M.* 811–12, 894; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260–1.
Chaani District *Z.* 665, 671.
Chagga (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Chagos Archipelago *M.* 886.
Chaki Chaki *Z.* 656–9, 661, 665.
Chambishi Mine *N.R.* 420.
Channel Islands, born in, *Ny.* 593, 598.
Chapotin, Ch., 869, 879, 941.
Charpentier-Cossigny, Joseph-François, 873, 889, 941.
Charron, K. C., 389, 697.
Chazal, Dr. A. E. de, 878–80, 939.
Chazal, M. de, 773.
Chendo—Fort Hill *Ny.* 560.
Chewa (tribe) *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 615.
Chewa-Chipeta (tribe) *Ny.* 588, 613.
Chiengi District *N.R.* 405.
Chikala *Ny.* 551.
Chikunda (tribe) *Ny.* 537–8, 588, 615, 635.
Chikwawa District *Ny.* 533–4, 541, 547, 555, 564, 569, 580–1, 588, 603–4, 607, 616, 637.
Childbirth *Ny.* 626; *U.* 301.
CHILDLESSNESS:
Causes *Ba.* 62; *K.* 188–9, 195; *Ny.* 611–13; *T.T.* 350–1; *Z.* 673.
Incidence *Be.* 62; *K.* 188–9, 195; *N.R.* 408, 493; *Ny.* 612–15; *T.T.* 350–1, 374, 379–81; *U.* 116, 284; *Z.* 668–9, 671.
See also under Births.

Child Marriage *K.* 168; *U.* 118, 315.
CHILD MORTALITY:
Causes *U.* 304.
Differential *M.* 852, 856; *T.T.* 372.
Estimates (and guesses) *Ba.* 68, 72; *E.A.* 124; *K.* 123, 139, 195, 214, 216–17, 222, 224; *M.* 883–4; *N.R.* 497, 516; *Ny.* 117, 123, 582, 600, 602, 614, 626, 628–9, 635; *Sey.* 936; *U.* 120, 304; *Z.* 670, 682.
Sex ratio *M.* 852, 855, 866; *N.R.* 494.
Statistics based on questioning at random several natives *Ny.* 629.
on questioning women about all their deceased children *Ba.* 44, 71; *Be.* 44–5; *K.* 185, 212, 214; *Ny.* 603, 608, 614–15, 617, 627–8; *Sw.* 45; *T.T.* 374, 392, 394–5; *Z.* 669.
on registered deaths *M.* 852, 855–6, 866; *N.R.* 508–9; *Sey.* 935; *Z.* 678.
CHILDREN:
Age-composition *Ba.* 29; *Be.* 31; *K.* 155; *M.* 766, 817, 819; *Ny.* 528, 582–4, 589–91, 616, 628; *Sw.* 29; *T.T.* 374.
Age-limit, upper, *Ba.* 28–9; *Be.* 29, 31; *E.A.* 102; *K.* 144, 155; *M.* 768–70, 816; *N.R.* 475, 499; *Ny.* 525, 531, 567, 582–4, 589–90; *Sw.* 29, 34; *T.T.* 331, 394–5; *U.* 231, 255; *Z.* 654–5.
Food-rationing register *Sey.* 925.
Illegitimate *K.* 188; *N.R.* 492; *Ny.* 612–13.
Malnutrition *Ba.* 69; *Be.* 74–9; *K.* 204; *Ny.* 621, 625–6; *T.T.* 350; *U.* 298–300; *Z.* 676–7.
Numbers *Ba.* 17, 28–9, 65; *Be.* 29; *K.* 97, 136–8, 153–5, 227; *M.* 760–2, 768–9, 805, 815–16, 819, 887–90; *N.R.* 403–4, 406–7, 475, 494, 496–500; *Ny.* 526, 582–6, 590–1; *Sw.* 29, 34; *T.T.* 325–6, 349–52, 354, 378, 399; *U.* 255–6; *Z.* 652, 654–5, 670.
Sex *Ba.* 29; *Be.* 29, 31; *K.* 155; *M.* 760–2, 768, 805, 817, 887–90; *N.R.* 403, 406, 496; *Ny.* 563, 567, 583, 585–6, 590–1; *Sw.* 29; *T.T.* 325–6, 349; *U.* 255–6; *Z.* 652, 654–5.
Slave raids *E.A.* 119–20; *K.* 190–1.
Wanted *Ba.* 58; *N.R.* 498; *Ny.* 612–14; *Sw.* 87.
See also under Asiatics, Coloured, Europeans, Indians, Slaves.
Children of Sultan District *T.T.* 393.
CHILE:
Born in, *K.* 161; *M.* 811–12; *U.* 260.
Nationality *M.* 813.
CHINA:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 161–2; *M.* 773, 776, 799, 808–12, 815, 894; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 597–8; *Sw.* 37, 42; *U.* 260–1.
Convicts from *M.* 744, 798.
Nationality *M.* 808, 813–14, 895; *Ny.* 592.
Chinese *K.* 157–8; *M.* 773, 776–81, 788, 793–5, 798–9, 803–8, 811–12, 814–17, 824–5, 833, 858, 894, 896–7; *N.R.* 478; *Ny.* 550; *Sey.* 923–6; *Z.* 654.
Arrivals and departures *M.* 744, 781, 798.
Chinsali District *N.R.* 497.
Chintechc District *Ny.* 534, 564, 580–1, 606, 618, 636.
Chiradzulu District *Ny.* 532–4, 547, 555, 564, 569, 580, 584, 588, 590, 615, 637.
Cholera *M.* 788, 800, 843–4, 868, 874–5, 879; *Z.* 671, 675.
Cholo District *Ny.* 533–4, 541, 546–8, 555, 564, 569, 580, 588, 608, 615, 637.
Cholo–Mlanje area *Ny.* 544.
Choma Hospital *N.R.* 506–7.
Chonge District *Z.* 665.
Christian, wives in accordance with Christian rites *Ny.* 614; *U.* 231, 258, 276.
Chua District *U.* 113, 252, 280–1, 303–5.
Chuka *K.* 185.
Church, Archibald, 188, 382, 442, 688.
Churchill, Winston Spencer, 289, 695.
Chwaka District *Z.* 660–1, 665.
Clay, G. F., 700.
Climate, effects on morbidity and mortality *Ba.* 68; *Be.* 74, 76; *E.A.* 119; *K.* 201; *N.R.* 76, 517; *Ny.* 76, 626; *Sw.* 86. *See also under* Europeans.
Clitoridectomy *T.T.* 350.
Cochin-China, born in, *M.* 894.
Code Decaen, 708, 711–12, 840–1, 937.
Code Delaleu, 869.
Code Farquhar, 713, 715, 721, 723, 725, 798, 841, 874, 911, 937.
Code noir, 707, 750.
Codrington, R., 414–15, 439–40, 630.
Coëtivy *M.* 885–6, 890–3; *Sey.* 920.
Coillard, François, 438, 497, 700.
Cole, G. Lowry, Governor, 727, 729, 759, 763, 792.
COLOURED:
Age-composition *Ba.* 39; *M.* 760, 770, 773; *N.R.* 478; *Sey.* 925; *So.* 642–3; *Sw.* 39, 42.
Baptisms, numbers, *M.* 850.
Birth and Death Registration *M.* 840.
Birthplace *Ba.* 38; *N.R.* 476; *Sw.* 42.
Births *M.* 851–2, 854, 856.
Burials, numbers, *M.* 850.

COLOURED (*cont.*)
Census, special provisions for, *N.R.* 412, 414; *South Africa High Commission Territories* 6–8, 13.
Children *M.* 760, 770, 815–16.
Conjugal condition *Sey.* 925; *So.* 642–3; *Sw.* 43.
Deaths *M.* 851–2, 854, 856, 879.
Definition *K.* 158; *Ny.* 596; *So.* 641–2; *South Africa High Commission Territories* 34–5.
Length of residence *N.R.* 477.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *N.R.* 105, 478; *So.* 105; *Sw.* 42.
Natural increase *M.* 761, 793.
Numbers *Ba.* 23, 38–9; *Be.* 23, 40; *K.* 157–8; *M.* 713, 757–8, 760, 762, 767–70, 772–3, 793, 800, 803; *N.R.* 105, 416, 423, 476, 478; *Ny.* 532, 536, 596–7; *Sey.* 904–7, 909–11; *So.* 105, 641–2; *Sw.* 23, 39, 42; *T.T.* 352, 356.
Sex *Ba.* 38–9; *Be.* 41; *M.* 760, 770, 772–3, 884; *N.R.* 478; *Ny.* 536; *Sey.* 912, 925; *So.* 642–3; *Sw.* 39, 42.
Colvile, Sir Henry, 316–18, 695.
Committee on Nutrition in the Colonial Empire, 22, 79, 87, 89, 299, 390, 625.
Committee on Statistical Services in Kenya, 133.
Comorian (tribe) *U.* 233; *Z.* 650.
Comoro:
Born in, *M.* 777.
Migration to *K.* 157; to *M.* 779–80, 792–3.
Slaves from *E.A.* 121; *M.* 792.
Conception Island *Sey.* 913, 918–19.
Concubinage *M.* 828–31, 833–7, 839; *Ny.* 540, 587, 612; *U.* 258, 276.
Conjugal condition *Ba.* 28, 30–1; *E.A.* 102; *K.* 153–6; *M.* 805, 827–33, 835–7, 839, 896–7; *Ny.* 102, 526, 582, 585, 587–8, 591–2, 603; *Sey.* 925–6; *Sw.* 30–1, 34; *U.* 102, 256–8. *See also under* Asiatics, Coloured, Europeans, Indians, Non-Africans.
Contraceptives *K.* 188; *T.T.* 378.
Convicts, *see under* India, China.
Conway, de, Governor-General, 759.
Cook, Dr. Sir Albert R., 119, 268, 270, 278–80, 289, 295–6, 298, 304, 317, 319–21, 688, 695.
Cooper, P. Ashley, 119.
Copperbelt *N.R.* 423.
Coqueval, Hilaire, 873, 941.
Cornet Spruit *Ba.* 19, 60, 68–9.
'Corvée Blacks' *M.* 769.
Coryndon (Lady Coryndon Maternity Training Centre), 270, 278, 298, 306.
Coryndon, R. T., 438, 440.
Cosmoledo *M.* 890, 892; *Sey.* 918, 920.
Counts of Population *Be.* 1, 11–12, 23–4, 29, 31, 40–1, 81; *K.* 143–4, 154–5; *M.* 751, 755–8, 762, 885, 887, 889–91, 893; *N.R.* 402–3, 405, 408–9; *Ny.* 95, 98, 117, 428–9, 522–38, 541, 543, 563–4, 567, 579–92, 600, 602–4, 611–12, 614–16, 627, 632–7; *Sey.* 904–12; *T.T.* 95, 98, 118, 325–35, 339–41, 347–52, 373, 378, 396–9; *U.* 95, 98, 230–5, 238–40, 252–8, 280, 302, 320–2; *Z.* 95, 99, 101, 650–5, 674, 681, 684–5.
Courcy-Ireland, M. G. de, 694.
Cousin Island (North Cousin) *Sey.* 913, 918–19, 927.
Cousine Island (South Cousin) *Sey.* 913, 918–19, 927.
Crean, B. A., 689.
'Creoles' *M.* 713, 749–50, 752, 761, 764, 771, 804–5, 890, 892; *Sey.* 904–5, 916, 923.
Creole Indians *M.* 793, 802, 849.
Crepin, Pierre, 753, 755, 942.
Culwick, A. T. and G. M., 329, 331, 373–4, 379–80, 394, 399, 608, 697.
Cunningham, Major, 318.
Curepipe *M.* 788.
Curieuse Island *M.* 891; *Sey.* 910, 913, 918–19, 927.
CYPRUS:
Born in; *K.* 161; *Ny.* 593, 598; *U.* 260.
Jewish refugees, 355.
CZECHO-SLOVAKIA:
Born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 811–13; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 598; *U.* 260.
Nationality *M.* 813–14; *Ny.* 597; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.

Danzig Free City, born in, *M.* 812–13; *Ny.* 598.
DAR ES SALAAM (*T.T.*):
Birth and Death Registration, 363, 368, 377–8, 400, 676.
Emigration from *Ny.* 563.
Maternity and Child Welfare, 367.
Population, 327, 335, 340, 348, 363.
Sisal conscripts recruited in, 389.
See also under Malaria.
Darling, Major-General, 723, 727, 791, 798, 874.
Darros Island *M.* 886, 892; *Sey.* 913, 918, 920.
Dauban, Dr., 875.
Dauphin (Fort), *see under* Madagascar, Slaves from *M.*
Davidson, Dr. Andrew, 787, 876–7, 899, 942.
Davidson, W. E., 903, 905–7.
Davies, E. R. St. A., Municipal Native Affairs Officer *K.*, 211.

Davis, J. Merle, 442, 445, 451–2, 455–6, 472, 509, 511, 700.
Death-Rate:
Computed from recorded deaths and estimated population *Ba.* 65–6, 72; *K.* 183–4, 200, 202, 204; *M.* 849, 858, 864–5, 868; *N.R.* 518, 520; *Ny.* 616, 619; *Sey.* 933–4; *Z.* 665, 667, 674–6.
Estimated *K.* 123–4, 141–3; *M.* 879; *N.R.* 403; *T.T.* 367–72; *U.* 269, 282–3; 286–7, 302–3, 307–8.
Inflated by hospitals, &c., in registration area *M.* 882—by inclusion of deaths occurring outside registration area *K.* 183—by understatement of population *M.* 882–3; *U.* 302; *Z.* 674.
Reduced by incomplete registration *Z.* 665, 667—by overstatement of population *M.* 882—by removal of sick persons outside registration area *T.T.* 363–4.
Death Registration:
Defective *Ba.* 44, 50; *Be.* 43–4; *E.A.* 112; *K.* 112, 179–80, 183–4, 190; *M.* 783–4, 841–3, 849–50, 877, 880–1; *Ny.* 609; *Sey.* 902, 917, 921; *So.* 647; *Sw.* 43–4; *T.T.* 363, 367–73, 676; *U.* 112–13, 268–72, 302–3, 320; *Z.* 112, 652, 661–8, 674–6, 683–4. *See also under* Infant Deaths.
Delayed *Be.* 52; *K.* 177–8; *N.R.* 490, 492; *Sey.* 928; *Sw.* 57; *T.T.* 377; *U.* 273, 275; *Z.* 657.
Time limit *Be.* 46, 50–1; *E.A.* 111; *German East Africa* 375; *K.* 111, 173–4, 176–7, 181–2; *M.* 842, 845; *N.R.* 111, 488, 491; *Ny.* 111, 610; *Sey.* 928–9; *So.* 111, 644, 646; *Sw.* 57; *T.T.* 111, 370, 376; *U.* 111, 265, 273, 275; *Z.* 111, 657. *See also under* Birth and Death Registration, Infant Deaths.
Deaths:
Age of deceased *M.* 851–3, 855, 858, 866–7; *Sey.* 935; *T.T.* 399; *U.* 306; *Z.* 679–80, 682.
Notifications *M.* 709.
Numbers ascertained at census *M.* 714, 817–18.
Numbers ascertained at routine tours *K.* 185, 190; *Ny.* 607.
Numbers ascertained by counting funeral processions *So.* 645.
Numbers ascertained by counting interments *So.* 645–6.
Numbers derived from informal records of missions *Ny.* 601–2, 608, 619.
Numbers derived from informal records of Native Authorities *Ny.* 600–2, 605–8, 616; *So.* 647; *T.T.* 363, 367.
Numbers derived from records of burials *T.T.* 378.
Numbers registered *K.* 183, 190; *M.* 817–18, 842–3, 852–61, 864–7, 875, 877, 881, 898–900; *Sey.* 933–4; *T.T.* 367–71; *U.* 240, 271, 282–3, 286–7, 302–3, 320; *Z.* 660–2, 667, 674–5, 683–4.
Numbers reported by employers *K.* 140–3.
Sex *M.* 851–61, 864–7, 882; *Sey.* 934; *So.* 647; *U.* 349.
See also under Asiatics, Europeans, Infant Deaths, Mortality.
Deacon, General, 712, 840–1, 887, 906, 943.
Deele, Lionel, 550, 703.
Dedza District *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 533–4, 547, 551, 555, 564, 569, 580, 583, 588, 603–4, 608, 611–12, 637.
De Hoek, migration from Nyasaland, 563.
Delaleu, 707–11, 757, 759, 937.
Delamere, Lord, 128, 131, 692.
Delaunay, Sieur, 903.
Demuth, Walter E., 701.
Denis Island *Sey.* 913, 918, 920.
Denmark:
Born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 811–12, 894; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 598; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Ny.* 597; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Density of population Barbados 787; *Ba.* 22; *Be.* 25; Bermuda 787; *E.A.* 102, 120; *K.* 102, 149, 194, 198, 220, 225, 237; *M.* 747, 787, 877, 879, 888; *N.R.* 102, 415, 423, 425–7, 437, 482, 516; *Ny.* 102, 532–4, 539, 637; *Sey.* 917; *So.* 102, 641; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 102, 328, 339–43, 396, 398; *U.* 102, 236–8, 252, 314, 316, 319; *Z.* 102, 651, 677.
Dentally diseased *T.T.* 389.
Dentists *T.T.* 384.
Dervishes *U.* 319.
Desneufs Island *Sey.* 920.
Desroches Island *M.* 885, 892; *Sey.* 913, 918, 920.
Diarrhoea *N.R.* 508–9; *T.T.* 391. *See also under* Europeans, Slave-ships.
Diego Garcia Island *M.* 885–6, 889, 891–2, 900; *Sey.* 904.
Diet deficiencies, *see under* Infant Mortality, Malnutrition.
Digo District *K.* 143–4, 150, 154–5, 157, 185, 189–90, 214.
La Digue Island *Sey.* 906, 909–10, 912–13, 916, 918–19, 927, 929–30.
Dilley, Marjorie Ruth, 217, 691.

Diseases, dissemination through greater mobility *Ba.* 59, 62–3, 68–71; *Be.* 78–9; *K.* 207; *Ny.* 619; *Sw.* 82–5; *T.T.* 326, 378, 381, 386, 397; *U.* 244, 250, 277, 279, 290–5, 300, 307–11, 313. *See also under* Absentees (Demographic effects).
Diseases, Knowledge of Incidence Inadequate:
Cholera *M.* 874.
General *K.* 189, 203–5, 220; *M.* 879; *N.R.* 517; *Ny.* 606; *T.T.* 365.
Leprosy *T.T.* 386.
Malaria *K.* 206; *M.* 877–8; *Sw.* 86.
Smallpox *M.* 873.
Tuberculosis *Ba.* 71; *K.* 208; *Ny.* 625; *U.* 300.
Venereal diseases *Ba.* 60, 63–4; *Be.* 73; *K.* 188–90; *Ny.* 624; *Sw.* 82; *T.T.* 326, 381.
Dodoma District *T.T.* 326–7, 340, 390–2.
Dodoma Township *T.T.* 381.
Donge *Z.* 672.
Dowa District *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 533–4, 547, 555, 562, 564, 569, 580, 585, 588, 614–15.
Duff, H. L., 630, 688.
Dufour, Captain Sieur, 748, 944.
Dufresne, Captain, 747–8.
Duke, Dr., 292.
Dumas, Governor *M.* 793.
Dundas, Sir Charles, 121, 249–50, 300, 392, 688.
Dundas, Commander, 193.
Durban, Nyasaland Natives in, 563.
Durongouët Le Toullec, Major, 748.
Dutch East India Company, 743–5.
Dutch East Indies, born in, *K.* 161–2.
Dutch occupation of *M.*, 707, 743–6, 797, 815.
Dysentery *K.* 200–2; *M.* 879, 899; *Sw.* 83, 85; *U.* 296–7, 307–8, 316. *See also under* Europeans.

Eagle Island *M.* 886, 893, 900; *Sey.* 918.
'Earl-Hett Report', 312.
East Africa Commission, 133, 145, 188, 218, 285, 289, 321, 326, 381–2, 396–8, 453, 507, 539, 554, 557, 613, 627, 633–4.
East Griqualand, migration from, *Ba.* 18.
East Igalula District *T.T.* 393.
East India Company *M.* 794, 797.
East Luangwa District *N.R.* 426.
East Luangwa Province *N.R.* 405, 418, 423–4, 427, 432, 449, 452, 455, 457, 475, 494.
Eastern Province (*Northern Rhodesia*), 423, 427–31, 437, 458, 460–2, 464–5, 468, 473, 485, 497, 505–6.
Eastern Province (*Tanganyika*), 327, 340, 342–3, 345, 348, 385, 387, 389.
Eastern Province (Uganda), 207, 238, 240, 245–7, 252, 254, 256–8, 269–71, 281, 286–7, 291–2, 295, 297, 302–3, 305, 318–19.
Eastern Suburb, *see under* Port Louis *M.*
Eastleigh Township *K.* 183.
Egypt, born in, *E.A.* 103; *K.* 160, 162; *M.* 811–12; *Ny.* 598; *Sey.* 924; *U.* 259, 261.
Egyptians *K.* 157; *So.* 642.
Eldama Ravine *K.* 183.
Eldoret *K.* 183.
Elgeyo District *K.* 150.
Elgin, Earl of, 147, 290.
Eliot, Sir Charles, 120, 122, 146, 148, 190–2, 196, 199, 215–16, 691–2.
Elisabethville *N.R.* 455, 457–8.
Ellenberger, D. Fred., 16, 91.
Elliot, J. R. McD., 694.
Elmoran, *see under* Masai.
Embu (tribe) *U.* 233.
Embu District *K.* 133–4, 150, 183, 225.
Emigration *Ba.* 16–22; *Be.* 24; *K.* 191, 246, 344; *M.* 789, 791, 794–7, 885; *N.R.* 98, 405, 424, 427–31, 439, 475, 515, 537–8; *Ny.* 405–6, 424, 426–8, 513, 536, 543, 550, 555, 566, 572, 582, 585, 587–8, 605, 636; *Sey.* 156, 908, 913–14, 917, 921; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 151, 245–6, 346, 538; *U.* 151, 232, 317; *Z.* 651–2, 673, 682–5; *see also under* Asiatics (Arrivals and Departures), Europeans (Arrivals and Departures), Indians (Arrivals and Departures).
Empire Marketing Board *Ny.* 634.
Emru District *K.* 133.
England and Wales, born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *M.* 894; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
English *K.* 156; *T.T.* 357. *See also under* British.
Ennis, G. F. M., 692.
Entebbe District *U.* 252, 285, 288, 292, 305; Internees Camp, 251; Town, 253.
Enumerations:
Area *E.A.* 97; *K.* 126, 132; *M.* 709–11, 724, 726, 735–6, 738–41; *So.* 640; *T.T.* 335–6, 338.
Attitude of Natives *Ba.* 10; *K.* 129–30, 132, 135, 137; *M.* 742, 805; *T.T.* 331, 333, 335; *Z.* 681.
Cost *Ba.* 12; *Be.* 12; *Gold Coast* 529; *K.* 127; *M.* 743; *N.R.* 412–13; *Ny.* 525, 528–9, 531–2; *Sw.* 12; *T.T.* 331, 333, 338–9; *Z.* 529, 651.
Defective *Ba.* 17, 20–1; *Be.* 11–12, 24, 31, 81; *K.* 127, 132; *M.* 712–14, 725, 742, 773, 783, 787, 801, 803–5, 808, 813, 817–19, 827, 829; *N.R.* 412;

Enumerations (*cont.*)
Ny. 524–9, 531–2, 538, 567, 581–5, 597–91, 633–5, 637; *Sw.* 26, 87; *T.T.* 325–31, 333–5, 348–51, 396–9; *U.* 231–5, 240, 253–6, 321–2; *Z.* 650–1, 681.
Forms *Ba.* 2–3, 5–16, 22; *Be.* 5–6, 8–10, 12–16; *K.* 96, 127; *M.* 711, 713, 725, 732–7, 739–41, 802, 804–5; *N.R.* 410–14; *Ny.* 522–6, 530–1; *So.* 640; *Sw.* 3–4, 6, 8–9, 13–16; *T.T.* 336–8, 397; *U.* 96, 230–1, 651; *Z.* 96, 99, 650–1.
Native Authorities' co-operation *Ba.* 10–11; *Be.* 11; *K.* 130; *Ny.* 522, 530–1, 589; *T.T.* 98, 329–31, 333; *U.* 98, 231. *See also under* Censuses, Counts.
Enumerators *Ba.* 2–3, 5, 10–11; *Be.* 2–3, 5–6, 13; *E.A.* 102; *K.* 96, 127, 130; *M.* 737–43, 802, 804; *N.R.* 410–14; *Ny.* 98, 522–3, 525–32, 579, 582–3, 589–90, 636; *So.* 640; *Sw.* 3–6; *T.T.* 331, 333, 337–9; *U.* 96–7, 230–1; *Z.* 96, 650.
Epinay, Adrien de, 714, 731, 746–8, 750, 755–7, 761, 791, 840, 873, 942, 944.
Erigavo Township *So.* 646–7.
Esnouf, Commandant of the Seychelles, 906.
Esthonia:
Born in, *K.* 160.
Nationality *T.T.* 358.
Estimates of Population:
Defective *E.A.* 99, 120; *K.* 97–8, 128, 130, 132–9, 143, 146–8, 215, 217–19, 222, 224–5; *M.* 757, 759, 781, 783–4, 787, 849, 868, 883, 888; *N.R.* 98, 402–9, 414–15, 417, 419–21, 423–5, 515, 518; *Ny.* 98, 525–7, 531, 535–6, 572, 594, 630–3; *Sey.* 921; *So.* 97, 641, 648; *T.T.* 98, 325–9, 333, 343, 347; *U.* 98–9, 232, 235–40, 251, 253, 270, 280, 302, 314, 320–1; *Z.* 99, 651–2, 680.
Methods *K.* 97–8, 128, 130, 133–9, 148, 217, 224; *M.* 723–4, 787; *N.R.* 98, 402–9, 415–17, 420; *Ny.* 525, 531, 535, 629–32; *Sey.* 921; *So.* 97, 641, 648; *Sw.* 25; *T.T.* 98, 326–33, 343, 347, 399; *U.* 231–2, 235–6, 240, 270; *Z.* 651–3, 681, 685.
Results *Ba.* 17–20, 22, 65; *Be.* 24–5; *E.A.* 99, 120, 123; *K.* 96–9, 122, 138–9, 142, 144–52, 158–9, 215, 217–19, 221–5; *M.* 785, 888; *N.R.* 96, 403–9, 414–21, 423–5, 427, 437, 516; *Ny.* 98, 526–7, 531, 535–6, 538, 541, 543, 572, 581–2, 591, 593–4, 596, 616, 629–36; *Sey.* 902, 916, 921–2; *So.* 97, 641, 648; *Sw.* 25–6; *T.T.* 98, 325–7, 333, 343, 347–8, 396–7, 399; *U.* 98–9, 120, 122, 232, 235–40, 250–1, 253, 280, 302, 313–14, 320–2; *Z.* 99, 650–5, 674–5, 680–2, 684–5.
Ethiopia, *see under* Abyssinia.
Eurafricans *Be.* 77.
Eurasians *K.* 146; *Ny.* 638; *So.* 645; *Z.* 680.
European Advisory Council, 40, 79–80.
Europeans:
Absentees *Ny.* 593; *Sw.* 26.
Age-Composition:
General *Ba.* 38–9; *Be.* 41; *E.A.* 106, 108; *K.* 106, 163, 165–8; *M.* 760, 762, 773; *N.R.* 106, 478–80, 482; *Ny.* 106, 594–6, 598–9; *Sey.* 925–6; *So.* 642–3; *Sw.* 39, 42; *T.T.* 106, 359–61; *U.* 106, 262–4; *Z.* 654–5.
Officials *E.A.* 108–9, 169; *K.* 169; *N.R.* 481; *Ny.* 594–5; *So.* 643; *T.T.* 362; *U.* 264; *Z.* 655.
Arrivals and departures *Ba.* 19–20, 35; *Be.* 40, 419; *E.A.* 99–100; *K.* 100, 146–9; *M.* 744, 746, 748–9, 761, 788, 809, 886–7; *N.R.* 419–21; *Ny.* 419, 592–4; *Sey.* 903, 909; *So.* 642; *Sw.* 41–2; *T.T.* 352–5, 358; *U.* 250–1.
Baptisms, numbers, *M.* 850.
Birth and Death Registration:
Compulsory *Ba.* 49–50; *Be.* 45–6, 49–50, 87–8; *E.A.* 110, 112; *German East Africa* 375; *K.* 110, 112, 170–1, 177, 179; *M.* 840; *N.R.* 110, 112, 488–9; *Ny.* 110, 112, 600, 609, 638; *So.* 110, 112, 643–5; *T.T.* 110, 112, 363, 375–7, 399; *U.* 110, 112, 272–5, 322; *Z.* 110, 112, 656–61, 663–4.
Defective *E.A.* 112; *K.* 112, 179, 227; *N.R.* 112, 125, 493, 518; *Ny.* 609, 638; *T.T.* 378; *U.* 323.
Legislation *Ba.* 49; *Be.* 45–6; *German East Africa* 375; *K.* 170; *M.* 840; *N.R.* 488–93; *Ny.* 600, 609; *So.* 643–4; *T.T.* 375; *U.* 272.
Voluntary *Be.* 88; *Ny.* 609; *So.* 643.
Birthplace *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104–5, 156, 159–61, 163–4; *M.* 805; *N.R.* 103–5, 419, 475–7; *Ny.* 104–5, 592–3, 597–8; *Sey.* 924; *So.* 105; *Sw.* 37, 42; *T.T.* 104–5, 356–7; *U.* 103–5, 259–61, 264.
Births, numbers, *Ba.* 49; *Be.* 87; *E.A.* 125; *K.* 181, 184, 227–8; *M.* 851–2, 854, 856; *N.R.* 493, 517–18, 520; *Ny.* 638; *So.* 645; *Sw.* 88; *T.T.* 399; *U.* 322–3; *Z.* 685.
Blackwater fever *N.R.* 520; *U.* 323.
Burials, numbers, *M.* 850, 879.
Census, special provisions for, *Ba.* 6–7; *Be.* 6–8; *Sw.* 6–8.

Europeans (*cont.*)
Children *Ba.* 35; *E.A.* 106; *K.* 106, 165, 168, 228; *M.* 760, 762, 815–16, 883, 887–90; *N.R.* 106, 420, 478–80, 520; *Ny.* 106, 594–5, 598–9; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 106, 359–61; *U.* 106, 262, 264; *Z.* 654.
Climate, effects of, *N.R.* 520.
Concessions to *Sw.* 41.
Conjugal condition *Be.* 39–40; *E.A.* 107–8; *K.* 107–8, 166–8, 170; *N.R.* 107–8, 480, 482; *Ny.* 107, 595–6, 599; *Sey.* 925–6; *So.* 642–3; *Sw.* 40, 43; *T.T.* 107, 360–2; *U.* 107–8, 262–5.
Deaths *Ba.* 49; *Be.* 87–8; *E.A.* 125; *K.* 184, 227–8; *M.* 851–2, 854, 856, 879; *N.R.* 518, 520; *Ny.* 638; *Sey.* 936; *So.* 645; *Sw.* 88; *T.T.* 400; *U.* 322–3; *Z.* 685.
Definition *K.* 156; *South Africa High Commission Territories*, 34.
Fertility *Ba.* 35; *Be.* 87–8; *E.A.* 125; *M.* 869; *N.R.* 518–19; *Ny.* 638; *Sw.* 88; *U.* 323.
Health and Morbidity (in general), *E.A.* 119; *K.* 200, 227–8; *N.R.* 520; *Ny.* 621; *T.T.* 400; *U.* 323.
Hospitals *Ba.* 67; *Be.* 73–4; *N.R.* 505–7, 520; *T.T.* 384.
Housing *M.* 755, 788; *N.R.* 502.
Immigration, encouraged, *M.* 753, 755, 761.
Influenza *Sw.* 26.
Length of residence *Ba.* 38; *M.* 788; *N.R.* 477; *Sw.* 38, 42.
Malaria *Be.* 77; *N.R.* 520.
Malnutrition (children) *N.R.* 520.
Mining employees *N.R.* 419–24, 433, 435, 509; *T.T.* 593.
MORTALITY:
General *E.A.* 125; *N.R.* 509, 518, 520; *Ny.* 638; *T.T.* 400; *U.* 323.
Infants *K.* 184; *N.R.* 518–20; *Sw.* 88.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *E.A.* 103, 105; *K.* 105, 163–4; *N.R.* 105, 477; *Ny.* 105, 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *So.* 103, 105, 643; *Sw.* 41–2; *T.T.* 103, 105, 357–8; *U.* 105, 261; *Z.* 100, 654.
Natural increase *K.* 123, 147–9, 179; *N.R.* 419; *Ny.* 593.
Numbers *Ba.* 19–20, 23–4, 32, 35–6, 38–9; *Be.* 11, 23–5, 37, 40–1; *E.A.* 99–100, 103–4; *K.* 100, 104, 146–9, 151, 156, 159, 161, 163; *M.* 713, 743–5, 750, 755–8, 760–2, 767–70, 773, 788–9, 800, 805, 884, 887, 889–90; *N.R.* 100–1, 104, 416–17, 419–21, 423–4, 475–80; *Ny.* 100, 104, 536, 592–9, 638; *Sey.* 903–7, 909–11, 923; *So.* 99, 641–2; *Sw.* 23, 26, 32, 35, 41–2, 88; *T.T.* 100–1, 104, 352–3, 356–62; *U.* 100, 104, 233, 250–1, 259–65; *Z.* 99–100, 102, 654–5, 680–1.
Prostitutes brought to *M.*, 753.
Refugees, World War, Second, *M.* 789, 807, 809.
SEX:
General *Ba.* 23, 32, 36, 38–9; *Be.* 23, 40; *E.A.* 106–7; *K.* 106–7, 163–8; *M.* 755, 760, 762, 770, 772–3; *N.R.* 106–7, 477–80, 482; *Ny.* 106–7, 536, 592–5, 597–9, 638; *Sey.* 912, 925–6; *So.* 106, 642–3; *Sw.* 23, 37, 39, 42; *T.T.* 106–7, 358, 360–2; *U.* 106–7, 262–4; *Z.* 106, 654–5.
Officials *E.A.* 109; *K.* 169; *N.R.* 481; *Ny.* 595; *So.* 643; *T.T.* 362; *U.* 264; *Z.* 655.
Smallpox *M.* 873.
Suitable settlements *E.A.* 100; *K.* 191.
Tuberculosis *Be.* 79.
Unsuitable habits *K.* 228.
Venereal diseases *Ba.* 59–60; *Ny.* 611.
World War, First, service, *Ba.* 35.
World War, Second, effects on health, *N.R.* 520; *T.T.* 400; Service *K.* 206; *N.R.* 506–7; *Ny.* 574–5, 596–7, 599; *T.T.* 345, 355, 383; *U.* 296. *See also under* Military, Missionaries, Non-Africans, Officials.
Ex-Apprentices, *see under* Slaves (Apprenticed).

Falkland Islands, born in, *K.* 161.
Famines *Ba.* 16–17, 68–9, 71; *E.A.* 118–19, 122–3, 195; *German East Africa* 380; *K.* 134, 141, 190–1, 193–9, 201–3, 208–9, 214–17, 221–2; *N.R.* 501–2, 507; *Ny.* 428, 560, 622, 625, 632; Ruanda-Urundi 241, 248–9; *So.* 646; *T.T.* 326, 346, 381, 386, 390–2, 396, 399; *U.* 239, 288, 296–7, 302, 314–17, 319–21.
Farquhar, Governor Sir Robert, 712–13, 715, 721–3, 727, 761–2, 767, 790–1, 797–8, 816, 841–2, 874, 879, 907–8, 939–40.
Farquhar Island *M.* 886, 891, 893, 900; *Sey.* 920.
Faubourg de l'Est *M.* 713.
Faubourg de l'Ouest *M.* 713.
Fauvel, A. A., 761, 887, 902–7, 927, 936, 942.
Fazan, District Commissioner *K.* 134–5, 137, 198, 222, 224–5.
Federated Malay States, born in, *K.* 161.
Feira, Government Station, *N.R.* 429, 441, 457, 507.
Félicité Island *Sey.* 910, 912–13, 918–19, 927.

Felkin, Dr. R. W., 116, 118–19, 121, 235, 237, 253, 258, 278, 284, 289, 314–15, 688, 695.
Fertility:
Differential *K.* 187–9; *M.* 870–2; *N.R.* 494, 497–500; *Ny.* 611–13, 617; *T.T.* 378–80; *Z.* 670–3.
Estimates (and guesses) *Ba.* 58; *E.A.* 113–18; *K.* 173, 187–9, 216–17, 220, 224–5; *N.R.* 517; *Ny.* 611–12, 616, 628, 631; *So.* 648; *T.T.* 378–81, 397; *U.* 117, 276; *Z.* 670–2.
Factors Reducing:
Ankylostomiasis *M.* 871; *Z.* 672–3, 676.
Backwardness *T.T.* 350–1.
Birth control *M.* 869; *N.R.* 497; *Ny.* 611, 613, 615, 633; *Sey.* 935; *Z.* 670, 672–3.
Christianity, spread of, *U.* 276.
Circumcision *K.* 188.
Concubinage *M.* 869; *Ny.* 612; *T.T.* 378.
Diet *Ny.* 617; *Z.* 672–3.
Early marriage *M.* 871; *Ny.* 612–13; *U.* 118, 315; *Z.* 670–1.
Emancipation of women *T.T.* 378; *U.* 277; *Z.* 670.
European civilization *Ny.* 633.
Housing conditions *K.* 188.
Inbreeding *T.T.* 379.
Low vitality of wives *Ny.* 613–14.
Malaria *M.* 869, 871; *Ny.* 613; *Z.* 671–2.
Migration of labourers *K.* 187, 217; *N.R.* 482–3, 493–4, 496–9; *Ny.* 611, 613, 617–18, 633.
Monogamy *U.* 276–7.
Motor transport *U.* 277.
Polygamy *N.R.* 496; *Ny.* 613–14; *U.* 118, 277–8, 315.
Prostitution of very young girls *Z.* 670.
Reluctance of men to marry *N.R.* 496; *U.* 277.
Sexual licence *K.* 187; *N.R.* 496–7; *Ny.* 611–13; *T.T.* 378–9; *U.* 276–7, 316–17; *Z.* 670, 672.
Slavery *Z.* 670–1, 673.
Sleeping-sickness *U.* 278.
Spacing of pregnancies *Ba.* 58; *K.* 216; *N.R.* 498; *Ny.* 611.
Stoppage of importation of women *U.* 276–7.
Suckling extended *K.* 216; *Ny.* 613; *U.* 118, 278, 315; *Z.* 670–1.
Tuberculosis *Z.* 671–2.
Venereal diseases *Ba.* 58–60, 62–4; *Be.* 73; *K.* 189; *M.* 871; *N.R.* 497–501; *Ny.* 611, 617–18, 633; *Sey.* 935; *T.T.* 326, 351, 378–9, 395–6; *U.* 217, 277–80, 317, 320–1; *Z.* 670–3.
Fertility (*cont.*)
Yaws *T.T.* 379. *See also under* Abortions, Childlessness, Liberated Africans, Slaves.
General Position, *Ba.* 17, 58–9, 64–6, 72; *E.A.* 117–18, 122; *K.* 187–90, 195; *M.* 869–72, 885, 898; *N.R.* 501; *Ny.* 611–14; *Sey.* 935; *So.* 648; *Sw.* 82; *T.T.* 349–52, 378–81, 399; *U.* 276–9, 316–17, 319; *Z.* 670–4, 678. *See also under* Births.
Fiji Islands, born in, *K.* 161.
Fingo (tribe) *Be.* 75.
Finland:
Born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 812; *N.R.* 476.
Nationality *M.* 813; *T.T.* 358.
Fipa (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Fisher, Dr., 499–500.
Flat Island *Sey.* 875, 918, 920.
Foaker (Administration Officer) *K.* 217.
Forbes, Major P. W., 438.
Fort Hall *K.* 133, 135, 150, 155, 183, 187, 200, 222–3, 225.
Fort Hall District, *see under* Fort Hall.
Fort Hall Reserve, *see under* Fort Hall.
Fort Jameson *N.R.* 407, 423, 428–9, 431, 437, 439, 455, 462, 464, 468, 473, 506, 547.
Fort Johnston *Ny.* 534, 536, 564, 580, 590.
Fort Manning *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 533–4, 537–8, 545, 547, 555, 564, 569, 580, 584, 588–9, 605–7, 615–16, 627, 629.
Fort Rosebery *N.R.* 430–1, 461.
Hospital, 506–7.
Fort Ternan *K.* 183.
Fosses, H. Castonnet des, 757, 793, 942.
Foster, Joseph, 89.
Fougeray, Chevalier Garnier du, 748.
Fowler, Major C. E. P., 788, 876–7, 881, 942.
Fox, District Officer *K.* 134.
France:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160, 162, 164; *M.* 809, 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sey.* 924; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 260.
Emigration to, from, *M.* 789.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *K.* 156, 163–4; *M.* 813–14, 895; *N.R.* 477; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *T.T.* 357–8; *U.* 261.
Francistown *Be.* 72, 80–1.
Freeston, Acting Governor, 347, 354–5.
French India Company *M.* 707, 746, 748–57, 886.
French Indo-China, born in, *M.* 811–12.
French occupation of Mauritius, 707, 711–13, 746–62, 788–9, 815, 839–41.
French occupation of Rodrigues *M.* 886–7.
French prisoners sent to Seychelles *Sey.* 905.
Frere, William Edward, 731, 773, 794, 796, 941.

Frigate Island *Sey.* 913–14, 918–19.
Froberville, Barthélemy Huet de, 764, 794, 798, 942.
Froberville, Eugène de, 886–7, 889–90, 903, 905–6, 910, 914, 935–6, 942.
Froberville, Léon Huet de, 749, 839, 873, 942.

Gabiro *U.* 242.
Gabriel Island *M.* 875.
Garissa District *K.* 138.
Gaud, Alph., 749, 754, 942.
Gaya (tribe) *T.T.* 325.
GERMAN EAST AFRICA:
Birth and deaths records, 363, 367, 375.
Burial permits, 363.
Cerebrospinal meningitis, 619.
Child mortality, 214.
Europeans, 100.
Famine, 380.
Fertility, 189.
Gonorrhoea, 189.
Maji-Maji Rebellion, 380, 399.
Map, 342.
Migrant labourers from *N.R.* 442; from Urundi 241; from *Ny.* 553.
Plague, 363, 619.
Population, 325–8, 396.
Punitive expeditions, 380, 396.
Seychelles Labour Corps *Sey.* 917.
Slave-raids, 121.
Germans *T.T.* 100, 103, 163, 352–4, 357–8, 383–4, 395–6; *U.* 354.
GERMANY:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104, 159–60, 164; *M.* 811–13, 894; *N.R.* 104, 476; *Ny.* 104, 593, 597–8; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *T.T.* 104, 357; *U.* 104, 260.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *E.A.* 105; *K.* 163–4; *M.* 813–14; *N.R.* 477; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 354, 358; *U.* 261.
Ghanzi District *Bc.* 25, 75, 77.
Gibraltar, born in, *K.* 160; *U.* 260.
Gikuyu (tribe), 692.
Gilgil *K.* 183.
Gilks, J. L., 201, 214, 691.
Gillman, C., 342.
Glacis *Sey.* 919.
Glenelg, Lord, 731, 792, 842.
Glorieuse Island *M.* 892, 902.
Gluckman, Max, 424, 497, 700.
Goa, born in, *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104, 158, 161–2; *Ny.* 104, 592, 597; *So.* 104, 642; *T.T.* 104, 356; *U.* 104, 259–61, 264.
Goans *E.A.* 101, 103, 106; *K.* 101, 105, 151, 156, 158, 161–2, 164, 167, 170, 229; *Ny.* 592, 597; *T.T.* 105, 352, 356–60, 362; *U.* 105, 233, 259, 261–2, 264–5; *Z.* 654.
Gobwen Township *K.* 182.
Gogo (tribe) *T.T.* 351, 390.
Gold Coast *Ny.* 529.
Gomm, Sir William, 797, 874, 880.
Gonorrhoea, *see under* Venereal Diseases.
Gooyer, Commander *M.* 744.
Gordon, Governor, 783.
Gore-Browne, Colonel Sir Stewart, 500.
Goyer, Cornelis Simonsz. 743–4.
Grand Port District *M.* 722, 730.
Grant, Charles, Viscount de Vaux, 743, 746, 753, 756–7, 759, 869, 873, 942.
Grant, R. W. Lyall, 689.
Grant, W., 321.
GREECE:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 260.
Nationality *M.* 813; *N.R.* 477; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Greeks *T.T.* 353.
Grey, Earl, 792, 874, 880.
Griffin, Sir Charles J., 693, 701.
Griffin, John Bowes, 693.
Griffith, Charles D., 16.
Grootfontein, migration from, *N.R.* 455.
Guernsey, born in, *Sey.* 924.
Güst, I., 745–8, 793, 942.
Guillardin, Messrs., & Co., 794.
Gulu District *Ny.* 584; *U.* 252, 269, 280–1, 295, 303, 305.
Gun War, 18, 35, 59.

Ha (tribe) *T.T.* 350–2.
Hadramaut, born in, *K.* 157.
Haemorrhages *M.* 869.
Hailey, Lord, 67, 71, 73, 91, 135, 159, 302, 509, 688.
Half-castes *K.* 158; *T.T.* 352, 356; *see also under* Coloured, Eurasians, Mulattoes.
Hall, Governor, 797.
Hamba (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Handeni District *T.T.* 367.
Harding, Major Colin, 439–40.
Hardinge, Sir Arthur H., 144, 146, 148, 158–9, 190–1, 194–9, 215, 670, 691.
Hargeisa Township *So.* 646–7.
Harrison, G., 890, 913.
Haslam, Dr. J. F. C., 504, 700.
Hautville, 750.
Hay, Major-General, 875.
Hay, R. W., 712, 874.
Health and Morbidity in general *Ba.* 68–71, 74; *Bc.* 74–9; *E.A.* 118–19; *K.* 191, 200–6, 208, 210–12, 217, 220–1, 227–8; *M.* 877–9; *N.R.* 423, 501, 509, 511–12, 517; *Ny.* 587, 590, 606, 618–23, 626, 628, 636; *Sw.* 83–6; *T.T.* 350, 381, 386–92, 396–8; *U.* 296–301, 307–13, 315; *Z.* 673, 675–7, 683–4. *See also under* Europeans.
Hedjaz, born in, *K.* 157.

Heeringa, Dr. K., 744, 942.
Hehe (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Helminthic diseases *E.A.* 119; *K.* 189, 202–5; *N.R.* 505; *Ny.* 590, 618, 622–3, 625, 636; *Sw.* 83, 85; *T.T.* 388–9; *U.* 297–300, 307, 309, 313; *Z.* 672–3, 676.
Hennessey, 299.
Herchenroder, Sir Furcy Alfred, 937, 945.
Herchenroder, M., 838, 863, 865.
Hertig, Dr., 70.
Higginson, Governor, 792, 798, 800, 802, 875, 881.
Hima, *see under* Bahima.
Hinde, Hildegard, *see below.*
Hinde, Sidney Langford, 192, 692.
Hinden, Rita, 512, 700.
Hindus *M.* 807–8; *U.* 259; *Z.* 654.
Hitié, Evenor, 753, 758, 942.
Hlatikulu *Sw.* 82–3.
Hobley, C. W., 144, 158, 201, 216, 692.
Hodgson, Margaret L., 22, 40, 69, 71, 91.
Hoima *U.* 304.
Hole, Hugh Marshall, 438, 700.
HOLLAND:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *M.* 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sw.* 37; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *Ny.* 592, 597; *T.T.* 358.
Homa Port *K.* 183.
Hong Kong, born in, *K.* 161; *M.* 799, 808, 810–12.
Hookworm infection *M.* 899.
Hosking, H. R., 694.
Hospitals *Ba.* 66–8; *Be.* 67, 73–4; *K.* 202, 206, 208; *M.* 882; *N.R.* 511; *Ny.* 619–22, 624–5; *So.* 645; *Sw.* 67, 82–3; *T.T.* 344, 370, 381–6, 389, 391–2, 395; *U.* 296–7, 301–2, 307, 309–10, 313; *Z.* 672. *See also under* Europeans, Medical and Sanitary Services, Military.
Hottentots *Be.* 25.
HOUSING:
Affecting morbidity and mortality *E.A.* 119; *K.* 200, 210–13; *M.* 880; *N.R.* 502–4, 507; *Sw.* 84; *T.T.* 388; *U.* 294–5, 300, 313; *Z.* 673, 677.
General conditions *K.* 200, 203, 211, 213; *N.R.* 502–4; *Ny.* 621; *Sw.* 84; *T.T.* 388; *U.* 295, 300, 302, 307, 312–13; *Z.* 677. *See also under* Europeans.
Hubert, Captain, 748.
Hudson, W. K., 22, 71, 91.
Hugo, Hubert, 745.
Hugon, Mr., Protector of Immigrants, *M.* 795.
Human sacrifices *U.* 316–17.
HUNGARY:
Born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 812; *N.R.* 476.
Nationality *M.* 813; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Huskisson, William, 763.
Huxley, Elspeth, 192, 199, 209, 692.

Ifakara *T.T.* 380.
Igou, Le Père Gabriel, 942.
Ihangiro *U.* 237.
Ila, *see under* Ba-Ila.
Ile de France, *see under* Mauritius.
Imbert, Mr., 226.
Immigrant Labourers from Africa *M.* 788, 792; from China *M.* 788, 798–9, 858; from Comoro Island *M.* 788, 792–3; from France *M.* 753; from Madagascar *M.* 788, 792, 858. *See also under* Indians *M.*
Immigration *Ba.* 17–22, 72; *E.A.* 100; *K.* 100, 140–1, 151–2, 156–9, 168; *M.* 550, 753, 755, 761, 777, 781–2, 788–9, 792–800, 802, 804–5, 820, 822, 828, 858–9, 885; *N.R.* 405–8, 424–31, 437, 497, 515–16, 543; *Ny.* 428–31, 527, 533–43, 546, 548, 581, 585, 587, 591, 630–8; *Sey.* 915; *So.* 550; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 344, 399, 431, 683; *U.* 239–40, 242, 245–7, 249, 253; *Z.* 651–2, 654–5, 674, 681–5. *See also under* Asiatics (Arrivals), Birthplace, Europeans (Arrivals), Indians (Arrivals), Non-Africans (Arrivals).
Inbreeding *Be.* 76–7.
INDIA:
Birthrate, 612.
Born in, *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *E.A.* 103–4; *K.* 104, 156, 161–2; *M.* 806, 809–12, 894; *N.R.* 104, 476; *Ny.* 104, 597–8; *So.* 642; *Sw.* 37; *T.T.* 104, 356; *U.* 104, 259–61.
Child marriage, 168.
Economic pressure, 597.
Infant mortality rate, 180.
Slaves from *M.*, 761, 764, 771, 793, 892; *Sey.* 908.
INDIANS:
Age-composition *K.* 165–6; *M.* 771, 821, 824–7, 835–6, 896; *Sey.* 925–6; *So.* 642; *T.T.* 359–61; *U.* 262–3.
Arrivals and departures *M.* 767, 774–5, 778, 780–1, 792, 794–8, 885; *Sey.* 921.
Birth and Death Registration *K.* 110, 170–1, 850.
Birthplace *K.* 161–2; *M.* 725, 801, 806–7, 809, 811–12; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *T.T.* 356; *U.* 259, 261.
Birthrate *M.* 818, 862–3, 872.
Births, numbers, *M.* 849–50, 857–8, 860–3, 871–2; *Z.* 672.
Census *M.* 743, 801–6, 818; *N.R.* 412.

INDIANS (*cont.*)
Children *K.* 168; *M.* 776, 805, 819, 825, 831, 850; *T.T.* 360; *Z.* 654, 677.
Conjugal condition *K.* 166, 168, 170; *M.* 827–37, 839, 896; *Sey.* 925–6; *So.* 642–3; *T.T.* 360–2; *U.* 262–3, 265.
Convicts *M.* 762, 767, 769–70, 772–3, 793, 797–8.
Death-rate *M.* 864–5, 881–2.
Deaths, numbers, *M.* 857–8, 860–1, 864–5, 881–2.
Definition *M.* 758, 801–6, 809.
Fertility *K.* 188; *Z.* 671.
Health *Ny.* 620.
Infant mortality *K.* 213; *M.* 817–18, 864–5, 883–4; *Z.* 679.
Infants *M.* 850.
Mortality *M.* 881–2.
Nationality *K.* 105, 164; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *So.* 105, 643; *T.T.* 105, 357; *U.* 105, 261.
Numbers *E.A.* 101, 103; *K.* 101, 131, 156–9; *M.* 757, 761, 773–5, 779–80, 782, 785–8, 799, 806–7, 885, 894; *N.R.* 101; *Ny.* 101; *Sey.* 923; *So.* 101, 641; *T.T.* 101, 352; *U.* 101, 233; *Z.* 101, 655, 680–2.
Officials *T.T.* 353.
Réunion, 747.
Sex *K.* 165–6; *M.* 771, 776–7, 779–80, 782, 785–6, 788, 796, 808, 814–15, 821, 824–7, 834–7, 896; *Ny.* 597; *Sey.* 926; *So.* 642–3; *T.T.* 358, 360–2; *U.* 262–4; *Z.* 654–5.
Slaves, *see under* India.
Still-births, 860–3, 884.
Women questioned about their pregnancies *Z.* 669. *See also under* Asiatics, Emigration, Immigration, India, Non-Africans.
Indo-Creoles, *see under* Creole Indians.
Indo-Mauritians *M.* 801–2, 804–6, 814, 824, 833, 894.
INFANT DEATHS:
Age of deceased *K.* 212; *M.* 864–5, 883–4; *N.R.* 495, 508–9; *Sey.* 935; *Sw.* 87; *T.T.* 374, 394; *Z.* 669.
Incomplete registration *K.* 184; *M.* 880; *N.R.* 483–5, 508, 519–20; *Ny.* 606; *T.T.* 368, 371, 393–5; *U.* 113, 269, 304, 306; *Z.* 114, 667, 678–9. *See also under* Death registration.
Numbers registered *M.* 818, 864–5, 883; *N.R.* 518, 520; *Ny.* 606, 627; *Sey.* 934–5; *T.T.* 368, 371, 393–4; *U.* 286–7; *Z.* 660, 677–9.
Understated at surveys *E.A.* 116; *Z.* 669.
Infant Mortality:
Attitude of Africans to, *T.T.* 368.
CAUSES:
Carelessness, ignorance, and superstition *K.* 212, 214; *N.R.* 507; *Sey.* 936; *T.T.* 394; *Z.* 678.
Circumcision *K.* 188.
Climate *Sw.* 86.
Congenital debility *Z.* 678.
'Convulsions' *Z.* 677.
Diarrhoea *M.* 883; *N.R.* 508–9; *Ny.* 629.
Diet *Be.* 80; *K.* 212, 214; *N.R.* 507–9; *Ny.* 626, 629; *Sw.* 86–7; *T.T.* 393–4; *U.* 300; *Z.* 677.
Helminthic diseases *T.T.* 393; *Z.* 676.
Housing *K.* 213; *N.R.* 507.
Infanticide: Africa, 397; Réunion, 747.
Influenza epidemic *N.R.* 508.
Malaria *K.* 213; *N.R.* 508–9; *Ny.* 628–9; *Sw.* 86; *U.* 304; *Z.* 678.
Malnutrition of mothers *K.* 214.
Measles *N.R.* 508.
Midwifery, parturition, *K.* 219; *Ny.* 626; *Z.* 677.
Native medicine-men, medicines, *T.T.* 394.
Premature birth *Z.* 678.
Respiratory diseases *K.* 212; *N.R.* 509; *Ny.* 629; *T.T.* 393–4.
Sanitary conditions *K.* 214; *N.R.* 507; *Ny.* 629; *Sw.* 87.
Smallpox *Ny.* 626; *T.T.* 393–4.
Summarized *K.* 212, 214; *M.* 883–4, 899; *N.R.* 507–9; *Ny.* 626, 629; *T.T.* 393–4; *Z.* 678.
Venereal diseases *Be.* 80; *E.A.* 393–5; *N.R.* 508–9; *Ny.* 611, 627; *T.T.* 378, 382, 393; *U.* 304.
Differential *K.* 184, 213; *M.* 818, 883; *N.R.* 507; *Z.* 679.
Estimates (and guesses) *Ba.* 68, 71; *Be.* 80; *E.A.* 116, 119–20, 124; *K.* 115, 123, 139, 188–9, 195, 212, 214–15, 217–18, 220; *N.R.* 120, 408, 507–9, 516–17; *Ny.* 117, 120, 582, 602, 614, 616, 626–9, 635–6; *Sw.* 86–7; *T.T.* 326, 363–5, 378–9, 392–5, 397, 399; *U.* 119–20, 304, 320; *Z.* 115, 679, 682.
Fight against *K.* 188; *Ny.* 629; *U.* 304–5.
Post-natal care, *see under* Infant Welfare Work.
RATES:
Based on informal records of Native Authorities *N.R.* 482–4, 495, 508, 516, 606, 627.
Based on questioning women about all their deceased infants *Be.* 45, 80; *E.A.* 114; *K.* 115, 185, 188, 212–13; *N.R.* 493, 507; *Ny.* 602–4, 615, 617, 627; *Sw.* 45, 86; *T.T.* 392, 394–5; *Z.* 115, 667–9, 678–9.

Infant Mortality (*cont.*)
Computed from registered births and infant deaths *K.* 180, 184, 214; *M.* 818, 864–5, 883; *N.R.* 519–20; *Sey.* 934, 936; *T.T.* 371, 393–5; *U.* 112–13, 268–70, 286–7, 302, 304–6; *Z.* 667, 677–9.
Estimated from age-composition of the population *Ny.* 626–8, 635.
Inflated by hospitals, &c., in registration area—by inclusion of deceased children over 1 year *E.A.* 116; *K.* 214; *N.R.* 508; *Ny.* 627; *U.* 306—by inclusion of deceased infants born elsewhere *Z.* 678—by inclusion of still-births *Ny.* 627—by incomplete birth registration *K.* 180; *T.T.* 371; *Z.* 678.
Surveys *Be.* 44–5, 80; *E.A.* 114–16; *K.* 115, 183, 212–14; *N.R.* 493, 507; *Ny.* 603–4, 608, 615, 617, 627, 629; *Sw.* 45, 86; *T.T.* 374, 392, 394–5; *Z.* 114–15, 667–9, 678–9.
Infant welfare work *Ba.* 67; *K.* 171; *N.R.* 486, 507; *Ny.* 621–2; *Sw.* 45, 86; *T.T.* 395; *U.* 304.
INFANTS:
Age-composition *K.* 155.
Meaning of word *Be.* 31; *K.* 144, 155; *N.R.* 507; *Ny.* 531, 589–90, 603, 615, 617, 627; *T.T.* 332, 334, 374, 394; *U.* 267.
Numbers *Ba.* 29, 65–6; *Be.* 31; *K.* 155; *M.* 817–18; *Ny.* 590–1; *Sw.* 29, 82; *T.T.* 332–4; *Z.* 666.
Sex *Ba.* 29; *K.* 155; *Ny.* 591; *Sw.* 29; *T.T.* 332, 334; *U.* 284.
Influenza *Ba.* 21; *Be.* 24; *E.A.* 118–19; *K.* 134, 201–2; *M.* 875; *N.R.* 508, 511, 514; *Ny.* 619, 622, 633–4; *Sey.* 917; *So.* 648; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 326, 381; *U.* 239, 295–6.
Ingrams, W. H., 764, 942.
Intermittent fever *M.* 876.
Irak, born in, *K.* 162; *U.* 260–1.
Iramba (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Irangi (tribe) *T.T.* 328, 351.
Ireland, born in, *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *K.* 160; *M.* 809, 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 597–8; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37, 42; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 260.
Iringa District *T.T.* 327, 341, 349.
Iringa Province *T.T.* 327, 341–2, 348.
Irish Nationality *T.T.* 357.
Irvine, T. W., 17, 91.
'Islands North of Madagascar' *M.* 885–6, 892.
Isle of Man, born in, *K.* 160.
Iseka District *N.R.* 420–1.
Italian Somaliland, born in, *K.* 160, 162; *U.* 261.
Italians *T.T.* 353, 355; *U.* 250–1.

ITALY:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 159–60, 162, 164; *M.* 811–12; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 593, 598; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 260.
Nationality *K.* 163–4; *M.* 813; *N.R.* 477; *Ny.* 592, 597; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 354, 357–8.
Jubaland ceded to, 145, 158.

Jackson, Commissioner, 318.
Jackson, Dr., 292.
Jackson, E. M., 89.
Jackson, Sir Wilfred Edward, Governor, 347, 355, 386.
Jackson, Rev., 25.
Jadotville *N.R.* 457.
Jalla, Adolf, 497.
Jaluo (tribe) *U.* 245, 247.
Jamaica, born in, *U.* 260.
Jambangome *Z.* 665.
James, Rev., 499.
Japan, born in, *Ba.* 35–6; *K.* 161–2; *M.* 811; *N.R.* 476; *U.* 260–1.
Japanese *K.* 157–8; *Z.* 654.
Jardine, Mr., 397.
Java, born in, *K.* 162; *M.* 811.
Javanese *K.* 157.
Jeppe, Carl, 92.
Jersey, born in, *M.* 811–12.
Jewish refugees *M.* 809; *Ny.* 592; *T.T.* 355. *See also under* Europeans (Refugees).
Jews *N.R.* 477.
Jita *T.T.* 351.
Johannesburg, *see under* Transvaal.
Johnston, Sir Harry, 100, 117, 119–22, 189, 217, 236–8, 258, 276–7, 288, 304, 313–14, 316–20, 550, 609, 629–30, 688, 702–3.
Johnstone, M. C., 875.
Joint East African Board, 119.
Jonasi Village *Ny.* 528.
Jones, J. F., 698.
Joubert, Gideon D., 16.
Jubaland *K.* 145, 158.
Justamond, J., 943.
Justamont, Sr., 754.

Kabale *U.* 244.
Kabunduli Native Authority *Ny.* 616–17.
Kacheliba *K.* 183.
Kaeppelin, Paul, 746, 748, 750–1, 942.
Kaffirs *Ba.* 19; *M.* 793.
Kafraria, 91.
Kafue District, 441.
Kafue Province *N.R.* 404, 418, 475, 494, 504.
Kagera river *U.* 244, 247, 250.
Kahama District *T.T.* 331–5, 340, 365–6, 370–1, 379, 385, 394, 396.

Kahama Sultanate *T.T.* 332–3, 370–1.
Kakamega (tribe) *U.* 233.
Kakitumba Bridge *U.* 243–5, 247–8, 250.
Kakitumba River *U.* 309.
Kalabo District *N.R.* 405–6, 408, 424–6, 429–30, 468, 486, 509.
Kalahari Desert *Be.* 11, 25, 74.
Kalamega *K.* 183.
Kalomo District *N.R.* 404.
Kamba (tribe) *K.* 192, 196, 216–17, 222, 692.
Kampala Township *U.* 253, 278.
Kanye Mission Hospital *Be.* 73.
Kanyenda Chief, *Ny.* 584.
Kaonde-Lunda Province *N.R.* 468.
Kapiet Location *K.* 183.
Kapsabet *K.* 183.
Kaptumo *K.* 183.
Karachonyo Location *K.* 134.
Karagwé *U.* 237.
Karamoja District *E.A.* 112; *U.* 240, 252, 254, 256, 266–8, 271, 287, 293, 297.
Karonga District *Ny.* 530, 534, 564, 580, 606–8, 616, 627, 636–7.
Kasama District *N.R.* 498, 512, 516.
Kasanshi Mine *N.R.* 420.
Kasanvu labour levy, abolition of, *U.* 241.
Kasempa District *N.R.* 415, 473.
Kasempa Province *N.R.* 403–5, 417–18, 423, 430, 475, 494.
Kasulu District *T.T.* 340.
Kasungu District *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 532–4, 543, 547, 555, 564, 568–9, 580–1, 585, 588, 614–15.
Katanga Mines *N.R.* 442, 454–7, 471–2; *Ny.* 554.
Katanga Mining Union *N.R.* 452.
Katanga Province *N.R.* 453, 456–8.
Katonga River *U.* 237.
Katuli Native Authority *Ny.* 541.
Kavirondo District *K.* 102, 115, 128, 134, 149–50, 153–5, 185, 188–9, 192, 207, 212, 217, 226, 237–8, 245.
Kavirondo, migration from, to *U.*, 247, 291.
Kawambwa District *N.R.* 428, 431, 461.
Kazungula *N.R.* 440, 462.
Keate, Robert W., 914.
Kempenfelt, Admiral, 753, 757, 869.
Kengeja *Z.* 665.
Kenya, 37, 95–108, 110–13, 115, 121, 126–230, 237–9, 245–7, 259, 261, 291, 300, 343–5, 354, 356, 505, 555, 593, 597–8, 609, 634, 811.
Kenya Development Committee *K.* 123.
Kenya Land Commission, 102, 123, 133–9, 142–3, 151–3, 155, 193, 197–9, 201, 214, 216–18, 221–6.
Kenyatta, Jomo, 193–4, 692.
Kerewe (tribe) *T.T.* 325, 351.
Kericho District *K.* 183, 207.
Kerugoya *K.* 208.
Kgalagadi District *Be.* 77.
Kgotla meetings, collection of information on fertility *Be.* 45.
Khama, Chief, 92.
Kiambu District *K.* 134–5, 150, 193, 198, 222–6.
Kiambu Local Native Council *K.* 186–7.
Kiambu Reserve *K.* 155.
Kiambu Settled Area *K.* 151.
Kiberege Division *T.T.* 329, 373, 380, 394.
Kibigori *K.* 183.
Kibondo District *T.T.* 340, 346.
Kibwezi *K.* 200; Famine Relief Camp, 199.
Kichugu Division *K.* 134.
Kiewiet, C. W. de, 18, 91.
Kigezi District *U.* 249, 252, 255, 287–8, 296–8, 303, 305.
Kigoma District *T.T.* 326–7, 339–40, 346, 389.
Kigoma Province *T.T.* 342.
Kikuyu (tribe) *K.* 122, 130, 185, 192–3, 196–199, 216–17, 222, 224, 692. *See also under* Akikuyu.
Kikuyu Central Association, 218.
Kikuyu District *K.* 102, 149, 153, 155, 196–9, 222–3, 225–6.
Kikuyu Province *K.* 202.
Kikuyu Reserve *K.* 128, 135, 201, 223.
Kikuyu Squatters in Tanganyika, 344.
Kikuyuland, *see under* Kikuyu District.
Kilimanjaro *T.T.* 392.
Kilindini Harbour *K.* 156.
Kilosa District *T.T.* 340, 454.
Kilwa District *T.T.* 327, 339, 387.
Kimberley, *see under* Cape Colony.
Kimberley, Earl of, 318, 670, 743, 783, 801, 877.
King's African Rifles *E.A.* 108; *Ny.* 550; *T.T.* 347; *U.* 295.
Kipandi, *see under* Registration of Natives.
Kipini *K.* 183.
Kirando *T.T.* 392–3.
Kisii District *K.* 183, 207, 226.
Kisiju *T.T.* 368–9.
Kisiwani *Z.* 665.
Kisumayu Township *K.* 158, 182.
Kisoro *U.* 249.
Kisumu Province *K.* 144, 212.
Kisumu Township *K.* 171, 176, 182–5, 190, 212.
Kisumu-Londiani *K.* 150.
Kiswahili language, 267, 331.
Kitale *K.* 183.
Kitara, Kingdom of, *U.* 321.
Kitgum District *U.* 295.

Kitui District *K.* 133–4, 136, 150, 153, 192, 196–7, 222.
Kitui Township *K.* 182.
Kitunda *T.T.* 329.
Kitwe Compounds *N.R.* 504.
Knapp, W. P., 198–9.
Koani *Z.* 665.
Kœnig, Etienne, 937.
Kœnig, M., Census Commissioner *M.*, 805–6, 938.
Koich river *U.* 290–1.
Koja, Refugees of Second World War, *U.* 251.
Koki *U.* 237.
Kondoa District *T.T.* 340, 390–1.
Kondoa–Irangi District *T.T.* 326–9.
Korogwe District *T.T.* 346, 388.
Kota-Kota District *Ny.* 428, 533–4, 547, 555, 564, 568–9, 580, 588, 604, 608, *615.*
Kukwe (tribe) *T.T.* 348, 351.
Kunda (tribe) *N.R.* 473.
Kuria (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Kwimba District *T.T.* 339–40.
Kyagwe County *U.* 293.
Kyaka *U.* 310.
Kyaka Ferry *U.* 243–4, 247, 249–50.
Kyambu Township *K.* 182.
Kyshe, J., Census Commissioner *M.*, 743, 801, 828.

La Fontaine, Provincial Commissioner, 225.
Labouchere, 800, 802, 875, 881.
Labour Census *K.* 152, 154; *Ny.* 544–5.
Lagden, Sir Godfrey, 17, 20, 91.
Lahaye, Jacob de, 746.
Laikipia District *K.* 193.
Laikipia–Samburu District *K.* 150.
Lake Province *T.T.* 327, 340, 342–3, 345, 371, 381, 383, 386–7, 389.
Lamba (tribe) *N.R.* 500.
Lambert, District Commissioner *K.* 133.
Lambkin, F. J., 278.
Lamu District *K.* 134, 150, 157, 176.
Lamu–Tanaland *K.* 142.
Lane, M. C. R. W., Provincial Commissioner, Nyeri, *K.* 200.
Langenburg *T.T.* 327.
Lango District *U.* 252, 269, 280, 287, 293, 303, 305.
Language habitually spoken at home *M.* 799.
Lansdowne, Marquess of, 146, 238, 276, 318.
Lascars *M.* 757, 793–4.
Latuka (tribe) *U.* 304.
LATVIA:
Born in, *M.* 812; *N.R.* 476; *Sw.* 37.
Nationality *M.* 813; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Lawley, Sir Arthur, 439–40.
Lawrance, A. S., 703.
Leakey, Dr., 188, 193, 196, 199, 216.
Lealui *N.R.* 425–6, 440.
Lebanya *Ba.* 16.
Leclezio, Henri, 789.
Ledger, C. K., 700.
Lee, Dr., 280.
Lefèvre, Colonel, 905.
Legentil de la Barbinais, 747.
Legitimated persons, re-registration of birth, *K.* 178; *N.R.* 492.
Legour Island *M.* 889.
Leguat, François, 745, 886, 942.
Length of residence *Ba.* 38; *K.* 163; *Sw.* 42; *U.* 233, 261.
Lenoir, 751.
Leprosy *E.A.* 119; *M.* 890–1; *Ny.* 618, 622–4; *Sey.* 910; *T.T.* 386; *U.* 301–2; *Z.* 660.
Leribe District *Ba.* 18–19, 59–63, 65–6, *68, 70,* 72.
Lesage, Lieut., 908.
Letsie, Chief, 19.
Leubuscher, Charlotte, 344, 697.
Leupe, P. A., 743–4, 942.
Lewey, Arthur W., 693.
Leys, Dr. Norman, 187, 192, 194, 200–2, 217–18, 692.
Lialui *N.R.* 438.
Liberated Africans, *see under* Slaves.
Life, expectation of, *E.A.* 119, 124; *Ny.* 587.
Likoma Island *Ny.* 533.
Likwenu-Kawinga–Namwera Road *Ny.* 560.
Lilongwe District *Ny.* 533–4, 537–8, 547, 555, 562, 564, 569, 580, 585, 588, 615, 622, 637.
Limbe Township *Ny.* 530, 536, 594, 621.
Lindi District *T.T.* 326–7, 341–2, 349, 389.
Lindi Province *T.T.* 327, 342.
Linfield, F. C., 633.
LITHUANIA:
Born in, *Ba.* 36; *K.* 160; *N.R.* 476; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Liverpool, Earl of, 712–13, 761, 790–1, 907.
Livingstone *N.R.* 409, 423, 427, 429, 460, 486–7, 498, 504, 506.
Livingstone, David, 505.
Liwonde District (Upper Shire) *Ny.* 534, 551, 564, 580, 590, 604, 611, 627.
Lobatsi Hospital *Be.* 73–4.
Loch, Henry B., Marquess of Ripon, 41.
Loewenthal, L. J. A., 299, 694.
Logoli (tribe) *K.* 137.
Lomagundi *N.R.* 458.
Londiani *K.* 183.
Long, Dr. E. C., 66.
Long Island *Sey.* 909–10, 912–13, 918–19.

Louis Trichardt, migration to, from *Ny.*, 573.
Lower Shire District *Ny.* 533, 538, 541, 547–8, 555, 564, 566, 569, 585, 588, 607, 615, 627, 630.
Losi (tribe) *N.R.* 497.
Loziland *N.R.* 424.
Luangwa Province *N.R.* 418, 433, 475, 494.
Luangwa Valley *N.R.* 516.
Luanshya *N.R.* 409, 504, 507.
Luapula *N.R.* 431.
Luba *U.* 319.
Luganda language *U.* 267.
Lugard, F. D., 100, 120–2, 191–5, 235–7, 258, 277–8, 304, 313, 315–19, 321, 688, 695.
Lugazi Sugar Estates *U.* 247, 312.
Luguru (tribe) *T.T.* 350–1.
Luiri Goldfields *N.R.* 420.
Lumbwa District *K.* 226.
Lunda (tribe) *N.R.* 512.
Lundazi District *N.R.* 403, 405–6, 427–8, 431, 442, 462, 464, 468, 484–5.
Lupa Goldfields *N.R.* 458–62, 467; *Ny.* 548, 560, 563, 567, 570; *T.T.* 344, 391.
Lupiro *T.T.* 380.
Lusaka District *N.R.* 429, 430.
Lusaka Hospital *N.R.* 506.
Lusaka Township *N.R.* 487, 504.
Lushoto-Soni, accommodation for refugees *T.T.* 355; centre for enemy aliens *T.T.* 354.
Luvingu *N.R.* 498.
Luxemburg:
Born in, *Ny.* 598; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Ny.* 597; *T.T.* 358.
Luzira, camp for railway workers, *U.* 307.
Lytton, E. B., 780, 880.

Ma-Ala District *N.R.* 499.
McDermott, P. L., 692.
Macdonald, J. R. L., 193, 236, 314, 316, 319, 688, 694.
Macfarlane, Chief Magistrate in Calcutta, 795.
Macgregor, J. C., 91.
MacGregor, Malcolm E., 878, 942.
McGregor, Mr. (Assistant Engineer, Uganda Railway Construction), 197.
Machakos District *K.* 133–4, 138, 150, 221–2; Famine Relief Camp, 199; Township *K.* 182–3.
Machona, *see under* Absentees (Duration of Absence).
Mackay, A. M., 121, 688.
Mackay, Mr., 765.
Mackintosh, Catherine Winkworth, 700.
McKisack, Audley, 698.
MacLellan Wilson (European Elected Member *K.*), 130.
Macmillan, Allister, 945.
Macmillan, W. M., 21.
Macquet, A., 753, 942.
Macvicar, Dr., 70.
Madagascar:
Born in, *K.* 160, 162; *M.* 764, 773, 776, 811–12, 814, 894; *Ny.* 597; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 259, 261; *Z.* 650.
Fugitives from, *Réunion* 746–7, 753.
Migration to, *M.* 777, 780, 792–3; *Sey.* 902, 917.
Nationality *M.* 813.
Slaves from *E.A.* 121; *M.* 725, 744–5, 750, 753–4, 755, 757–8, 761, 764, 771, 789, 791–2, 797, 887, 890, 892; *Réunion* 753; *Sey.* 908.
Madeira, born in, *K.* 160; *Ny.* 593, 597–8.
Madge, E. H., 906–7.
Madi District *U.* 293.
Madras, Asiatics from, *M.* 758. *See also under* Indians.
Mafeteng District *Ba.* 18, 59–62, 66, 68.
Mafia Island *T.T.* 326–7.
Magadi Railway *K.* 200.
Magharib District *Z.* 665.
Magon, René, 902.
Mahamba Hospital *Sw.* 83.
Mahé. *See under* Seychelles.
Town of, *Sey.* 912; Northern District of, *Sey.* 912; Southern District of, *Sey.* 912.
MahengeDistrict *T.T.* 326–7, 341.
Mahenge Province *T.T.* 327, 341–2.
Mainwaring, W. H., 119, 501.
Mair, L. P., 231, 278, 317, 695.
Maji-Maji Rebellion *T.T.* 380, 399.
Makalamabedi *Be.* 80.
Makerere *U.* 253.
Makonde tribe *T.T.* 351.
Makunduchi *Z.* 665.
Makwai, Chief, *Ba.* 16.
Malagasy, *see under* Madagascar.
Malaria *Ba.* 71; *Be.* 74–80; *E.A.* 119, 386; *K.* 151, 189, 200–7; *M.* 780, 783, 788, 819, 868, 876–9, 885, 899; *N.R.* 76, 505, 509, 511; *Ny.* 76, 613, 618, 622–3, 626, 628–30; *Sey.* 917; *Sw.* 83–6; *T.T.* 381, 386, 393; *U.* 296, 298–9, 304, 307, 309, 311, 315; *Z.* 671, 676, 680. *See also under* Abortions, Europeans, Fertility, Infant mortality, Mortality.
Malavois, 904, 905, 906, 909.
Malay States, Federated, born in, *K.* 161.
Malaya, Slaves from, *M.* 771, 890; *Sey.* 908.
Malayans *M.* 746, 757–8, 764, 776, 793, 858.
Maletsunyane Falls *Ba.* 22.

Malindi District *K.* 134, 150, 157.
Malipyi *T.T.* 380.
MALNUTRITION:
Incidence *Ba.* 69–71; *Be.* 74–9; *E.A.* 119, 124; *K.* 200, 203–6, 208–12, 300; *M.* 878–9; *N.R.* 430, 501, 507, 517; *Ny.* 621–3, 625–6, 636; *Sw.* 83–6; *T.T.* 300, 344, 348, 365, 388–92, 396, 399; *U.* 279, 298–301, 308–13, 315–16; *Z.* 676–7.
Loss before arrival of Europeans *Ba.* 68; *Be.* 74–7; *E.A.* 119; *K.* 209; *N.R.* 501; *Sw.* 86.
Second World War *K.* 208–10; *T.T.* 391–2.
See also under Children, Europeans, Fertility, Infant mortality, Mortality.
Malta, born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 811–12; *Ny.* 593, 598; *U.* 260.
Mangapwani District *Z.* 665.
Mangwato tribe *Be.* 74.
Mankambila *Ny.* 584.
Mankoya District *N.R.* 425–6, 430–1, 483.
Mantoux test, *see under* Tuberculosis incidence *K.*
Manyoni District *T.T.* 339–40.
Maragoli *K.* 209.
Marchant, Chief Native Commissioner, *K.* 132.
Marenga, Chief, 584.
Margeot, 890.
Margry, Pierre, 754–5, 793, 943.
Marianne Island *Sey.* 918–19, 927.
Marie-Louise Island *Sey.* 913, 918, 920.
Marimba *Ny.* 525.
Maroons, *see under* Slaves, escaped.
Marriage age *Ba.* 58; *K.* 222, 226; *M.* 835–6; *N.R.* 496; *Ny.* 582–6, 592, 614; *T.T.* 374; *U.* 277. *See also under* Child marriage, Fertility (Early marriage).
Marsabit *K.* 183.
Marshall Hole, 438.
Martin, Minnie, 31, 58, 91.
Martin, Robert Montgomery, 767, 853, 855–6, 935, 936, 943, 946.
Martinique, born in, *M.* 812.
Masai (tribe) *E.A.* 122; *K.* 189, 192–5, 197, 214–15, 221; *T.T.* 344, 350–1; *U.* 223, 318.
Masai District *K.* 138; *T.T.* 339.
Masai Province *K.* 150, 185, 189, 214, 226.
Masai Reserve *K.* 130, 207.
Masailand *K.* 195, 206, 207; *Ny.* 550.
Masaka District *U.* 241, 247, 252, 291, 305, 309; Hospital, 310.
Masasi *T.T.* 392.
Mascarin, *see under* Réunion.
Maseru *Ba.* 11, 17, 34, 44, 58, 60, 66–7.
Mashanjo (tribe) *N.R.* 429.
Mashe River *N.R.* 429.
Mashonaland *N.R.* 439–40.
Masindi *U.* 306.
Maswa District *T.T.* 340, 345, 367, 387.
Matabeleland *N.R.* 438–40, 442, 445.
Matangatwani *Z.* 665.
Matatana, *see under* Madagascar, Slaves from *M.*
Mathera District *K.* 193.
Mathew, Charles, 693.
Mathews, Lloyd, 680.
Mathiba, Chief, 11.
Maudave, de, 756–7, 945.
Maun Hospital *Be.* 79–80.
Mauritians *K.* 156–8; *Ny.* 596; *Z.* 654.
Mauritius, 139, 707–900.
Born in, *Ba.* 36, 38; *K.* 160, 162; *M.* 764, 801–2, 805–6, 808–12, 894; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 597; *Sey.* 924; *U.* 259, 261.
Mawiko, migration to *N.R.*, 425.
Mazabuka *N.R.* 403, 497; Hospital, 507.
Mazeras *K.* 183.
Mazrui Rebellion *K.* 191.
Mbabane Hospital *Sw.* 82–3.
Mbabane, urban area *Sw.* 86.
Mbale District *U.* 292–4.
Mbarara *U.* 244, 309.
Mbó *K.* 193.
Mbeya District *Ny.* 567; *T.T.* 327.
Mbogwe Sultanate *T.T.* 332–3, 371.
Mbulu District *T.T.* 379.
Mbulu Province *T.T.* 348.
Mbulu tribe *T.T.* 351.
Mbwana Native Authority *Ny.* 616–17.
Measles *M.* 879, 899; *N.R.* 508.
Medical and Sanitary Services:
Cost *K.* 619; *N.R.* 619; *Ny.* 619; *T.T.* 619; *U.* 619; *Z.* 619.
INADEQUATE:
for Africans in particular *Ba.* 66–8; *Be.* 73–4; *E.A.* 119, 381; *K.* 199–200, 202, 204–6; *N.R.* 501, 504–7; *Ny.* 619–22; *So.* 648; *Sw.* 82; *T.T.* 381–5; *U.* 301, 312.
for fight against special diseases *Ba.* 63, 67; *Be.* 80; *K.* 189, 206–8, 212; *N.R.* 500, 505; *M.* 878; *Ny.* 621, 623; *T.T.* 381–2, 385; *U.* 279, 295.
Hospitals *Ba.* 66–8; *Be.* 73; *N.R.* 505–7; *Ny.* 619–22; *Sw.* 82–3; *T.T.* 381–5; *U.* 301–2.
in general *E.A.* 119; *M.* 877; *Ny.* 620; *Sw.* 82; *T.T.* 381–5.
Medical Officers, numerically, *Ba.* 63, 67–8, 71; *K.* 172, 200, 202–6; *N.R.* 505–6; *Ny.* 619–22; *So.* 648; *Sw.* 82; *T.T.* 382–5; *U.* 295, 301.
See also under Diseases, Knowledge of incidence.
Increasing need *N.R.* 506–7; *Ny.* 620.

Medical and Sanitary Services (*cont.*)
VARIATIONS:
Changes between World Wars *Ba.* 67–8; *Be.* 73–4; *E.A.* 123; *K.* 189, 206; *N.R.* 505; *Ny.* 619; *Sw.* 83; *T.T.* 382–3, 399.
Expansion before the First World War *Ba.* 66–7; *E.A.* 123; *Ny.* 619; *U.* 301.
Reductions in First World War *U.* 295.
Reductions in Second World War *K.* 206; *N.R.* 500, 506–7, 520; *T.T.* 383–6; *U.* 296.
Meldrum, Charles, 756, 765, 774–5, 778, 781–3, 787, 853, 856–8, 868, 873, 875, 879, 899, 933, 943.
Mengo District *U.* 234, 252–4, 279, 285, 291–5, 302, 305, 310.
Hospital *E.A.* 119.
Merama Hill *U.* 244, 309.
Merker, M., 189, 195, 214, 692.
Meru District *K.* 142, 150, 183, 188.
Merville, Count de la, 757.
Messina, migration to, from *Ny.* 563, 573, 577.
Mexico, born in, *K.* 161; *U.* 260.
Midwives *K.* 180, 219; *Ny.* 613.
MIGRANT LABOURERS:
from *Ba.* to Union of South Africa, 17–22, 26–8, 59, 62–3, 68–70, 73.
from *Be.* to Union of South Africa, 24–5, 73, 75, 78–9, 462, 467, 470, 515.
from Belgian Congo to *N.R.*, 432–3, 436; to *U.*, 241–2, 245–50, 311.
from *K.* to *U.*, 245–7.
from *N.R.*, 344, 407–8, 416–18, 424–5, 437–74, 501, 512–17, 549–50, 555; to Belgian Congo, 442, 448, 450–63, 465, 468–9, 471–3; to German East Africa, 442; to *Ny.* 461, 463–4, 468, 547; to *S.R.* 430, 432, 438–69, 471–4, 513–15, 555; to South West Africa, 453–5, 457; to *T.T.* 344, 442, 448, 450, 452–63, 465, 467–9, 471; to Union of South Africa, 437–8, 440–2, 450, 453, 455, 457–62, 466–73, 515.
from *Ny.*, 344, 431–7, 443, 457, 460–1, 463, 465, 470, 473, 513–15, 536, 543, 549–81, 587–9, 591–2, 611, 613, 617–19, 625–6, 633, 636–7; to Belgian Congo, 457, 550, 554–5, 557, 563, 566, 569–72; to *K.* 555; to *N.R.* 431–7, 549–50, 557, 559, 563, 566–7, 569–73, 575–9, 581; to Portuguese East Africa, 550, 552, 554–5, 557, 563, 566, 569–72, 576–8, 581; to Southern Rhodesia, 432, 443, 513–14, 543, 546, 550–79, 581, 611; to *T.T.*, 344, 461, 548, 550, 555, 557, 560, 563, 565–7, 569–79, 581, 613, 625; to Union of South Africa, 470, 515, 550–4, 557, 560–6, 569–79, 581, 611, 619.
from Portuguese East Africa to *N.R.*, 426, 431–3, 436; to *Ny.*, 539–49; to *T.T.*, 344.
from Portuguese West Africa to *N.R.*, 425–6, 431–3, 436–7, 467.
from Réunion to *M.*, 755.
from Ruanda-Urundi to German East Africa, 241; to *T.T.*, 241, 343–4; to *U.*, 241–50, 253, 307–13.
from Southern Rhodesia to *N.R.*, 433.
from Sudan to *U.*, 245, 247, 250.
from *Sw.*, 26, 83–4; to Transvaal, 26, 84; to Union of South Africa, 34, 83–4.
from *T.T.* to *K.*, 140–2, 151–2, 343–5; to *N.R.*, 345, 433, 436; to *U.*, 241–7, 249–50, 310, 345; to Union of South Africa, 345; to *Z.*, 343–5.
from *U.* to *K.*, 140–2, 151–2, 245.
Health, from *Ba.*, 59, 62–3, 68–71, 73; from *Be.*, 73, 78–9; from *N.R.*, 440, 454, 461–2, 470; from *Ny.*, 550, 577–8, 625; from *Sw.*, 83–4; in *T.T.*, 344; in *U.*, 249, 307–13.
Mortality, in *Ba.*, 70; from *N.R.*, 440, 442, 448, 462, 513–15; from *Ny.*, 514, 551; in *T.T.*, 344; in *U.*, 307–8, 311. *See also under* Absentees, Migration, internal.
Migration, internal, *Ba.* 61–2; *K.* 136, 149, 153, 192, 196, 205–6, 209, 217, 219, 222, 225; *N.R.* 404–6, 423, 428, 432, 450, 460, 474; *Ny.* 527, 543–6, 549, 565, 572, 581, 589, 611, 617, 636–7; *Sw.* 83–4; *T.T.* 328, 333–4, 344–6, 348, 395; *U.* 232, 234–5, 241–2, 245–7, 280, 307, 310, 315–16. *See also under* Birthplace.
Milbert, M. J., 712–13, 758, 760–1, 764, 943.
Military:
AFRICAN:
Conscription *T.T.* 345; *U.* 248, 250.
Health *Ba.* 71; *K.* 206, 208, 210, 212; *Ny.* 611; *T.T.* 346, 386.
Numbers *K.* 200, 206; *M.* 765; *Ny.* 550, 611; *Sey.* 904; *So.* 641; *Sw.* 25; *T.T.* 347, 386; *U.* 318–19.
World War, First, *E.A.* 118; *Ny.* 611, 619; *T.T.* 345–6; *U.* 295.
World War, Second, *Ba.* 71; *Be.* 25; *M.* 807; *N.R.* 469–70; *Ny.* 470, 574–80; *T.T.* 345–7, 386.
European: *Ba.* 59; *K.* 206; *M.* 744–5, 747–51, 755–8, 761, 764–5, 769, 773, 777–9, 784, 809, 873; *Ny.* 596; *T.T.* 345, 355; *Sey.* 903–4, 906; *U.* 250, 318. *See also under* Europeans.

Milligan, S., 699.
Milton, Sir William, Administrator of Southern Rhodesia, 441.
Mine Labourers, from *Ba.*, 18–19, 21–2, 24, 59, 62–4, 69–70, 73; from *Be.*, 24, 73, 75–9; from *N.R.*, 344, 437–74; from *Ny.*, 344, 432–7, 441, 473, 513–15, 548, 550–79, 619; from *Sw.*, 24, 83–5; from *T.T.*, 343, 345, 353, 433, 454; in *K.*, 345; in *N.R.*, 423, 426, 429, 431–7, 445, 453, 455, 460–1, 469, 471, 502–3, 506–7, 509–12, 515, 549, 557, 559, 567; in *T.T.*, 344, 391, 457–62, 467, 548, 560, 563, 567, 570–1, 577; in *U.*, 309.
Minor Dependencies, slaves transferred to, from *M.*, 792.
Misale *N.R.* 462.
Miscarriages, see under Abortions.
Missionaries *Ba.* 10–11, 67, 70; *Be.* 40, 73, 78; *E.A.* 381; *K.* 129–30, 185, 196–201, 213, 216–17, 226; *N.R.* 438, 441, 454, 469, 497–9, 501, 504–6; *Ny.* 550, 563, 594, 601–2, 608, 611–12, 619–20, 624, 627; *Sw.* 41, 82–3; *T.T.* 350, 354–5, 383–4, 387, 394; *U.* 116, 118–19, 235–6, 258, 276–8, 302, 304, 314, 317.
Mitchell, J. P., 299.
Mitchell, P. E., 392.
Mjengi, Sub-chief Ubulu District, *T.T.* 379.
Mkalama District *T.T.* 340, 385.
Mkanda, Chief, *Ny.* 584.
Mkoani District *Z.* 665.
Mkokotoni District *Z.* 660, 665, 668–9, 672.
Mkushi District *N.R.* 497.
Mlanje District *Ny.* 533, 537, 540–1, 545–8, 551, 555, 564, 580, 583–5, 588, 590, 608, 615, 627, 630, 637.
Mlanje Tea Estates *Ny.* 545–6, 548.
Mlolo Village *Ny.* 528.
Mlongeni *Ny.* 584.
Mlowe *Ny.* 584.
Mochuana *Be.* 78.
Modderfontein, emigration of Nyasaland Natives to, 563.
Mofu *T.T.* 380.
Mohales Hoek *Ba.* 61, 63.
Mohammedans *M.* 807–8; *Ny.* 525, 528; *U.* 259; *Z.* 654. Marriage according to Mohammedan law *U.* 231.
Mokhaneledi, Chief, *Ba.* 17.
Mombasa:
Asiatics, 228.
Census, 95, 126–7, 132, 151, 156, 339.
Compulsory births and deaths registration, 171, 176, 179.
Emigration from Mombasa to Tanganyika, 344.
Mombasa (*cont.*)
Excess of immigrants over emigrants, 149.
Native birth-rate, 187–8.
Notification of deaths, 182–4, 190.
Population density, 150.
Registration of Natives, 142.
Momberas District *Ny.* 533, 539, 555, 585, 588, 614–15, 631.
Mondon, 905.
Mongu District *Ny.* 468; Hospital, 506–7.
Mongu–Lealui District *N.R.* 408, 425–6, 430.
Montgomery, H. R., 690.
Monyake, Chief, *Ba.* 16.
Mopedi, Chief, *Ba.* 16.
Moran (Warriors) *K.* 189.
Morgan, Dr., 45.
Morija *Ba.* 70.
Morogoro District *T.T.* 327, 340, 343–4, 391, 454; centre for enemy aliens, 354.
Morosi rebellion *Ba.* 18.
Morphey, Corneille Nicolas, 902, 903.
Mortality:
Causes:
Accidents *K.* 202.
Alcoholism *Sw.* 25.
Beriberi *M.* 879, 881, 899; *Sey.* 936.
Blackwater fever *N.R.* 520.
Bombay fever *M.* 881.
Cerebrospinal meningitis *K.* 202; *T.T.* 386–7; *U.* 295–7.
Cholera *M.* 874–5, 879–81; *Z.* 675.
Diarrhoea *M.* 875; *T.T.* 391.
Dysentery *M.* 879, 899; *U.* 296–7, 307–8, 316.
Epidemic distempers *M.* 790.
European civilization, impact, *E.A.* 118–19, 397; *K.* 199, 202, 217–18.
Helminthic diseases *Ny.* 623.
Homicide *K.* 221; *Ny.* 622, 630; *U.* 314–17.
Influenza *Ba.* 21; *Be.* 24; *E.A.* 118–19; *K.* 201–2; *M.* 875; *Ny.* 619, 633–4; *Sey.* 917; *So.* 648; *Sw.* 26; *T.T.* 326, 381; *U.* 239, 295–6.
Intermittent fever *M.* 876.
Malaria *Be.* 77, 80; *K.* 206; *M.* 876–8, 899; *N.R.* 511, 520; *Ny.* 618, 623; *Sw.* 83, 86; *T.T.* 386; *U.* 296; *Z.* 680.
Malnutrition (and starvation) *E.A.* 118, 122–3; *K.* 190, 193–201, 208, 210, 215–17, 221; *M.* 873; *N.R.* 501, 509; *Ny.* 622, 632; *Sey.* 936; *T.T.* 326, 381, 390–2, 396, 399; *U.* 239, 288, 296, 314–17, 319–21.
Measles *M.* 899.
Plague *Be.* 80; *K.* 199, 204; *M.* 875–6; *U.* 294–5, 302, 315–16; *Z.* 680.
Recording of, *Be.* 52; *E.A.* 111; *K.*

Mortality (*cont.*)
111, 172, 177, 187; *M.* 846–7; *N.R.* 111, 491–3, 511–12, 519; *Ny.* 111, 610; *So.* 111, 645, 647; *Sw.* 54–5, 57; *T.T.* 111, 377; *U.* 111, 275; *Z.* 111, 657.
Respiratory diseases *K.* 203–5; *Ny.* 623.
Slave-raids *E.A.* 118, 121; *K.* 190–2, 194, 215; *Ny.* 632; *U.* 296, 314.
Sleeping-sickness *Be.* 79–80; *E.A.* 118, 123; *K.* 199, 215; *N.R.* 501; *T.T.* 333, 370, 385, 399; *U.* 289–92, 296, 320–2.
Smallpox *E.A.* 122–3; *K.* 196–8, 204, 215; *M.* 759, 873–4, 879, 881; *N.R.* 501; *Ny.* 618; *So.* 648; *U.* 289, 295–6, 315–16; *Z.* 670, 680.
Syphilis *U.* 295.
Tuberculosis *Ba.* 71; *K.* 203; *Sey.* 936; *Z.* 670, 679–80.
Typhus fever *Ba.* 16, 70–1; *M.* 899.
Urbanization *K.* 202.
Wars *Ba.* 16; *E.A.* 118, 120, 122–3; *K.* 190, 192–4, 201–2, 215–17, 221; *N.R.* 501; *Ny.* 619, 630, 632–3; *So.* 648; *T.T.* 326, 396–7; *U.* 120, 253, 288, 296, 314–20.
See also under Cholera, Climate, Infant mortality (Congenital debility, 'Convulsions', Tetanus), Relapsing fever.
Estimates (and guesses) *E.A.* 114–15, 118–19, 124; *K.* 123, 141–3, 173, 187, 190, 200, 203, 210, 214–15, 220–1, 224; *M.* 775, 873–4, 876; *N.R.* 403, 517; *Ny.* 612.
General position *E.A.* 118–19, 122; *K.* 190–1, 200–3; *M.* 873, 876–77, 879–82, 884–5, 899; *N.R.* 509–10, 515–16; *Ny.* 622; *So.* 648; *Sey.* 935–6; *T.T.* 381; *U.* 295–6, 303; *Z.* 680.
See also under Europeans, Housing, Indians, Migrant Labourers, Military, Officials, Slaves, Syrians.
Moshesh, Paramount Chief, *Ba.* 16–17.
Moshi District *T.T.* 327, 339, 343, 392.
Mosuto (tribe) *Ba.* 44, 58, 65, 69.
Motte, D. de La, 756, 944.
Mount Elgon *U.* 238.
Moyale *K.* 183.
Moyeni *Be.* 61.
Moyenne Island *Sey.* 909, 918–19.
Moyne, Lord, 303, 321, 691.
Mozambique, 9; born in, *M.* 764; immigrants from, *N.R.* 426; slaves from, *M.* 725, 753, 755, 761, 764, 771, 789, 890, 892, 903; *Sey.* 908.
Mpaso *Ny.* 528.
M'pesesi (Fort Jameson) *N.R.* 439–40.
Mpika District *N.R.* 404, 498.
Mponda Village *Ny.* 536.
Mporokoso District *N.R.* 431, 472.
Mpwapwa District *T.T.* 340.
Msalala Sultanate *T.T.* 332, 371.
Msambweni medical centre *K.* 143, 185.
Mubende District *U.* 252, 280, 285, 302, 305.
Mufulira Mine *N.R.* 420, 507, 509, 511; Township *N.R.* 409, 423, 504.
Muhoroni *K.* 183.
Mulago Hospital *U.* 253, 301, 307–8, 310.
'Mulattoes' *M.* 758.
Mumbwa District *N.R.* 450, 497.
Mumias *K.* 183.
Mundy, Lieut., 316.
Munyaruanda (tribe) *U.* 312.
Muro (tribe) *U.* 233.
Murray, Sir George, 800.
Murray, S. S., 701, 703.
Musoma District *T.T.* 340, 345.
Muthaiga *K.* 183.
Muwazi, E. M. K., 300, 695.
Muyombe division *N.R.* 430.
Mwanza *T.T.* 327, 340, 342, 345, 349, 367, 371, 385, 391.
Mwase Native Authority *Ny.* 543.
Mwenewenya *Ny.* 532.
Mwenzo *Ny.* 560.
Mwera District *Z.* 660–1, 669, 674.
Mwera tribe *T.T.* 350–1.
Mweru-Luapula Province *N.R.* 418, 442, 455–6, 475, 494.
Mwinilunga District *N.R.* 405, 428–9, 473, 485, 512.
Mwirasandu-Nsongezi-Kagera Port Road Construction *U.* 307.
Mylius, Registrar of Slaves, 791.
Mzimba District *N.R.* 428; *Ny.* 534, 543, 547, 564–5, 568–9, 580, 588, 604.

NAIROBI:
Asiatics, 159, 228.
Births and deaths registration, 171.
Census, 95, 126–7, 129, 132.
Death notification, 179, 181–3, 190.
Estimate of population, 151.
Europeans, 146.
Famine Relief Camps, 199.
Housing, 210–11.
Malaria, 206.
Mortality, 198.
Population density, 150.
Registration certificates for Natives, 142.
Repatriation of Natives, 209.
Vital statistics, 184.
Naivasha District *K.* 150; Province *K.* 144.
Nakaranga *U.* 235, 314.
Nakuru District *K.* 150.
Namwala District *N.R.* 404, 497–9.
Nandi District *K.* 150, 226.

Nandi Plateau *E.A.* 100.
Nanyuki *K.* 183.
NATAL, 90.
Census, 90.
Migration to and from Natal *Ba.* 17, 19.
See also under Union of South Africa.
Nationality *Ba.* 27; *M.* 813–14, 895; *Sey.* 922, 924. *See also under* Asiatics, Birth and Death Registration (Forms), Chinese, Coloured, Enumeration (Forms), Europeans, Indians, Non-Africans, and countries.
Native Kings: Kabarega of Unyoro *U.* 316–18, 694; Karema of Buganda *U.* 316; Kiwewa of Buganda *U.* 316; Lewanika of Barotseland *N.R.* 438; Mutesa of Buganda *U.* 120, 313–14, 316–17; Mwanga of Buganda 315–16; Prempeh of Ashanti *Sey.* 922; Suna of Buganda *U.* 304.
Native medicine-men and medicines *Ba.* 67; *Sw.* 81–2; *T.T.* 394.
Native Reserves Commission *Ny.* 613, 629.
Native Welfare Committee *Ny.* 541, 549, 629, 635.
Natives, definition *N.R.* 487; South Africa High Commission Territories, 34.
Natural increase *Ba.* 17–22, 59, 66, 72, 81; *Be.* 74, 81; *E.A.* 120–4, 396–7; *K.* 123–4, 195, 215–27; *M.* 782, 885; *N.R.* 407, 474, 515–17; *Ny.* 117, 123, 543, 600, 611, 628, 630–8; *Sey.* 921; *So.* 648–9; *Sw.* 26, 87; *T.T.* 326, 328, 334, 343, 365, 369, 379, 395–9; *U.* 232, 234–5, 240, 255, 271, 302, 317, 319–22, 396; *Z.* 651–2, 670–2, 681–5.
Nawambwele Village *N.R.* 499.
Nazarene Mission *Sw.* 83.
Nchanga Mine *N.R.* 420, 423, 511.
Ncheu District *Ny.* 533–4, 547–8, 551, 564, 569, 580, 588, 605, 614–15.
Ndanda Mission *T.T.* 387.
Ndii, Famine Relief Camp, *K.* 199.
Ndola District *N.R.* 403–4, 415, 419, 429, 455, 466–7, 512; Government Hospital for Natives *N.R.* 506.
Ndolage Mission Hospital *T.T.* 383.
Necker, Jacques, 758, 943.
Neno *Ny.* 534, 580.
Net reproduction rate *M.* 885; *T.T.* 399.
New Zealand, born in, *Ba.* 35–6; *K.* 161; *N.R.* 476; *Ny.* 592, 598; *U.* 260.
New Zealanders *T.T.* 357.
Newcastle, Duke of, 736, 742, 800, 875.
Newcome, Henry, 903, 905.
Newfoundland, born in, *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *K.* 161; *N.R.* 476.
Newnham, Sir Arthur, 152–3, 692.
Newton, George, 844, 943.
Ngambo, *see under* Zanzibar Town.
Ngami, Lake, *Be.* 25, 80.
Ngamiland *Be.* 11, 79–80.
Ngara Subdivision *T.T.* 330.
Ngindo tribe *T.T.* 351.
Ngogwa Sultanate *T.T.* 332, 371.
Ngong *K.* 130.
Ngoni tribe *N.R.* 473; *Ny.* 588, 602, 613–15; *T.T.* 351.
Nguru *Ny.* 537–41, 543, 546–8, 615, 635.
Nguru Hills *T.T.* 343.
Nicaraguan nationality *T.T.* 358.
Nicolay, Sir William, Governor, *M.* 732, 792, 794–5, 842, 881, 940.
Nieuwland, Jacobus von, Commander *M.* 745.
Nile District *U.* 289.
Nile Province *U.* 238, 319.
Nilotics U. 298.
Nimule District *U.* 253.
Nkana Mine *N.R.* 409, 420, 423, 502, 504, 507, 511.
Nkonde tribe *Ny.* 538, 612, 615.
Non-Africans:
Age-composition *Ba.* 39; *E.A.* 106, 108; *K.* 106, 165–8; *N.R.* 106, 478; *Ny.* 106, 108, 594–5, 598–9; *So.* 106, 642–3; *Sw.* 39, 42; *T.T.* 106, 359–62; *U.* 106, 262–4.
Arrivals and departures *Z.* 655.
BIRTH AND DEATH REGISTRATION:
Compulsory, *Be.* 43, 50–2; *E.A.* 110, 112; *German East Africa*, 375; *K.* 110, 112, 170, 174, 177, 228–9; *N.R.* 110, 112, 489, 491; *Ny.* 110, 112, 609–10, 638–9; *Sw.* 52–7; *T.T.* 110, 112, 364, 375–6, 400; *U.* 110, 112, 272–5, 322; *Z.* 110, 112.
Defective *E.A.* 112; *K.* 170–1, 179–80, 227–9; *N.R.* 112; *Ny.* 638–9; *T.T.* 378, 399–401; *U.* 323–4.
Legislation *Be.* 43, 45–52; *German East Africa*, 375; *K.* 170, 175–7, 272; *N.R.* 489; *Ny.* 609; *Sw.* 52–7; *T.T.* 363, 375–7; *U.* 272–5.
Voluntary *Be.* 43; *K.* 170, 228; *Ny.* 609; *Sw.* 52; *T.T.* 377, 399.
Birthplace *Ba.* 35–6, 38; *E.A.* 103; *K.* 103, 156–63; *N.R.* 476–7; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 103, 356–7; *U.* 103, 259–61, 264.
Births *Ny.* 638; *U.* 323; *Z.* 684.
Census, special provisions for, *Ba.* 13–14; *Be.* 13–14; *N.R.* 412–14; *Sw.* 13–14.
Children *Ba.* 39; *E.A.* 106, 108; *K.* 106, 165, 168; *N.R.* 106, 478; *Ny.* 106, 108, 594–5, 598–9; *Sw.* 39; *T.T.* 106, 359–62; *U.* 106, 262, 264.
Conjugal condition *E.A.* 107–8; *K.* 107, 166–8, 170; *N.R.* 107; *Ny.* 107, 595.

Non-Africans (*cont.*)
599; *So.* 108, 642–3; *Sw.* 43; *T.T.* 107, 360–2; *U.* 107, 262, 265.
Deaths *Ny.* 638; *T.T.* 400; *U.* 323; *Z.* 684.
Definition *Ny.* 532, 596; *South Africa High Commission Territories*, 34–5; *T.T.* 336, 376; *Z.* 650–1.
Length of residence *K.* 163, 261; *N.R.* 477; *U.* 261.
Nationality *Ba.* 38; *E.A.* 103; *K.* 163–4; *N.R.* 477–8; *Ny.* 597; *T.T.* 357; *U.* 261, 264.
Numbers *Ba.* 23, 35; *Be.* 23, 40; *E.A.* 101; *K.* 104–5, 144, 147–50, 156; *N.R.* 104–5, 416, 475, 478; *Ny.* 104–5, 532–6, 592–9; *So.* 104–5, 641–2; *Sw.* 23; *T.T.* 104–5, 339–41, 343, 345, 347, 352–3, 356–62; *U.* 104–5, 233, 250–2, 259–64; *Z.* 651–2, 654–5, 680–2, 685.
Sex *Ba.* 23, 38–9; *Be.* 23, 41; *E.A.* 106–7; *K.* 106–7, 164–8; *N.R.* 106–7, 478; *Ny.* 106–7, 536, 595, 599; *So.* 106, 642; *Sw.* 23, 39, 42; *T.T.* 106–7, 358, 360–2; *U.* 106–7, 262–4; *Z.* 106, 654–5.
See also under Asiatics, Coloured, Europeans.
Non-Natives, *see under* Non-Africans.
North Island *Sey.* 913, 918, 920.
North Borneo, born in, *K.* 157.
North Cousin Island *Sey.* 927.
North-East Shinyanga District *T.T.* 393.
North-Eastern Rhodesia, 95, 110, 121, 402, 410, 414–15, 417, 419, 439, 441–2, 471, 482, 488–9, 520, 630–2.
North Kavirondo District *K.* 136–7, 142, 150, 153, 155–6, 186.
North Mara District *T.T.* 385.
North Nyasa District *Ny.* 533, 547, 555, 564–5, 567–9, 588–9, 602, 607–8, 613, 615–16, 629.
North Nyeri *K.* 150.
North Swaka Reserve *N.R.* 428.
North-West Kahama *T.T.* 393.
North-West Runsewe *T.T.* 393.
North-Western Rhodesia, 95, 110, 402, 410, 415, 419, 439, 441–2, 488–9.
Northern Angoniland *Ny.* 631.
Northern Frontier District (Kenya), 129–30, 149–50.
Northern Frontier Province (Kenya), 138, 142.
Northern Ireland, *see under* Ireland.
Northern Province (Northern Rhodesia), 427–8, 430–1, 458, 460–1, 465, 468, 498.
Northern Province (Nyasaland), 527, 532–8, 543, 546, 548, 554–6, 561, 568–70, 580–3, 585, 587–91, 600, 604, 624, 635.
Northern Province (Tanganyika), 327, 342–4, 379, 386–7, 392.
Northern Province (Uganda), 246, 252, 254, 256–8, 269–70, 280–1, 287, 295, 302–3, 305–6.
Northern Rhodesia, 95, 97–108, 110–13, 120, 125, 160–2, 259, 344, 346, 402–521, 537, 549–50, 557, 559, 563, 566–7, 569–73, 575–9, 581, 593, 597–8, 631.
Northern Turkana *K.* 146.
NORWAY:
Born in, *K.* 160; *M.* 812, 894; *N.R.* 476; *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 37; *U.* 260.
Nationality *Sey.* 924; *Sw.* 42; *T.T.* 358.
Ntakataka. *See under* Missionaries *Ny.*
Ntaote Hospital *Ba.* 67.
Nwazi *K.* 192.
Nyabeya, Refugees of Second World War, *U.* 251.
Nyaihangiro (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Nyakyusa (tribe) *T.T.* 351, 381.
Nyamwezi (tribe) *T.T.* 325, 348–9, 351.
Nyanja (tribe) *Ny.* 615.
Nyanza Province *K.* 149–50, 176, 185, 202, 209.
Nyasa (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Nyasa District *N.R.* 441.
Nyasa Lake *K.* 191.
Nyasaland, 37, 76, 95, 97–102, 104–8, 110–13, 116–17, 120–1, 123, 160, 162, 191, 233, 259, 344, 405–6, 424, 426–37, 443, 457, 460–1, 463, 465, 468–70, 473, 476, 513–15, 522–639, 641–2.
Nyaturu (tribe) *T.T.* 351.
Nyawa (Chiefdom of) *T.T.* 387, 393.
Nyeri District *K.* 133–5, 183, 188, 200, 223.
Nyeri Reserve *K.* 155.
Nyika Plateau *Ny.* 613.
de Nyon, Governor, *M.* 748–50.
Nzega Clinic *T.T.* 395.
Nzega District *T.T.* 340, 387.

Oceania, born in, *E.A.* 104; *K.* 164; *M.* 809–10; *Sey.* 924.
OFFICIALS, EUROPEAN:
Mortality *Ba.* 88; *E.A.* 125; *K.* 227–8; *N.R.* 520–1; *Ny.* 639; *So.* 645, 649; *Sw.* 88; *T.T.* 400; *U.* 324; *Z.* 685.
Numbers *Ba.* 88; *E.A.* 108–9; *K.* 169, 228; *M.* 744–6, 749–51, 755; *N.R.* 421, 481, 521; *Ny.* 593–5, 639; *So.* 99, 641–3; *Sw.* 88; *T.T.* 100, 353, 362, 400; *U.* 264, 324; *Z.* 100, 655, 685.
See also under Europeans, Medical and sanitary services.
Oil Islands *M.* 886.
Okavango Delta *Ba.* 25.