

Chapter 2

German War Memories in British Tanganyika: Imperial Rivalries, Commemorations and Heroism, 1920–1960s

Introduction

The mandate-trusteeship¹ period saw the Germans locking horns with the British in fostering hegemonic memories of war and colonialism in Tanganyika. While the former were hoping to restore the *status quo* and possibly regain their lost territory, the latter were struggling to establish their political position in Tanganyika.² The British, who took over Tanganyika from the Germans after World War One, strove, as much as they could, to erase German heroic memories and propagate their own. However, as the politics of colonial commemoration and revisionism took root in Germany during the 1920s and 1930s, the Germans in Tanganyika were becoming increasingly allied with their home government in asserting themselves in the territory.³ The German community in Tanganyika, in addition to struggling

1 The mandate period covered the period from 1919 to 1945, followed by the Trusteeship period which started from 1946 to 1961. For convenience, the term 'mandate' or 'Mandate-trusteeship' will often be used to refer to the entire period of British colonial period in Tanganyika, that is, from 1919 to 1961.

2 The imperial politics evident in the interwar period constituted what some scholars call "continuation of the older Anglo-Germany rivalry. Wolfe W. Schmokel remarks: "In a sense the German colonial claims of the interwar period and the British response to them may be seen as the continuation and the last chapter of the story of Anglo-German colonial rivalry." See, for example, Wolfe W. Schmokel, "The Hard Death of Imperialism: British and German Colonial Attitudes, 1919–1939", in Prosser Gifford and WM. Roger Louis (eds), (with the assistance of Alison Smith), *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 302; Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann and Alison Smith, "The German Empire in Africa and British Perspectives: A Historiographical Essay" in Prosser Gifford and WM. Roger Louis (eds), (with the assistance of Alison Smith), *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 736.

3 Thorough discussion on the politics of colonial revisionism (German colonial movement) within Germany and the negotiations for Germany to join the League of Nations as well as commercial and political agreements reached between Germany and Britain is widely covered in literature. See, for examples: Schmokel, "The Hard Death of Imperialism", pp. 301–335; Wolfe W. Schmokel, *Dream of Empire: German Colonialism, 1919–1945* (New Haven, 1964), pp. 82–84; Jean Stengers, "British and German Imperial Rivalry: A Conclusion", in Prosser Gifford and WM. Roger Louis (eds), (with the assistance of Alison Smith), *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), pp. 345–347; Michael D. Callahan, *Mandate and Empire: The League of Nations and Africa, 1914–1931* (Great

to attain economic pre-eminence, erected war monuments, formed organizations and campaigned for the return of Tanganyika to Germany. It should be remembered that “after the First World War the Colonial Society struggled to keep the memory of the lost empire alive and agitated for its return.”⁴ Such actions, and many others, created the necessity for the British mandate government to keep a watchful eye on German activities in Tanganyika. Amidst this political tension, the people of Tanganyika found themselves divided between those who supported the British and those who sided with the Germans, most notably the former Askaris who had served the German colonial government. This chapter explains the extent to which the politics of commemorations and heroism were such a contested terrain in Tanganyika at the time of the mandate.

The chapter opens by providing background information about the end of German colonial rule in East Africa and the eventual transfer of Tanganyika to the British as a mandated territory. It shows how the German community lost its influence on the British community in Tanganyika soon after the end of the First World War and how the two communities competed in promoting their imperial identities in the subsequent decades. This is done by describing different commemorative initiatives and the related events which characterized the mandate period. The chapter argues that Africans were not passive actors in the commemorative events of the mandate period, as they also participated in them by siding either with the Germans or the British for their own reasons.

The Transition Period, 1914–1922

Between 1914 and 1916 Tanganyika was turned into a battleground for the two warring imperial powers, Germany and Great Britain. This stemmed from the fact that Tanganyika, being part of Deutsch Ostafrika, was not spared by the 1914–1918 war. The German force, *Schutztruppe*, found itself confronting two forces: the British forces, advancing inland from the north-east coast and the Belgian forces, charging eastward from the lake region.⁵ The *Schutztruppe* was defeated in this war, marking the end of German colonial rule in East Africa. Article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919 provided for Germany to cede Tanganyika

Britain: Sussex Academic Press, 1999), pp. 60–67; Birthe Kundrus, “Colonialism, Imperialism, National Socialism”, in Bradley Narauch and Geoff Eley (eds), *German Colonialism in a Global Age* (USA: Duke University Press, 2014), pp. 333–338.

⁴ Pierard, “The German Colonial Society”, p. 19.

⁵ Gedeon S. Were and A. Wilson, *East Africa through a Thousand Years: A History of the Years A.D.1000 to the Present Day* (London: Evans Brothers Limited, 1968), pp. 215–220.

to Britain.⁶ Officially turned into a mandated territory in July 1922, Tanganyika was placed under the so-called Class B type, representing the former German colonies “in which the Mandatory Power [was] responsible for the administration” and promotion of “the moral and material welfare of the people.”⁷ This provision, the so-called article 3 of the mandate laws, saw Britain assuming full administrative control of Tanganyika.⁸ They consolidated their political power in their newly acquired ‘colony’ and strove to undermine German colonial influence in the territory.⁹ As elaborated later on, this was achieved through the “gradual elimination of the vestiges of German influence,” which not only entailed the demolition of German colonial monuments and erasing all other forms of German heroic memories, but also changing the name of the colony itself, from German East Africa to Tanganyika and adopting its postage stamp.¹⁰ The name Tanganyika, which was chosen by William Cecil Bottomley from the East Africa Department, was officially declared on the 1st February 1920 for what was believed to be “a tangible way to symbolize the transfer to British rule.”¹¹ Another reason for the change of the name was however given: “to differentiate the Tanganyika Mandate from the British East Africa colony of Kenya.”¹²

Soon after the war, the British repatriated the Germans and confiscated their property. Between 1917 and 1924, Sir Horace Byatt, the first British Governor of

⁶ Raymond Leslie Buell, *The Native Problem in Africa*, Vol. I (London: The Macmillan Company, 1928), p. 430. Article 119 of the Treaty of Versailles stated categorically that: “Germany renounces in favour of the principal allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over their overseas possessions.” Seen in NA, CO691/160/11. “Colonial Defence Committee’s First Bulletin: The Truth Restated in Reply to German Colonial Claims”, July 28th, 1938.

⁷ Gerald F. Sayers (ed) *The Handbook of Tanganyika* (London: The Secretary Office, 1930), p. 1930; Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 50.

⁸ Article 3 of the mandate laws for Tanganyika territory stated: “The Mandatory shall be responsible for the peace, order and good government of the territory, and shall undertake to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and the social progress of its inhabitants. The Mandatory shall have full powers of legislation and administration.” Cited in Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, pp. 194–195.

⁹ Addressing the United Nations meeting on 20th December 1956, Nyerere said that, despite the good intention of the Mandate laws, Sir Donald Cameron, the British Governor to Tanganyika, administered the country as though “it were a British colony.” Cited in Julius K. Nyerere, *Freedom and Unity: A Selection from Writings and Speeches, 1952–1965* (London: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 41.

¹⁰ Peter A. Dumbuya, *Tanganyika under International Mandate 1919–1946* (Maryland: University Press of America, 1995), p. 103; Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 51. Different other names had been recommended for the territory such as Kilimanjaro, New Maryland, Smutsland, Azania and Victoria.

¹¹ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 49.

¹² Dumbuya, *Tanganyika under the International Mandate*, p. 103.

Tanganyika, fully implemented the policy of repatriation with the result that the white population in Tanganyika, mostly missionaries and settlers, had halved by 1921.¹³ This policy also involved the confiscation and liquidation of the enemy's property, thus causing protests from the German government.¹⁴ Between 1921 and 1924, the majority of the former German plantations were auctioned to the British, Indians and Greeks.¹⁵ Prior to 1925, the Germans were allowed to return to Tanganyika on the condition that they had to change their nationality.¹⁶ However, in accordance with article 7 of the mandate laws which provided for equal rights for all people from the League of Nations member countries to live in the Mandatory, the government lifted a ban on Germans entering Tanganyika in 1925.¹⁷ The next year Germany joined the League of Nations – on the 10th September, 1926 to be precise.¹⁸ Consequently, German nationals, particularly settlers, returned in great numbers, much to the annoyance of the British settlers, who feared that the Germans would not only jeopardize their economic interests in the territory, but also outnumber them.¹⁹ In 1925 alone, about 188 German subjects had returned, and by 1939, the German population in Tanganyika was

¹³ Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, pp. 262–303.

¹⁴ J. Clagett Taylor, *The Political Development of Tanganyika* (California: Stanford University Press, 1963), p. 43; Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 63.

¹⁵ Taylor, *The Political Development of Tanganyika*, p.63; Bertil Egero, "Colonization and Migration: A Summary of Border-crossing Movements in Tanzania before 1967", The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, Research Report No. 52, 1979, p. 17.

¹⁶ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 64.

¹⁷ J.P.Moffet (ed), *The Handbook of Tanganyika*, second edition (Dar es Salaam: Government of Tanganyika, 1958), p. 93. Confiscation of German property was in accordance with the Enemy Property (Retention) Ordinance of 1921. See, for example, *Dar es Salaam Times*, Vol.III, No. 4, 10th December, 1921. However, the Enemy Property Department had been established in Dar es Salaam since 1917 "for the purpose of taking over the control, and subsequently, of disposing and liquidating the property of ex-enemy nationals." See Sayers, *The Handbook of Tanganyika*, p. 118. Part of article 7 of the Mandatory stated: "The Mandatory shall secure to all nationals of States Members of the League of Nations the same rights as are enjoyed in the territory by his own nationals in respect of entry into and residence in the territory, the protection afforded to their person and property, the acquisition of property, movable and immovable, and the exercise of their profession or trade, subject only to the requirements of public order, and on condition of compliance with the local law." Seen in Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 195.

¹⁸ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, pp. 122–123.

¹⁹ Buell, *The Native Problem*, p. 442. However, "this influx of Germans into Tanganyika did not distress the local colonial administration or most permanent officials in the Colonial Office" as it did to the British settlers. The authorities in Dar es Salaam and London encouraged German settler farming because it was the most successful one. See, for example, Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, pp. 135–136.

23 percent higher than that of the British.²⁰ As already mentioned, the Germans were emerging as a powerful economic class in Tanganyika, which the British settlers resisted arguing that the mandate authority in Tanganyika was actually “impairing their interests” over the former.²¹ In 1938, for example, a section of the report on “German Activities” submitted to the mandate government read thus:

Germans in Tanganyika are an exclusive community. They arrive in German ships, stay at German hotels, buy nothing but German goods from German shops, employ Germans and export their produce in German ships to Germany. Thus Great Britain, who governs and finances the country, protects us with her navy and builds the roads and railways, which enables German produce to be exported, is boycotted by one of our largest producing communities. The effects of this state of affairs can be summarized by: (a) The country loses employment for British nationals, (b) British shipping loses its fair proportion of freight, (c) British export industries suffer, and (d) British trading concerns in the country are being gradually eliminated.²²

It is evident therefore that as the number of Germans increased in Tanganyika, so also did their activities which angered the British community living in the territory. According to table 1 below, an annual average of 272 Germans returned to Tanganyika between 1927 and 1936. In 1929, the German colonists, save the missionaries, possessed a total of 361,827 acres of land, ranking the second after British nationals who owned 745,029 acres.²³ “By 1934 Germans owned more sisal estates than any other group of Europeans or Asians and perhaps controlled as much as one third of the total acreage under cultivation,” argues Michael D. Callahan.²⁴ Statistics shown in table 2 below indicate that between 1931 and 1934 a fare number of German settlers had purchased coffee, tea and sisal estates.

It is important to note therefore that even as the British replaced the German colonial administration of Tanganyika, an expanding class of Germans was becoming increasingly influential, socially, and economically.²⁵ The following sections indicate how this led to tension between the Germans and British, thus intensifying the politics of imperial identity and the race for commemorations in mandated Tanganyika.

²⁰ Iliffe, *A Modern History of Tanganyika*, p. 303; Buell, *The Native Problem*, p. 442; Michael J. Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time: Policing the End of Empire* (London: The Radcliffe Press, 1996), p. 115. According to Macoum 420 German families had returned to Tanganyika by September 1926.

²¹ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 136.

²² NA, CO691/160/11, Report No. 36 on German Activities, 19th January 1938.

²³ Sayers, *The Handbook of Tanganyika*, p. 252.

²⁴ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 135.

²⁵ A similar situation was experienced in British Cameroon where German planters controlled the local economy in Southern Cameroon. See, for example, Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 66 and p. 79.

Table 1: Immigration of the Germans into Tanganyika, 1925–1936.

Year	German Immigrants
1925/26	586
1927	442
1928	344
1929	275
1930	279
1931	200
1932	244
1933	248
1934	244
1935	197
1936	249

Source: NA, CO691/153/13/4, March 1937.

Colonial Monuments: From the Wissmann Monument to the Askari Monument

German colonial rule in East Africa involved the erection of colonial monuments which honoured important colonial figures. A famous monument that existed in Tanganyika in German times (see Figure 2 below) was that of Major Hermann von Wissmann. Designed by Adolf Kürle in 1908 and officially launched on 3rd April 1909, Wissmann's statue was erected a few metres from the Dar es Salaam harbour which it faced.²⁶ Consisting of a life-sized statue of Wissmann with a lion and an *Askari*, the monument was meant to honour the late Wissmann as a colonial hero.²⁷ Naturally, after the First World War, the British could not put up with this sort of monument glorifying the 'enemy'.²⁸ It was hence removed in 1916 and shipped to London as a war trophy and, afterwards, in 1921 sold to Justus Strandes, a Senator of Hamburg.²⁹ The following year, together with Hans Dominik's Monument,

²⁶ Michael Perraудин and Juergen Zimmerer (eds), *German Colonialism and National Identity* (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 4.

²⁷ Perraудин and Zimmerer, *German Colonialism*, p.4.

²⁸ Expressions of dislike to the Wissmann statue can be seen in F.S. Joelson, *The Tanganyika Territory (Formerly German East Africa): Characteristics and Potentialities* (London: T. Fisher Unwin LtD, 1920), p. 25.

²⁹ A thorough discussion on transition of colonial monuments can also be found in Juergen Zimmerer and Kim Sebastian Todzi, *Hamburg Tor zur Kolonialen Welt: Errinnerungsorte der (post-)Kolonialen Globalisierung*, (Hamburg: Wallstein Verlage, 2021).

Table 2: Purchase of Estates by Germans from Government and Other Nationals, 1931-1934.

Year	Coffee Estates (Acres)		Sisal Estates (Acres)		Tea Estates (Acres)		Other Estates (Acres)	
	From government	From other Nationals	From government	From other Nationals	From government	From other Nationals	From government	From other Nationals
1931	1000	2853	—	3857	300	—	2447	11422
1932	4340	3211	580	1235	464	—	1667	9028
1933	5789	3152	—	4199	198	8547	140	4835
1934 (to 19 th May)	1479	124	—	1095	—	—	—	400
Total	12608	9340	1080	10386	962	8547	4254	25685

Source: NA, C06691/139/7/32-33, 1934.

the monument was erected in front of the University of Hamburg main building.³⁰ Nine years after its removal from Dar es Salaam, the Askari Monument was erected on the same site. This replacement, as explained in the following section, set in motion the race for colonial commemoration by the mandate government and the German community living in Tanganyika. Other German colonial monuments which existed in Dar es Salaam, and which disappeared with the defeat of Germany were the bust of Bismarck “at the entrance to State House drive” which was donated by Dr. Hans Mayor; the statue of Carl Peters as well as the Kaiser Wilhelm I memorial, located in front of the harbour.³¹

The Askari Monument (see Figure 1 below) was built by the Imperial War Graves Commission (IWGC) during the 1920s. The statue was made in England, staged for exhibition at the Royal Academy of summer 1927, and was brought to Dar es Salaam ready for erection.³² The physical appearance of this monument was the work of James Alexander Stevenson (1881–1937), featuring an impressive “pedestal with bronze panels and a life-sized figure or larger of a Kings African Rifles soldier on top” and “the panels depicting groups of African Soldiers and Carriers on active service.”³³ Its construction was completed in 1927 and officially unveiled on 14th March 1928.³⁴ The monument was built concurrently with two similar monuments in Mombasa and Nairobi to honour the African Askaris and Carriers as well as the Arabs who fell in the First World War while serving the British Army. One of its bronze panels bore the inscription: “this is to the memory of the Native African troops who were the hands and feet of the army: and to all other men who served and died for their King and country in eastern Africa in the Great War 1914–1918. If you fight for your country even if you die your sons will remember your name.”³⁵ After colonial rule, the Askari monument was

30 Perraudin and Zimmerer, *German Colonialism*, p. 4; Jokinen, “Colonial Monuments and Participative Art- Cultures of Remembrance, Myths, Anti-theses, Inversions”, <http://www.afrika-hamburg.de/English.html>, last accessed on 20th March 2017.

31 W.T. Casson, “The Public Monuments of Dar es Salaam”, *TNR*, No. 71, (1970), p. 184; F.S. Joelson, *Germany's Claims to Colonies* (London: Hurst & Blackett, LTD, 1939), p. 114.

32 Casson, “The Public Monuments of Dar es Salaam”, p. 184.

33 TNA, AB/754/3, Commanding Troops Tanganyika Territory to the Chief Secretary (hereafter CS), 9th April 1921 and TNA, No. 23428/2, Report by Deputy Director of Works, 4th November 1927.

34 TNA, AB/754/3, Commanding Troops Tanganyika Territory to CS, 9th April 1921; TNA, No. 23428/2, Report by Deputy Director of Works, 4th November 1927.

35 The inscriptions were prepared by Rudyard Kipling. Seen in TNA, 23428/2, Report by Deputy Director of Works, 4th November 1927.



Figure 1: The Askari Monument. Photographed by author, 1st February 2023.



Figure 2: Wissmann Monument before its removal from Dar es Salaam.

Source: Koponen, Juhani. *Development for Exploitation: German Colonial Policies in Mainland Tanzania, 1884–1914*. Finland: Finish Historical Society, 1994, p. 86.

inherited by the independent government of Tanganyika, and on 8th September 1995, it was gazetted as the “monument symbolizing the culture of peace.”³⁶

Reactions and Counter-Reactions to the Erection of the Askari Monument

As mentioned above, the newly erected Askari monument became the object of opposition by the German community living in Tanganyika in the 1930s. The British colonial government was criticized for having erected the Askari Monument on the site formerly occupied by the Wissmann Monument. The German community complained that the Askari Monument was actually mocking Wissmann, who was still honoured as a colonial hero, because it stood on the same site as the former Wissmann Monument. To replace the Wissmann Monument with “a statue of a native soldier” was thought of as “a most unnecessary insult to [Wissmann] memory.”³⁷ So the Germans wanted it moved to another site. For example, in 1927 they appealed to the government to postpone the unveiling ceremony pending the removal of the monument to what Mr. Howe Bowne called “a more appropriate site in front of the *Boma*.”³⁸ However, the government went ahead with unveiling the monument, much to the disappointment of the Germans. It is clear that the Germans were angered by the fact that the mandate government took no heed of their complaints and requests. Nevertheless, the Germans in Tanganyika continued to commemorate their colonial heroes even when the Wissmann statue had been removed from the territory. War grave memorials were established in different places to honour German war heroes, particularly the fallen veterans of the First World War. Evidence shows that German war memorials, mostly war graves, existed in different places in Tanganyika. Between 1923 and 1928, IWGC carried out the exercise of identifying all German war graves in Tanganyika in a project called “Concentration and Exhumation of German war Graves.”³⁹ Isolated German war graves were exhumed with the approval of the German government and concentrated in selected sites in urban areas as permanent war memorial cemeteries.⁴⁰ These were taken care of by

³⁶ Donatius M.K. Kamamba, “National Cultural Heritage Register Antiquities Division”, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Dar es Salaam, 2012, p. 7.

³⁷ TNA, No. 23428/42, CS to the Governor, October 31st, 1927.

³⁸ TNA, No. 23428/42, CS to the Governor, October 31st, 1927.

³⁹ See correspondences in TNA, No. AB 1075, “War Graves Concentration and Exhumation”, 1927–1928.

⁴⁰ A similar exercise which is thoroughly explained in chapter seven was carried out after independence.

IWGC and the railway authority in collaboration with the German community and the Town Councils. In the post-World War One period, German war memorials existed in places like Bagamoyo, Morogoro, Old Moshi, Dar es Salaam, Songea, Tanga, Lindi, Kilwa, Iringa, Arusha, and in many urban areas of Tanganyika.⁴¹ Some of these memorials were established by the Germans themselves without the help of the mandate government.⁴² In 1936, for instance, the German community of Morogoro wrote to the mandate government asking for permission to build a war memorial in honour of their war heroes.⁴³ Their memorial resembled the *German Iron Cross Medal* on which the words: *UNSEREN HELDEN, Die fuer Deutschlands GROESSE starben* (Our Heroes who died for the greatness of Germany) appeared. As discussed in one of the subsequent sections of this chapter, the imperial war graves and memorials inherited after independence were taken care of by the government of Tanzania under the umbrella of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC).

Although German war grave memorials were established across the country with the help of the mandate government, colonial memories which glorified Germany's colonial past in Tanganyika were greatly discouraged. This, as shown in Tables 3 and 4 below, included renaming most German place names and street names or any name which showed German colonial influence.⁴⁴ Perhaps worth mentioning here is the renaming of the S.S. Goetzen (See Figure 3), a German steamer which had operated on Lake Tanganyika since the early 20th century. The steamer was scuttled at Kigoma soon after the outbreak of World War One and was salvaged in 1924.⁴⁵ It was reconditioned in 1925 and resumed service on Lake Tanganyika in 1926.⁴⁶ Its name was changed from S.S. Goetzen to S.S. Liemba,

⁴¹ Robert Heussler, *British Tanganyika: An Essay and Documents on District Administration* (USA: Duke University Press, 1971), pp. 14–55. See also correspondence in Mbeya Zonal Archives (hereafter MZA), No. M.7/3/170, “Tanzania Government War Graves, 1970/71.

⁴² After the end of World War One, the War Memorial Committee (with a chairman appointed by the Governor) was formed to take care of all war graves in Tanganyika. In 1946, Provincial Committees were established in each Province for the same purpose. Seen in MZA, No. M.7/3/170, Prime Minister to all Provisional Commissioners, 15th June 1961. See also correspondence in TNA, No. CW 80158, “Maintenance of War Graves,” 1961; TNA, No. 33180/68, Province Office (Northern Province) CS, 23rd March 1946. Commemorations of war heroes by the Germans continued after the Second World War. See, for example, Joson Verber, *The Conundrum of Colonialism in Postwar Germany* (USA: University of Iowa, 2010), pp. 1–2.

⁴³ TNA, 24678, “Erection of War Memorial at Morogoro Cemetery of Germans”, December, 1936.

⁴⁴ This point is further elaborated in chapter six. Extensive studies on colonial place names in Tanganyika have been done by G.N. Shann, “Tanganyika Place Names of European Origin”, *TNR*, (1960), Nos. 58 and 59, (1960).

⁴⁵ Sayers, *The Handbook of Tanganyika*, p. 295.

⁴⁶ NA, CO 691/87/2/11, Extract from the General Manager, 25th July, 1927; NA, Co691/87/2/14A, Secretary of State to Millbank Westminster, 8th April 1927; Sayers, *The Handbook of Tanganyika*,

because the British colonial officials did not like the idea of a ship being named after the German Governor, Graf von Goetzen. A suggestion was even made earlier that the steamer be named after the British Governor.⁴⁷ Generally speaking, the decade proceeding the end of the First World saw the British trying to efface German legacies in East Africa. For example, a British economist complained in 1922: “it is now several months since the Treasury received the English paper money and the new shillings, yet no effort has been made to put our money into circulation.”⁴⁸ His fear was that the local people “[were] becoming used to seeing Kaiser Head on the coin” which would affect British political influence in Tanganyika.⁴⁹

Table 3: Re-named German Place Names in 1920.

German Place Names	British Place Names
Bismarckburg	Ufipa District
New Langenburg	Rungwe District
Wilhelmstal	Usambara District
Aruscha Dschu (Arusha)	Arusha
Leudorf (Arusha)	Leganga
Hohenlohe Graben (Arusha)	Yaida Valley
Winter Hochland (Arusha)	Winter Highland
Bismarckburg (Ufipa)	Kasanga
New Langenburg (Mbeya)	Tukuyu
Wiedhafen (Songea)	Manda
Johannesbrucke (Songea)	Likuyu
Milow (Songea)	Milo
Wilhemstal (Tanga)	Lushoto

Source: The Tanganyika Territory: Official Gazette, Vol. I., No. 35, 14th October 1920, p. 209.

p. 295. These included Kibweza, Sumbua, Kirando, Kala, Lufu River, Mpungulu, Kasanga and Kirambo.

⁴⁷ NA, CO 691/85/13/No. 496, L.S.Amery to Sir Donald Cameroon (Governor), 5th August 1926.

⁴⁸ “Paper Currency”, *Dar es Salaam Times*, Vol.III, No. 14, 18th February 1922, p. 6.

⁴⁹ *Dar es Salaam Times*, Vol. III, No.14, 18th February 1922, p.6. According Terence Ranger, ‘the Kaiser stood as the dominant symbol of German rule.’ Seen in Terence Ranger, “The Invention of Tradition in Colonial Africa”, in Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition* (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 211.

Table 4: Re-named German Roads and Streets in 1920.

German Street Names	Location	British Streets
Kaiser Strasse	Bagamoyo	King Street
Markt Strasse	Bagamoyo	Fruit Market Street
Inder Strasse	Bagamoyo	Indian Street
Fisch Markt Strasse	Bagamoyo	Fish Market Street
Schule Strasse	Bagamoyo	Schoolhouse Street
Tun Strasse	Bagamoyo	George Street
Karawan Strasse	Bagamoyo	Caravan Road
Wissmann Strasse	Bagamoyo	Windsor Road
Zollamt Strasse	Bagamoyo	Custom House Road
Unter den Akazien	Dar es Salaam	Acacia Avenue
Johannes Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Acean Road
Wilhelms-Ufer	Dar es Salaam	Azania Front
Kreuzler Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Kirk Street
Stuhlman Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Main Avenue
Becher Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Park Avenue
Emin Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Garden Avenue
Kaiser Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Merged in Main Avenue
Wissmann Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Windsor Street
Ring Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Ring Street
Bülow Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Stanley Street
Neue Strasse	Dar es Salaam	New Street
Robert Koch Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Park Road
Liebert Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Burton Street
Schele Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Speke Street
Trotha Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Smuts Street
Bismarck Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Versailles Street
Soliman Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Suliman Street
Brucken Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Bridge Street
Winterfeld Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Cameron Road
Leue Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Selous Street
Upanga Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Upanga Street
Moltke Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Merged in Upanga
Halva Strasse	Dar es Salaam	RoadHardinge Street
Araber Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Arab Street
Mosche Strasse	Dar es Salaam	Mosque Street
Breit Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Njia Kuu
Strande Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Kingsway
Wissmann Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Boma Road
Hafen Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Harbour Road
Wahindi Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Indian Street
Otto Strasse	Pangani/Handeni	Palm Street
Landhelds Strasse	Tabora	Long Street
Pofpe Alle	Tabora	Uyui Street
Karawanserei Strasse	Tabora	Caravan Road

Table 4 (continued)

German Street Names	Location	British Streets
Siegel Strasse	Tabora	Livingstone Road
Holzmann Strasse	Tabora	Mwembe Street
Bahnhof Strasse	Tabora	Boma Road
Ost Strasse	Tanga	Amani Street
Nord Strasse	Tanga	Amboni Street
Kasernen Strasse	Tanga	Queen Street
Plantagen Strasse	Tanga	Plantation Street
Bezirksamts Strasse	Tanga	Government Road
Bahnhof Strasse	Tanga	Station Road
Von St.Paul Strasse	Tanga	Ngamiani Road
Usagara Strasse	Tanga	Graham Road
Zollamt Strasse	Tanga	Custom House Road
Massai Strasse	Tanga	Masai Street
Kaiser Strasse	Tanga	King Street
Njanjani Strasse	Tanga	Mnyanjani Street
Ngoma Platz	Tanga	Ngoma Place
Inder Strasse	Tanga	India Street
Schule Strasse	Tanga	School Street
Waschamba Strasse	Tanga	Washambaa Street
Waseguha Strasse	Tanga	Wazigua Street
Bismarck Platz	Tanga	Selous Square
Eisenbahn Strasse	Tanga	Steere Street

Source: The Tanganyika Territory: Official Gazette, Vol. I., No. 35, 4th October 1920, p. 209.

The mandate government also ensured that German political activities in the territory did not flourish. Archival sources mention some organizations which were formed by the German community in Tanganyika with political ambitions.⁵⁰ Judging from the evidence at hand, the formation of such organizations was meant to achieve two important things: first, to unify all German nationals in Tanganyika in the hope of the future return of their colony, and second, to maintain cooperation between the German nationals living in Tanganyika and those in Germany. Michael J. Macoum describes the German nationals who returned to Tanganyika after the First World War as people who “were obsequious towards officials, friendly with the Asians and benign to the Africans,” hoping to win “acceptance and fame among the people of Tanganyika.”⁵¹ Macoum adds that “Germany was aiming

⁵⁰ A wide coverage of these activities can be seen in NA, CO 691/160/11, “Permanency of Mandate, German Aspiration”, 1938; Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, p. 118.

⁵¹ Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, p. 117.



Figure 3: Liemba Ship. Photogaphed by Eliane Kurmann. Photo: © Eliane Kurmann.

to regain pre-eminence in her former colonies through peaceful commercial penetration.”⁵² It was clear that the Germans were determined to have total control of the economy as they were optimistic that Tanganyika would revert to Germany in the near future. Within the British community in Tanganyika, rumours circulated that the Usagara Company was being used by the German government to import German commercial capital into Tanganyika. Jointly owned by a Greek and a German, the company was, among others, thought to finance German settlers, particularly German coffee growers in north-eastern Tanganyika.⁵³

As far as the politics of commemoration were concerned, the formation of the German Association (*Deutscher Bund*) in July 1933, for instance, exacerbated antagonistic relations between the British and Germans in Tanganyika.⁵⁴ In a meeting held at Dodoma to inaugurate the association, Troost was appointed the *Landesgruppenleiter* for Tanganyika and *Ortsgruppenleiter* for Moshi District, and Captain

⁵² Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, p. 117. It must be remembered that article 6 of the Anglo-German Commercial Treaty of 1924 provided for the Germans to engage in commercial activities in Tanganyika. See, for example, NA, CO691/160/11, Telegrams Nos. 187 and 188, 18th September 1938.

⁵³ Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, p. 116.

⁵⁴ This was registered by the mandate government as a Cultural Association. Seen in NA, CO691/160/11/89–90, Letter to District Office of Moshi, 26th July 1938.

von Schoenfeld was installed as the first leader of the *Deutscher Bund*.⁵⁵ Another German organization with a similar political impact was the Hitler Youth Movement/Association, formed in February 1934.⁵⁶ Its members constituting some 140 adults and 210 children in 1937 were often accused by British officials of wearing military uniforms in the 1930s.⁵⁷ Other organizations with marginal political influence were *Bund Deutscher Frauen*, an organization for German women in Tanganyika, and the Sports Club, founded by Dabaga-based youths in 1936.⁵⁸ Others were *Deutsche Arbeitsfront*, German Labour Front, founded in the early 1930s and later in 1933 renamed, *Deutscher Handlungsgehilfenverband* or German Commercial Assistants' Union, as well as *Stützpunkt*, a sort of help-post, originally established in Dodoma and later on its activities extended to Moshi and Dar es Salaam.⁵⁹ The so-called German School Association (*Deutscher Schulverband*) was formed in October 1935 under P. Rheinbaben as president to supervise and co-ordinate all German schools in Tanganyika.⁶⁰

The founding of German associations indeed worried some British officials that the Germans might take up arms against the British government in order to regain their colony. These officials greatly feared German underground military activities, such as smuggling arms and ammunition into Tanganyika and establishing arms caches. In 1937, a British Officer had warned that the Germans were militarily prepared to overthrow the mandate government.⁶¹ He further warned that in the event of a German attack, the chances were that about 40 percent of the Africans would support them in fear of revenge.⁶² Despite the absence of evidence for all these allegations, the government tightened security regulations in the territory. German activities in Tanganyika were therefore closely watched and regarded with suspicion. Upon the arrival of the S.S. Tanganyika at the port of Tanga in September 1938, for example, a company of the Kings African Rifles (KAR) was immediately dispatched by order of the Deputy Governor to inspect

55 Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, pp. 119–120. Before then, Troost was working as a manager of the Usagara Company's training school at Altona in Hamburg.

56 Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, pp. 122–126; NA, CO 691/153/13/21, C.Y. Carstairs to Captain Graham, 3rd September 1937.

57 NA, CO691/160/11/89, Eric Reid to Bruce Hutt, 26th July 1938; NA, CO 691/153/13/21, C.Y. Carstairs to Captain Graham, 3rd September 1937.

58 Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, pp. 122–126. For the statistics see NA, CO 691/153/13/21, Y. Carstairs to Captain Graham, 3rd September 1937.

59 Macoum, *Wrong Place, Right Time*, pp. 122–126.

60 See correspondences in TNA, 23256, "German School Association", 1936.

61 NA, CO691/160/11, Telegrams Nos.187 and 188, 18th September 1938; NA, CO691/160/11/26A, Air Ministry to Colonial Office, 12th May1938.

62 NA, CO691/160/11/77, Telegrams Nos.187 and 188, 18th September 1938.

the ship for the presence of arms and ammunition.⁶³ Six months before this event, British security officers were on the alert concerning rumours of “contingents of Germans from Tanga and Dar es Salaam” visiting the *Schleswig-Holstein*, a Germany naval training ship at Zanzibar.⁶⁴ Similar incidents happened in Dar es Salaam. A mere beer-drinking party held by high-ranking German leaders on board the *S.S. Adolph Woermann* in the harbour of Dar es Salaam drew the suspicious eyes of Government officers who had mistaken it for a political meeting.⁶⁵

As mentioned earlier, the wearing of political uniforms was another means used by some members of German organizations to express their political motives.⁶⁶ Because there was no law preventing individuals from wearing political uniforms, it was decided that no action should be taken to regulate or control it “unless the local situation deteriorates.”⁶⁷ Therefore, the absence of a legal mechanism to control the wearing of political uniforms allowed the Germans to openly express their political feelings, such as singing songs and hoisting flags and the like. They would, for example, wear political uniforms on the day when the mandated territory celebrated His Majesty’s birthday. One such incident occurred in August 1938 at Moshi, where it was reported that a German leader, Mr. Delfs-Fritz, attending such a celebration wore a political uniform.⁶⁸ Present at the party were other Germans dressed normally as well as “children from the German school at Mweka.”⁶⁹

The event at Moshi became the focus of debate by the mandate government. Although some British officers saw nothing wrong with German political uniforms, others did. For instance, the District Officer of Moshi stated that “Mr. Delfs-Fritz wore the uniform because he was officially representing his home government.”⁷⁰ He added that the wearing of such a uniform by Mr. Delfs-Fritz was

63 NA, CO691/160/11/77, Telegrams Nos.187 and 188, 18th September 1938. To hide the reason for moving KAR Company to Tanga, it was suggested that the government should announce that ‘the troops had been moved to Tanga for training purposes.’

64 CO691/160/11/8, Dispatch No. 24, NA, 12th May 1938; NA, CO691/160/11/11, Dispatch No. 23, 16th May 1938; NA, CO691/160/11/146, Report from S.F. Sayers (Deputy Governor) to W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, M.P (Secretary of State for the Colonies), 23rd April 1938. It was estimated that about 75 and 35 Germans from Tanga and Dar es Salaam respectively visited the naval ship in question.

65 NA, CO691/153/13/77, Commissioner of Police to CS, 12th August 1937.

66 Wearing of military uniforms by German youths at Moshi was not uncommon See, for example, NA, CO 691/153/13/88, F.A.B. Nicoll (Commissioner of Police) to CS, 15th July 1937.

67 NA, CO691/160/11/6c, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 8th September 1938.

68 NA, CO691/160/11/6c, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 8th September 1938.

69 NA, CO691/160/11/6c, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 8th September 1938.

70 NA, CO691/160/11/6c, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 8th September 1938.

nothing other than “a mark of respect” for the mandate government.⁷¹ However, this did not allay the fears of some British officers.⁷² It became a matter for discussion in the House of Commons, and although it appeared there was not much to worry about, a proposal was made to legislate against the wearing of political uniforms in Tanganyika.⁷³ Within the territory, however, some people wanted the government to regulate the wearing of political uniforms.

By and large, the commemorative initiatives discussed so far indicate that the Germans and British living in mandated Tanganyika had mutual and conflicting interests. The mandate government played the leading role in regulating commemorative events, because it wanted to strengthen its political position and show the German community its imperial identity and superiority. Africans were rarely involved in the events discussed so far. The following sections examine the extent to which the African community was involved or participated in the politics of imperial identity and commemorations.

Africans Involvement in the Politics of Commemoration and Heroism

Some African elites allied with either the Germans or British in supporting imperial motives in mandated Tanganyika. Records indicate that in some cases ex-German Askaris were lured into supporting colonial revisionism. In the Western Province, for example, efforts were made by individual Germans to draw ex-German Askaris closer to them by making them believe that the British were bound to cede Tanganyika to Germany. For example, “Herr Schroeder-Wildberg, a well known supporter of colonial revisionism, “had managed to gather round him a small clique of ex-German Askaris and a sprinkling of Indians” whom he had made to believe that Tanganyika would at no distant date revert to the

⁷¹ NA, CO691/160/11/6c, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 8th September 1938. In his congratulatory letter submitted to the District Officer, Herr Delfs-Fritz wrote: “On the occasion of celebrating the birthday of His Majesty The King of Great Britain I beg to convey in the name of the *Nationalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter Partei* my sincerest wishes for the health and life of His Majesty The King. May His Majesty’s reign be most successful for the Nations embodied in the British Empire and for the whole World.” Seen in NA, CO691/160/11/87, *Landesgruppe* to District Officer (Moshi), 9th June 1938.

⁷² NA, CO691/160/11/89–90, Eric Reid, Silverdale Estate to District Officer (Moshi), 26th July 1938.

⁷³ The Consuls for Germany in Dar es Salaam and Nairobi wrote to apologize for what had happened. NA, CO691/160/11/161, “German Propaganda in Tanganyika, Alleged Intensification of Activities”, Cutting of the *Tanganyika Standard*, 26th February 1938.

Germans.⁷⁴ On learning of this situation, the government closely watched his activities. In April 1938, a similar incident was reported in Tabora and Bukoba, where ex-German Askaris dressed in 'German uniforms' were on parade.⁷⁵ The report added that some members of the African Association at Bukoba had established close ties with the Germans there. Generally, towards the outbreak of the Second World War both the British and Africans greatly feared that the Germans would take back Tanganyika. The Africans were particularly worried about the political situation of the late 1930s, when the Germans were more open about their political ambitions in Tanganyika.⁷⁶

The foregoing "indiscretions," as British officers often called them, not only angered the mandate government and German consul, but also impeded the development of good "Anglo-German relations in the territory."⁷⁷ Nevertheless, both the local German leaders and British officials were at times disturbed by some papers for misreporting German activities in the colonies. In such cases, the mandate government would blame the reporters. D.W. Kennedy, the Acting Governor, described the local news reporters in Tanganyika as follows: "they are of poor calibre and seem, through stupidity or intent, to be doing all they can to stir up racial animosities at a time when there is absolutely no justification for their outpourings."⁷⁸ To give but one example, on 23rd June 1937, the *Tanganyika Standard* reported on the digging of trenches and military training by members of the Mweka-based Hitler Youth Movement in Moshi.⁷⁹ Much to the annoyance of the government, the investigation carried out afterwards showed that no such thing had ever happened in Moshi. The new report came out with new findings indicating that German boy scouts were "at their annual jamboree and camp," actually doing no military training or preparation as reported earlier.⁸⁰

However, it is an undoubted fact that the underground political activities of the Germans posed a great challenge to both the German Consulate and the mandate

74 NA, CO691/160/11/95, "Notice: Agents of the Consulate", September, 1938, p. 4.

75 NA, CO691/160/11/145, Cutting from *The Daily Times* of 22nd April 1938; CO691/153/13/13, Governor to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 8th June 1937.

76 NA, CO691/160/11/50, Governor to the Secretary of State, September, 1938.

77 NA, CO691/160/11/95, "Notice: Agents of the Consulate," September, 1938, p. 5. When Major Alan Dower visited Tanganyika in July 1938 he remarked thus: "I hope this country and Germany will be the greatest of friends, but the handing over of Tanganyika Territory would not certainly lead to greater friendship." See also NA, CO691/160/11 "Tanganyika Cannot Be Surrendered, by Major Alan Dower, M.P., Addresses East African Groupe", 28th July 1938.

78 NA, CO691/153/13/22, D.W. Kennedy to W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, M.P (Secretary of State for the colonies), 19th August 1937.

79 NA CO691/153/13/95, Cutting from the *Tanganyika Standard*, 23rd June 1937.

80 NA, CO691/153/13/16, D.W. Kennedy to W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, M.P, 17th July 1937.

government. On 26th February 1938, the German Consul in Dar es Salaam warned the Germans in Tanganyika to desist from engaging in politics because they were “guests in a foreign country.”⁸¹ But as the campaign for re-acquisition of former German colonies continued through the 1930s in Germany, the Germans in Tanganyika were becoming increasingly involved in political activities.⁸² In a colonial festival organized by the Reich Colonial Association on the 4th July 1938 in Hamburg, Duke Adolf Friedrich of Mecklenburg made it clear that former German colonies were rightfully “German property.”⁸³ He further argued that the mandate arrangement was nothing other than a disguised form of colonialism. However, the mandate government, in collaboration with German officials in Tanganyika, had to make sure that the campaign for colonial revisionism did not result in political chaos.⁸⁴ Addressing a German meeting at Moshi, Herr Roediger told a gathering of Germans that “the German colonial problem would not be solved in Africa but in Europe” and for this reason they should “leave that matter alone.”⁸⁵ They were warned “not to occupy themselves with foreign policy.” De Carriere, The German Consul in Nairobi, stated:

Every German and especially every German living in Tanganyika has the right to hope for and to look forward to it. But he has no right whatever to occupy himself with this eminently political question to conduct any propaganda in connection with it. This question can only be dealt with by the cabinets in Berlin and London. There is not a single German who could further or hinder it. Whoever discusses it with his countrymen or with British subjects offends our hosts and does harm to himself as well as to the German community in this country because he creates a false impression among the British.⁸⁶

The above reaction to German political attitudes by individual colonial officials was not the only one. Another reaction came from the Africans who, covertly, expressed their fear of the return of Tanganyika to Germany. Africans, together with Indians, were always overwhelmed each time it was rumoured that Tanganyika would revert to the former colonial master.⁸⁷ In this connection, an anonymous

⁸¹ NA, CO691/160/11/8, “Kilimanjaro Meeting,” 1938.

⁸² NA, CO 691/153/13 “Permanency of Mandate: German Aspirations”, 1937.

⁸³ NA, CO691/160/11/45/403, Extract from the *Daily Telegraph*, 4th July 1938.

⁸⁴ NA, CO691/160/11/158, H. Peeng (German Consul in Dar es Salaam) to CS (Dar es Salaam), 9th March 1938.

⁸⁵ NA, CO691/160/11/146, Report from S.F. Sayers (Deputy Governor) to W.G.A. Ormsby-Gore, M.P, 23rd April 1938. The meeting was attended by Ludwig Aeldert, Consul General for East Africa stationed at Nairobi. Herr Roediger was Acting German Consul General at Lourenco Marques who was on leave.

⁸⁶ NA, CO691/160/11/158, H. Peeng to CS, 9th March 1938.

⁸⁷ NA, CO691/160/11/166, Governor to CS for the Colonies, 11th November 1938; NA, CO691/160/11, “Uncertainty of the Future of Sovereignty of Tanganyika” by F.J. Anderson, November, 1938; NA,

bishop from Masasi believed: "There can be no doubt that, apart from a few ex-German 'akidas' or 'jumbes,' who under indirect rule no longer receive monthly salaries, the revival in this country of German rule would be regarded as an immeasurable tragedy."⁸⁸ This fear was widely shared in the colony. In November 1938 it was reported by Mr. Mark Young, the Acting Governor:

There is doubt that in almost every district recent rumours have given rise to considerable discussion and that there is among the African population a feeling of insecurity and anxiety which is not confined to the educated native. So far as the latter are concerned, I am told that every penny they earn is being saved and that, in the event of the Territory being transferred, a number have expressed their intention of migrating to adjoining territories.⁸⁹

A year before, a similar view was shared by the Bishop above:

In November 1935 I spent two days at the village of the Yao Sultan Kandulu, in the Tunduru area. He asked me privately what was the meaning of all that was being said about the country being handed back to Germany, 'because,' he went on, it concerns me intimately, as I fought on the British side. It would therefore be necessary for me to move into British territory before a German government became re-established. I made light of it and told him not to believe all he heard, and that many rumours have no truth in them at all, but it impressed me greatly that this man, living in a remote district 250 miles from the coast, should, before the rather agitated campaign of 1936 had begun, already have been told that the country would probably return to Germany. Thousands of Africans fought in the war on the British side, and I have no doubt that rather than face German rule, a number of these who like Kandulu would feel compelled to move out of this territory into Nyasaland, Northern Rhodesia, Uganda, or perhaps Kenya, would be very considerable.⁹⁰

Discernible in these accounts is an indication that traumatic memories of German colonialism still lingered in the minds of the majority of the local people who did not wish to see Tanganyika reverting to Germany.⁹¹ Thus, the memories of ruthless exploitation by the Germans heightened the anxiety and confusion of local people over the allegation of the possible return of the Germans. To allay this fear, the mandate government, in collaboration with the home government, issued statements to the effect that Tanganyika would continue to be administered under

CO691/160/11/158, "The Mandate "Agitation: The Right Method," November, 1938; NA, CO691/153/11/12, Extract from Morning Post, 21st June 1937.

⁸⁸ Cited in NA, CO 691/153/14/18, The Bishop of Masasi to Secretary of State for the colonies, 25th June 1937.

⁸⁹ NA, CO691/160/11/166, Governor to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 11th November 1938.

⁹⁰ NA, CO 691/153/14/18, The Bishop of Masasi to Secretary of state for the colonies, 25th June 1937.

⁹¹ NA, CO691/153/13/44, "Colonies and the Native", A Cutting from *Manchester Guardian*, 29th August 1937.

mandate laws until further notice.⁹² Additionally, British newspapers published views of the Africans on their dislike of German colonial rule. Individual British officers used the memory of the Maji Maji war to tarnish the image of the Germans. The Manchester Guardian of August 29th 1937 reported: “they [the local people] remember too well the slaughter of their fathers which followed the Maji Maji Rebellion of 1905; they know that Germany has a long memory.”⁹³ According to this report, some African chiefs and the ordinary men of the territory frowned at the thought of the return of Tanganyika to the Germans as the majority of them “personally or by tradition [remembered] what German rule was like.”⁹⁴ For example, one of the arguments put forward in support of British acquisition of German colonies in the House of Commons in 1915 was that British colonial administration had gained acceptance among the Africans primarily because of German past experiences in the continent.⁹⁵ By 1916, the politics of annexation in Britain had attracted people from outside the government, particularly human right activists and scholars, who opposed German colonies “be returned to Germany because of the atrocities committed by the Germans against the natives.”⁹⁶ However, this accusation, the so-called “colonial guilt lie” was strongly opposed in Germany in the subsequent decades.⁹⁷ Wolfe W. Schmokel has written that “the German representatives on the League’s Permanent Mandates” in the period between 1927 and 1933 “were sensitive to [. . .] anything in the annual reports submitted by the mandatory powers that reflected in any way unfavorably on German prewar colonial practice.”⁹⁸

At the government level, a referendum, which was code-named *An Appeal from the Peoples of Tanganyika*, was held which the Africans were required to

⁹² NA, CO691/160/11/142, Telegram No. 226, 2nd December 1938. Part of this Telegram stated: “On November 29th Legislative Council of Tanganyika by unanimous resolution made clear the desire of the peoples of Tanganyika to remain under British rule and expressed the hope that confidence would be restored to them by recent assurances given by the Prime Minister of Great Britain.”

⁹³ NA, CO691/153/13/44, *Manchester Guardian*, 29th August 1937; NA, CO691/153/13/1, *The East Africa and Rhodesia*, 21st January 1937.

⁹⁴ NA, CO691/153/13/44, *Manchester Guardian*, 29th August 1937.

⁹⁵ Gaddis Smith, “The British Government and the Disposition of the German Colonies in Africa, 1914–1918,” in Prosser Gifford and WM. Roger Louis (eds), with the assistance of Alison Smith), *Britain and Germany in Africa: Imperial Rivalry and Colonial Rule* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1967), p. 15.

⁹⁶ Smith, “The British Government”, p. 284.

⁹⁷ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 64.

⁹⁸ Schmokel, *The Hard Death of Imperialism*, pp. 303–304. See also Strandmann and Smith, *The German Empire in Africa and British Perspectives*, p. 734.

sign.⁹⁹ It is interesting that when this particular exercise was being carried out at Masasi, people refused to disclose their identity for fear of the Germans taking vengeance on them in future.¹⁰⁰ Overall, fear of the Germans in the Southern regions of Tanganyika was widespread because of the ruthless suppression of the Maji Maji uprising. This fear, unfortunately, lingered in the minds of these people even after independence. Cases of people hiding or refusing to be interviewed on matters concerning the Maji Maji War were reported after independence. When doing his oral research at Matumbi between 1966 and 1967, Gilbert Clement Kamana Gwassa failed to solicit information from some 'survivors of the war' who had fresh memories of the German crackdown on Maji Maji war fighters.¹⁰¹ However, one should not underestimate the fact that colonial reports on this particular aspect could have been exaggerated for the simple reason that the British did not welcome the idea of losing Tanganyika to the Germans. "The Likelihood," Gaddis Smith reflected, "that the German East Africa, once captured, would be returned in a peace settlement diminished as the British expenditure in men and treasure in the campaign mounted. To think of abandoning what has been won at excessive cost is not easy."¹⁰² The following section provides more details on how the payment of the ex-German Askaris became an issue of political significance.

The Politics Involved in the Payment of Ex-German Askaris

Payment of the ex-German Askaris who had fought in the 1914–1918 War influenced the politics of colonial heroism in the inter-war period. After the end of the First World War, the Germans left Tanganyika before paying the men who, during the war, had served them as Askaris, porters, auxiliary combatants or as servants of "the German military and Imperial German Postal Service."¹⁰³ When these claims appeared in the early 1920s, the German government responded quickly by sending a delegation to Tanganyika to go round the country, moving from

⁹⁹ NA, CO 691/153/14/18, The Bishop of Masasi to Secretary of State for the colonies, 25th June 1937.

¹⁰⁰ NA, CO 691/153/14/18, The Bishop of Masasi to Secretary of State for the colonies, 25th June 1937.

¹⁰¹ Gwassa, *The Outbreak and Development of the Maji Maji War*, p. 28.

¹⁰² Smith, *The British Government*, pp. 283–284.

¹⁰³ For this classification of groups of people who rendered support to the Germans during the First World War see for example, TNA, No. 193/17, Accession No. 69, Circular letter No. 12 of 1926, 22nd February 1926.

district to district, making the payments.¹⁰⁴ In comparison to a similar exercise carried out by the British to return the money surrendered to the British war officers by the ex-German Askaris who had been detained as war prisoners, the German delegation was able to make the payment in a shorter time and with fewer difficulties. Due to this, some British officers expressed their worry about the negative feelings the local people were developing towards the British colonial government. This section therefore throws some light on the extent to which issues of fame and local influence were brought to bear on the mandate government's handling of the payment of the ex-German Askaris.

There were two groups of claimants, as far as the above-mentioned groups of Africans who participated in the First World War are concerned: those who had fought on the side of the Germans and had not received their 'war wages' from the German colonial government, and those who had ended up being prisoners of war in the British prisoner-of-war camps and whose money they possessed upon entering the camps were taken from them by British army officers. In view of this, the German delegation was only concerned with the first group. The latter claimed their money back from the British Army when they were released at the end of the war. As already mentioned, the Germans responded swiftly to settle the claims made by their former so-called "Native Comrades." The total claims amounted to an estimated sum of £500,000.¹⁰⁵ Some British officers in the government, fearing that the beneficiaries of these arrears would end up squandering the money, thought of encouraging them to open bank accounts "to promote savings among the natives."¹⁰⁶

The German delegation arrived in Tanganyika in early 1926 and immediately circular letters were distributed to the local governments to make preparations for the payment. The British colonial government fully co-operated with the German delegation in carrying out this exercise in the country. It was mandatory

¹⁰⁴ R.W. Gordon was appointed as the District in charge of the German Delegation. Seen in NA, CO691/90/12, R.W. Gordon to CS, 21st March 1927.

¹⁰⁵ TNA, No. 193/10/10, Accession No. 69, confidential circular letter from CS to all Senior Commissioners and Administrative Officers in charge of District and Sub-Districts, 18th February 1926.

¹⁰⁶ TNA, No. 193/10/23, Accession No. 69, The Standard Bank of South Africa Ltd. (Dar es Salaam) to CS, 3rd March 1926; TNA, No. 193/10/10, Accession No. 69, Confidential circular letter from the Chief Secretary, 18th February 1926. On reporting the amount of money to be used for this purpose, the Acting CS, C.C.F. Dundas said that the majority of people received "relatively large sums." "It is most desirable", he added, "that some influence be brought to bear on these natives to induce them to make the best use of this money either by expending it on real benefits, or by placing it on deposit. Nothing should be done which might be construed as a direct order or coercion but Administrative Officers should suggest to the natives the best means of making use of the money and endeavour to dissuade them from squandering it in a thriftless manner."

that all payments were made through Administrative Officers.¹⁰⁷ In fact, before the permission was granted to the German delegates to proceed with payment plans, the mandate government had to ensure that “the mission would have nothing of a military character, and the proceedings would be under the direction and control of [. . .]” British colonial officers.¹⁰⁸ The local governments were required to prepare a list of the claimants with the necessary supporting documents. The list had to indicate particulars such as the “districts to which the [claimants] originally belonged in German times as well their tribe, current residence, and evidence of their employment like letters of appointment and salary details.”¹⁰⁹ In comparison, the German delegates were less pedantic in approving the claims, which meant that the payments were made without any hurdles. As a matter of fact, payments were made “according to the merits of each individual case, notwithstanding the fact that the claimant [was] no longer in possession of German receipts or other documents.”¹¹⁰ What is more, German war records, unearthed at Njombe in October 1918, consisted of “full records of German troops and followers in the field,” which were of great use in cross-checking the claims made by the Africans.¹¹¹

As noted above, some ex-German Askaris claimed a refund of their money forcibly “surrendered to the British military authorities in East Africa” on entering British prisoner-of-war camps or on admission to hospital.¹¹² The Military Claims Commissioner from the War Office came to Tanganyika in 1921 to look into these claims.¹¹³ The Africans were encouraged to submit their claims, though no immediate payments were made.¹¹⁴ The War Office was reluctant to make payments even

¹⁰⁷ TNA, No. 193/10, Accession No. 69, Circular letter No. 0238/92 from John Scott to all Senior Commissioners and Administrative Offices in charge of District and Sub-districts, 16th January 1926.

¹⁰⁸ Sr. Donald Cameron, *My Tanganyika Service and Some Nigeria* (London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1939), pp. 66–67.

¹⁰⁹ TNA, No. 193/10, Circular letter No.0238/92, 16th January 1926; TNA, No. 193/10/6, Accession No. 6, H. Grieson, D.O, Moshi, to all Chagga chiefs, 4th February 1926.

¹¹⁰ TNA, No. 193/17, Accession No. 69, Circular letter No. 12 of 1926, 22nd February 1926; NA CO691/102/15/1, Governor’s Deputy (Dar es Salaam) to The Right Honourable (London), 13th February 1929. The British colonial government emphasized: “the claims of ex-German for moneys surrendered by the British Military Authorities might be settled where the Government was satisfied that the claim was genuine.

¹¹¹ TNA, No. 193/10/4, Accession No. 69, District Officer to P.C (Northern Province), 5th February 1926.

¹¹² NA, CO 691/90/12/13, Secretary of State Office (Dar es Salaam) to The War Office (London), 18th October 1927; NA, CO 691/90/12, Minutes No. 10, 14th July 1927; NA, CO691/90/12, G.W. Gordon to Chief Secretary, 21st March 1927.

¹¹³ NA, CO 691/90/12, Entry No. 10, 14th July 1927.

¹¹⁴ NA CO 691/102/15, Entry No. 4, War Office, 28th June 1929.

when the claims and all necessary supporting documents were submitted. Due to this, the local authority in Dar es Salaam continued to be at loggerheads with the War Office, blaming it for delaying the payments. For its part, the War Office complained about exaggerated claims, which, above all, lacked supporting documents or evidence.¹¹⁵ “In principle,” complained R.W. Gordon, “I beg to submit that our Military Authorities were technically to blame. Money or notes taken away on capture should have been returned to these ex-German Askaris etc. on their release.”¹¹⁶

After the foregoing huffing and puffing, an agreement was reached in early 1929 whereby the money owed by the government to the Africans should be paid as soon as possible. When submitting the report on the total claims, estimated at £4,266, to the higher authority in London in early 1929, the Deputy Governor wrote: “I trust that you will be able to see your way to pressing this matter strongly upon the War office, thus removing an injustice which cannot but rattle in the minds of the natives concerned and affect the prestige of the British Administration in their eyes.”¹¹⁷ Undoubtedly, the slackness of the British in settling the Ex-German Askaris’ claims not only annoyed some Government officials in Dar es Salaam, but also made them fearful that British influence was declining relative to that of the Germans whose payments were made without a hitch.¹¹⁸ R.W. Gordon, who was the District Commissioner in charge of the German Commission of Payment, warned and advised the government that:

The native’s sense of injustice has been thoroughly proved by the creation of the present unhappy contrast: on the one side he sees that the German Government has honourably paid its arrears of war wages, whereas on the other our Government has, up till the present, repudiated native claims to refund part of the aforesaid war wages, of which he was deprived while lingering in British captivity! But there happily remains time for us to efface this one dark stain that, in regard to German payments, does particular and exceeding injury to our fame.”¹¹⁹

¹¹⁵ NA CO 691/102/15, Entry No. 4, War Office, 28th June 1929; NA, CO 691/90/12/7, Confidential Letter, 28th May 1927.

¹¹⁶ NA, CO691/90/12, G.W. Gordon to CS, 21st March 1927.

¹¹⁷ NA, CO691/102/15/1, Governor’s Deputy (Dar es Salaam) to The Right Honourable (London), 13th February 1929.

¹¹⁸ John Scott, the Acting Governor, admitted that payments by Germans “were completed so rapidly and without friction,” that the whole exercise was handled fair[ly] and scrupulous[ly]”, NA, CO691/90/12/18344/11, John Scott (Acting Governor) to The Right Honourable, 14th July 1927; Cameron, *My Tanganyika Service*, p. 68.

¹¹⁹ NA, CO691/90/12, R.W. Gordon to the CS, Dar es Salaam, 30th June 1927.

This view was seconded by the Acting Governor, who cautioned the government that immediate measures had to be taken to settle the claims lest it would create what he called a “deplorable” impression in the eyes of the local people.¹²⁰

It must be noted that the mandate government co-operated with the German delegation in making payments to the former German Askaris with a view to concealing the German gesture of honour by creating the impression among the claimants that the British were instrumental in effecting the payments. This view was confirmed by John Scott with reference to R.W. Gordon that far from “causing a reaction of feeling in the native mind in favour of Germany, the payments tended to increase [British] prestige.”¹²¹ Therefore, it was this good image that the Government had, through the German Commission of Payment, painstakingly created among the local population, which they feared would amount to nothing if the government did not settle the claims of the Africans once and for all. It can be seen therefore that the British jumped at the chance of settling this matter hoping to paint a good image of their administration in the eyes of the Africans, to the detriment of the Germans’ reputation. The readiness and swiftness of the Germans in honouring the claims of their former Askaris set a record which could not easily be broken by the British. However, the British attained a similar achievement to that of the Germans when they were able to return the skull of Chief Mkwawa to the Hehe people and award war medals to all Tanzanians who were recruited into KAR during the Second World War.¹²² The story of Mkwawa is covered in the following section.

Campaign for the Return of the Skull of Chief Mkwawa, 1918–1955

The campaign for the return of the skull of Mkwawa, the former chief of Uhehe, was another commemoration, which invoked memories of German colonialism in mandated Tanganyika. It is worth beginning this section with a few glimpses of the military history of Uhehe. Pre-colonial history indicates that by the time the Germans sent military expeditions to Uhehe, Mkwawa and his father, Muyugumba,

¹²⁰ NA, CO 691/90/12/18344/10, Acting Governor (Dar es Salaam) to the Right Honourable (London), 14th July 1927.

¹²¹ NA, CO 691/90/12/18344/10, Acting Governor (Dar es Salaam) to the Right Honourable (London), 14th July 1927.

¹²² The exercise of awarding war medals was conducted all over Tanganyika during the 1950s. Seen in various correspondences: TNA, C 1/1, “Ceremonial: Honours, Medals, Kings/Queen’s Birthday, Celebrations and Funerals”, 1938–1962, Accession No. 155.

had achieved lordship through war over the adjoining chiefdoms and those located far afield.¹²³ Muyugumba, who died in 1879, had fought successful wars of expansion and plunder (cattle raids) against the Mbunga people and Kipeta of Songea Ngoni in 1875 and 1878, respectively.¹²⁴ In killing Kipeta, whose position as chief was taken over by Chabruma, Muyugumba almost suffered defeat in a counter-attack launched by the latter. In one of the skirmishes engineered by Chabruma, the advancing Ngoni soldiers were able to besiege Muyugumba at Lugalo, but he was rescued by his son, Mkwawa.¹²⁵ By 1879 when he died, Muyugumba had, for the purpose of expanding sources of captives, ivory, and stock, exerted military influence as far as Pawaga, Ugogo, Usagara, Usangu and Ubena, as well as Ruaha and Kilombero river valleys.¹²⁶

With the death of Muyugumba, Mkwawa became the new chief of Uhehe. Following in the footsteps of his father, Mkwawa wanted to extend his sphere of trade in ivory and slaves as far as possible. For this reason, his neighbouring chiefdoms continued to be terrified of him. To save his skin, for example, chief Merere of Usangu established blood relations with Mkwawa by giving him two daughters as wives in exchange for the latter's elder sister.¹²⁷ To punish his father's old enemy, Chabruma, Mkwawa charged at the Ngoni soldiers at the battle of Lupembe in 1882 and defeated them, hence forcing Chabruma to make peace with Mkwawa.¹²⁸ Although Mkwawa was able to terrorize his neighbours, his chiefdom was not immune to external invasions. He was at one time overpowered by chief Mwambamba of Unyamwezi and "forced to retreat to Gogo territory but soon came back and beat Mwambamba at the battle of Rusawira."¹²⁹ During

¹²³ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe," 1954, p. 1. The origin of Muyugumba, the founder of Uhehe chiefdom, is traced to Mujinga who initially lived in the lowlands of Usagara as a hunter. He migrated to "the Nguruhe area of Lower Dabaga and married a daughter of the Chief of that area." "He ultimately returned to Usagara, where he died. His son, also named Mujinga, became Chief of Nguruhe, and was succeeded in turn by his son, grandson and great-grandson, named Kitowa, Mdegela and Kilonge. The last of these, Kilonge, extended his chiefdom to included Rungemba by marrying the daughter of the Chief of that area." His son, Muyugumba, therefore emerged as a powerful chief of Uhehe.

¹²⁴ See, for example, Edger V. Williams, "Trade and Warfare in Uhehe in the period 1850–1900" in *Social Science Conference Papers*, Vol. 1, 1969, p. 194.

¹²⁵ Williams, "Trade and Warfare in Uhehe", p. 194; NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe," 1954, p. 1.

¹²⁶ Williams, "Trade and Warfare in Uhehe", pp. 194–195. Muyigumba's wars against the Bena and Sangu were fought between 1874 and 1875.

¹²⁷ Williams, "Trade and Warfare in Uhehe", p. 19.

¹²⁸ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe," Second Edition, 1954, p. 2.

¹²⁹ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe," Second Edition, 1954, pp. 1–2.

his last war against Mwambamba in 1882, the battle of Igumbiro, Mkwawa successfully halted the advancing Nyamwezi troops.¹³⁰

Therefore, between the 1880s and early 1890s, Mkwawa demonstrated unrivalled marshal skills to his neighbours, thereby establishing himself politically and militarily. His swiftness to assimilate new warfare methods, particularly the use of firearms and fortifications, coupled with his extensive experience of war in the region, had made his chiefdom strong enough to put up stiff resistance to the German troops. At the first attack by German forces in August 1891, Mkwawa's men were able to kill more than 200 African mercenaries, 10 Germans and Emil von Zeleweski, the German Commander.¹³¹ More than four years elapsed before the Germans could launch a counter-attack in October 1894 to punish Mkwawa, when his fort was stormed and he and his men were put to flight, abandoning an arsenal of guns at his capital of Kalenga.¹³² Thenceforth, Mkwawa fought a defensive war in the bush against the Germans who had offered a bounty of 5,000 rupees equivalent to £400 for his capture.¹³³ He was found dead on July 19th 1898. Historical accounts of his death attest to the fact that Mkwawa chose to take his own life rather than surrender to the Germans.¹³⁴ Upon finding his body, the Germans, incensed at their failed mission of catching him alive, resolved to decapitate it and shipped the head to Germany as a trophy of victory.¹³⁵

The circumstance in which the skull of Mkwawa became a matter of concern to the mandate government cannot be solely accounted for by article 246 of the Treaty of Versailles of 1919, which had instructed Germany to return it to Tanganyika.¹³⁶ The article stated: “the skull of Sultan Mkwawa, which was removed from German East Africa and taken to Germany [...] shall be handed over to the

130 NA. No. 13/172/01/66, “The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe,” Second Edition, 1954, p. 2.

131 James Leonard Giblin, *A History of the Excluded: Making Family a refuge from State in Twentieth-century Tanzania* (USA: Ohio University Press, 2005), p. 24.

132 These included “field-pieces, machine guns and numerous M/715.” Seen in Helge Kjekshus, *Ecology Control and Economic Development in East African History: The Case of Tanganyika* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1977), p. 144.

133 NA. No. 13/172/01/75, Speech by His Excellency the Governor at the Ceremony of the Return of the Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe to Chief Adam Sapi and the People of Uhehe on Saturday, 19th June 1954, p. 3.

134 NA. No. 13/172/01/75, p. 5. Giblin gives a new version of the death of Mkwawa which challenges the view that Mkwawa died as “a lonely fugitive” in the bush. Giblin’s interviews reveal that Mkwawa had close contact with his family to which he said his farewell before killing himself. This oral account reveals as well that Mkwawa was given a befitting traditional burial by his relations. For more discussion on this aspect see Giblin, *A History of the Excluded*, pp. 24–28.

135 G.L. Steer, *Judgement on German East Africa* (London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd, 1939), p. 255.

136 Steer, *Judgement on German East Africa*, p. 255.

British Government.”¹³⁷ For the British, the need to return the skull of Mkwawa to Tanganyika was of ‘political importance’.¹³⁸ This is due to the fact that, soon after the war, the Hehe people took the matter up with the British Administrators whom they hoped would do anything in their power to make sure that the skull was returned to them.¹³⁹ As a matter of fact, the British could not just ignore the Hehe’s claims, because they had supported the British forces during the 1914–1918 war.¹⁴⁰ Thus, the British felt obliged to assist in returning the skull as a gesture of honour to the Hehe people. The intention to return the skull was initially that of a British officer who, on 14th November 1918, wrote to the Foreign Office advising that a clause instructing the Germans to return the skull should be inserted in the Treaty of Versailles of 1919.¹⁴¹ The returned skull was hoped “to give [the Hehe people] a due sense of both the power and benevolence of their new rulers.”¹⁴² That was not the only reason for the British to intervene in this matter. It is obvious that British support was also meant to create a good impression and wield influence among the local population, consequently damaging Germany’s image. Hence, they saw the possibility of achieving this by helping the Hehe people, who were desperate to have their sacred skull which was still in the Germans’ possession. However, Sir Donald Cameron reveals that the skull saga which had hit the House of Commons in the late 1930s had never been an issue among the Hehe people. Wondering why Mkwawa’s Skull had caught the attention of the House of Commons, Cameron had written in 1939: “I met no native in Tanganyika, not even Mkwawa’s son, who was much interested in the subject.”¹⁴³ Of course, Cameron and some of his colonial government officials in Tanganyika seemed to challenge the Treaty of Versailles for having demanded restoration of Mkwawa’s Skull as he further wrote: “It seemed to us a strange course thus to commemorate in the midst of purely native country such a serious blow to German prestige.”¹⁴⁴

It must be emphasized that the Germans frowned on some provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, which were, in the language of Michael S. Neiberg, utterly “symbolic or just bizarre.”¹⁴⁵ This included the above-mentioned provision as well as two more provisions: the first demanded that “all French flags captured during

¹³⁷ NA, No. 13/172/01/53, “Skulls for Selection”, *Der Spiegel*, 25th August 1954, 1954–1956.

¹³⁸ Sayers, *The Handbook of Tanganyika*, p. 71.

¹³⁹ NA, No. 13/172/01/8/8, Cutting from *Evening News*, 1955.

¹⁴⁰ NA, No. 13/172/01/75, “Speech by His Excellency”, 19th June 1954, p. 2.

¹⁴¹ NA, CO 691/112/16, Entry No. 1/F.O/9151/19, 18th October 1930.

¹⁴² NA, CO 691/112/16, Entry No. 1/G.E.A/4135, 18th October 1930.

¹⁴³ Cameron, *My Tanganyika Service*, p. 50.

¹⁴⁴ Cameron, *My Tanganyika Service*, pp. 49–50.

¹⁴⁵ Michael S. Neiberg, *The Treaty of Versailles: A Concise History* (USA: Oxford University Press, 2017), p. 61.

the 1870–71 war” should be given back to France and the second instructed Germany to return to “the king of Hejaz a historic Koran that the Ottoman sultan had once given to Kaiser Wilhelm.”¹⁴⁶ In the eyes of the Germans, these provisions sounded ridiculous, which explains why the German government was hesitant to comply with the British demand in the first place. After all, according to a translated article of *Der Spiegel*, “the *corpus delicti* of Article 246 of the Versailles Treaty was never received by the German government.”¹⁴⁷ For the Germans, therefore, giving back the skull was something they could not approve of easily. Initially, they were somewhat cagey in giving information about it. According to British archival sources, the Germans pleaded ignorance and denied existence of the skull in Germany. Apart from their attempt to cover it up, the Germans also found fault with the provision of the Treaty of Versailles for not presenting it to them officially. In particular, *Der Spiegel* reported in 1954 that the British were using the skull saga as a pretext for enticing the Hehe people to join the battalion of the KAR, which was fighting against the Mau Mau in Kenya.¹⁴⁸ “The young Wahehe,” it was reported, “were given to understand how they could show their gratitude for the British solicitude for the happiness of the Wahehe tribe, namely by volunteering to fight against the Mau Mau.”¹⁴⁹ Evidence in Sir Edward Twining’s speech delivered on the day the skull was being officially presented to the Hehe people in Iringa indicates that, apart from praising the Hehe people for their fine “martial qualities,” he asked chief Adama Sapi (the grandson of chief Mkwawa) to allow what he called “the cream of [his] youth to come forward and join the KAR.”¹⁵⁰ Attending this ceremony was also the Officer commanding the Sixth battalion of the KAR who had planned to recruit about 70 Hehe youths on the spot.¹⁵¹ Although this battalion was based in Dar es Salaam, a similar Sixth battalion of the KAR existed in Kenya, which was one of the KAR troops fighting Mau Mau guerrillas in Kenya during the 1950s.¹⁵² Others were the First Lancashire Fusiliers, the Fourth KAR of Uganda and

146 Neiberg, *The Treaty of Versailles*, p.61.

147 NA. No. 13/172/01/53, “Skulls for Selection”, 25th August 1954.

148 NA. No. 13/172/01/53, “Skulls for Selection”, 25th August 1954.

149 NA. No. 13/172/01/53, “Skulls for Selection”, 25th August 1954.

150 NA. No. 13/172/01/75, “Speech by His Excellency”, 19th June 1954,” p. 2. According to Luanda and Mwanjabala, ‘By 1931 the soldiers of 6 K.A.R. were mostly Nyamwezi, Sukuma, Hehe, Yao and Ngoni, but also some Nubi and a Congolese Company Sergeant Major.’ See N.N. Luanda and E. Mwanjabala, “King’s African Rifles to Tanganyika Rifles: A Colonial Sliceup”, in *Tanzania People’s Defence Forces, Tanganyika Rifles Mutiny January 1964* (Dar es Salaam: Dar es Salaam University Press, 1993), p. 8.

151 NA. No. 13/172/01/75, “Speech by His Excellency”, 19th June, 1954,” p. 2.

152 Wunyabari O. Maloba, *Mau Mau and Kenya: An Analysis of Peasant Revolt* (UK: James Currey Publishers, 1993), p. 81; Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 96; Luanda and Mwanjabala, “King’s

the local KAR of Kenya.¹⁵³ There is however no evidence that the Dar es Salaam battalion was used in the Mau Mau War. The Committee of Imperial Defence declared that the Dar es Salaam battalion be excluded from “defending British interests in India, Middle East, and other parts of East Africa.”¹⁵⁴ Of course, article 4 of the Mandatory forbade any military activities within and outside Tanganyika except for local policing.¹⁵⁵ The only KAR battalion which could be used outside the territory was the Second battalion which was stationed in Tabora after it was moved from Nyasaland (Malawi) to Tanganyika.¹⁵⁶ “At the outbreak of the second world war the 6 K.A.R. left Dar es Salaam for Moshi for re-training. It was destined for Nanyuki where it was responsible for the defence of the inland sector.”¹⁵⁷

The enforcement of above-mentioned article 246 in the early 1920s did not bear fruit. After some failed efforts in 1920 and 1921, the matter was shelved until 1930 when it was mentioned again in the government. Such a sustained lack of interest in the skull question was due to the lack of co-operation and commitment by the German and British governments, respectively.¹⁵⁸ When the German government was asked to return the skull of Mkwawa in the early 1920s, the German Foreign Officer, Gustav Stressemann, hastily ordered the museum authorities to “give them simply three skulls of their choice.”¹⁵⁹ The museum authorities immediately sent three skulls to London for the British Foreign Office “to choose one of them as the head of the Sultan [Mkwawa].” Whereas nothing was ever reported by the British Foreign Office on the final decision made, the colonial government in Tanganyika was satisfied that none of the three skulls was found to belong to the late chief Mkwawa.¹⁶⁰ However, the colonial government did not do anything until the late 1930s when there was renewed interest in this matter.

African Rifles to Tanganyika Rifles”, p. 11. The Sixth battalion of Dar es Salaam aimed at recruiting “local Africans who would not serve outside mandatory territory.”

¹⁵³ Maloba, *Mau Mau and Kenya*, pp. 81–82. By early 1953, the K.A.R troops “had failed to isolate and eliminate the Mau Mau guerrillas,” hence the need for urgent reinforcements. See also Colonial Office, *The Colonial Territories, 1952–1953* (London: Her Majesty’s Stationery Office, 1953), p. 16.

¹⁵⁴ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 96.

¹⁵⁵ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, p. 195. The article stated: “The Mandatory shall not establish any military or naval bases, nor erect any fortifications, nor organize any native military force in the territory except for local police purposes and for the defence of the territory.”

¹⁵⁶ Callahan, *Mandate and Empire*, pp. 96–97.

¹⁵⁷ Luanda and Mwanjabala, “King’s African Rifles to Tanganyika Rifles”, p. 12.

¹⁵⁸ NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

¹⁵⁹ NA. No. 13/172/01/E/IV, Translation of an article Appearing in the German Monthly Periodical of *Der Spiegel*, 6th July 1954.

¹⁶⁰ NA, CO 691/112/16, Entry No. 1/F.O/40726/21, 18th October 1930.

Towards the end of the 1930s, the question of Mkwawa's skull was brought up again in the mandate government. The Governor, Sir Edward Twining, played an instrumental role in initiating the process of searching for the skull.¹⁶¹ From his personal observation when visiting Iringa in 1949, he learned that the Hehe people "still attached considerable importance to the return of the skull" of their ancestor.¹⁶² In realization of this, he started a new process of searching for the skull with assistance provided by the United Kingdom High Commissioner for Western Germany. In April 1953, he was informed that the chances were that Mkwawa's skull could be among the many skulls stored in the Ethnological Museum of Bremen.¹⁶³ On learning this, he gathered details of the shape and size of Mkwawa's skull in Iringa, which could be used for identification purposes.¹⁶⁴ The elders' recollection of the unusual small head of the late Mkwawa, akin to that of Chief Adam Sapi and his sister, prompted him to measure the skull of the latter. The finding was 'a cephalic index of 71 percent,' a quite unusual size in scientific terms. This information, together with the knowledge that the skull had a hole "caused by a firearm with a caliber of 21.5 mm," typical of *Schutztruppe's* firearms in wide use during the late 19th century, facilitated identification in Bremen.¹⁶⁵ On his official trip to England in July 1953, Sir Edward Twining resolved that he should not go back to Tanganyika before going to Bremen to investigate the skulls personally in the hope of recognizing the one belonging to the late Mkwawa.¹⁶⁶ To identify the skull in Bremen, Sir Edward Twining was assisted by the British Consul, Mr. Massey, and the Director of the Bremen Museum, Dr. Wagner.¹⁶⁷ They were finally able to find a skull whose physical appearance tallied with the information collected earlier by Twining in Uhehe. Thus, Mkwawa's skull had been found.

Transported in a special container from Bremen to Dar es Salaam via London, the skull arrived in Dar es Salaam in June 1954.¹⁶⁸ We must add that transporting

¹⁶¹ NA. No. 13/172/01/8/8, Cutting from *Evening News*, 1955. Sir Edward Twining was appointed Governor of Tanganyika in June 1949 and that same year he "began to take a personal interest in the affair. It was largely due to his efforts that the matter was taken up once more."

¹⁶² NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

¹⁶³ NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

¹⁶⁴ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe", 1954, p. 5.

¹⁶⁵ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe", 1954, p. 5.

¹⁶⁶ NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

¹⁶⁷ NA. No. 13/172/01/66, "The Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe," 1954, p. 5.

¹⁶⁸ NA. No. 13/172/01/21, Alan M. Streete to R.W. Francis (Colonial Office), December 1st, 1955; NA, CO 822/12/5/2, B.E. Rolfe to C.H. Fone, Esq, December 24th, 1957. The skull was handed over to Chief Adam Sapi on the 18th June 1954 after signing "a legal document" which was also "counter-

the skull from Dar es Salaam to Iringa was not an easy task for the team responsible. A number of mishaps befell those involved in transporting it, much to their bewilderment. In an attempt to transport it by air, “the emergency exit was blown off” and “the plane had to return to Dar es Salaam for repair.”¹⁶⁹ The skull continued to misbehave even when transported by train via Dodoma. One person, a bandmaster by the name of Gulab Singh, died on the train, another one fell sick and had to go to hospital, “the head boy had a soda water bottle burst in his face and the cook was struck on the face by a flying saucer.”¹⁷⁰ Puzzled by these mysterious happenings, Sir Edward Twining had to open the box containing the skull at Dodoma to be sure of its contents, before he allowed it to be transported to Iringa.¹⁷¹

The successful return of the skull to Tanganyika was lauded by the Hehe people, and, indeed, its return served to foster good relations between the Hehe people and the Germans on the one hand and between the former and the British on the other. In a ceremony organized to officially receive the skull at Kalenga on the 19th June 1954, Chief Adam Sapi showered the Governor with praises:

We Tanganyikans are all aware, Sir, of the distinguished service you have rendered to this territory in return for which we have nothing to offer, Sir, but our deep-rooted loyalty to Her Majesty's Government and to Your Excellency, our simple thanks.¹⁷²

Germany's contribution was equally appreciated by both the Hehe people and the British colonial government. A letter of appreciation was written to the Bremen Museum for its assistance. As a sign of friendship, the Hehe people gave some ethnological objects as “a token of gratitude” to the Museum of Bremen.¹⁷³ Although some Hehe people remained skeptical about the authenticity of the skull returned to them, the majority, after having seen the “bump in the middle of the forehead” which, according to the elders, matched that of Chief Mkwawa, were satisfied that the skull in really belonged to him.¹⁷⁴

signed by members of his family.” See, for example, NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

¹⁶⁹ NA. No. 13/172/01/218, E. Twining to E.B. David (colonial office, London), 15th February 1954.

¹⁷⁰ NA. No. 13/172/01/218, E. Twining to E.B. David (colonial office, London), 15th February 1954.

¹⁷¹ NA. No. 13/172/01/218, E. Twining to E.B. David (colonial office, London), 15th February 1954.

¹⁷² NA. No. 13/172/01/74, Speech by Chief Adam Sapi, M.B.E., M.L.C. at the Ceremony of the Return of the Skull of Chief Mkwawa of Uhehe on Saturday, 19th June 1954.

¹⁷³ NA. No. 13/172/01/198/8, Inward Telegram from Sir Edward Twining to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, 21st June 1954.

¹⁷⁴ NA. No. 13/172/01/10/72, Governor to Principal Secretary of State for the colonies, 6th July 1954.

To avoid complaints from the German side, the British government tried to control publicity about the return of the skull to Tanganyika. Owing to what was described as “German touchiness about the Treaty of Versailles,” the British Foreign Office ordered the press to avoid as much as possible mentioning article 246 of the Treaty of Versailles in their reports.¹⁷⁵ This decision was based on the assumption that referring to the article would, for reasons mentioned earlier in this chapter, cause some negative responses by the Germans. Nevertheless, the colonial government in Tanganyika found fault with this instruction saying that the Germans had only themselves to blame. In view of this, Sir Edward Twining wrote in reply to the directive from the British Foreign Office: “the Germans should not have cut his head off: they should not have sent it to Germany when they had cut it off and if they did not want to return it they should not have lost the war, I will do my best to see that publicity is not given, but I cannot guarantee this.”¹⁷⁶ The following section focuses on the issues concerning preservation and maintenance of the inherited Imperial War Graves in post-colonial period.

The Imperial War Graves in Post-colonial Tanzania

The graves of European soldiers who fell in the two world wars in different parts of Tanzania were initially preserved by the British colonial government under IWGC until the Tanganyika government took over this responsibility on 1st July 1961.¹⁷⁷ The work of maintaining the war graves cemetery after independence was undertaken by the respective town councils, the Area Commissioner’s Office or the town clerks, and in certain areas by the mission stations.¹⁷⁸ The war graves across Tanganyika were usually marked by memorial crosses and headstones. Most of these were maintained by salaried monument guards and gardeners, who received funds from the government to cover these expenses.¹⁷⁹ In 1968, the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) Tanganyika Agency, under the then Prime Minister’s and Second Vice-President’s Office, was formed for the purpose of constructing and

¹⁷⁵ NA, No. 13/172/01/3, E.B. David to Colonial Office, 27th February 1954.

¹⁷⁶ NA. No. 13/172/01/206, E.F. Twining (Governor of Tanganyika) to E.B.David (Colonial Office), 8th March 1954.

¹⁷⁷ From various letters seen in NRC, CW 80155, “Maintenance of War Graves by Town Councils”, 1960/68, No. 46; NRC, M7/3/113, Circular letter from Permanent Secretary (Prime Minister’s Office) to All Provincial Commissioners, 15th June 1961.

¹⁷⁸ MZA, M7/3/170/192, “51st Annual Report of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (Tanganyika Agency)”, 14th April 1970, pp. 1–9.

¹⁷⁹ Correspondences in NRC, CYE/7, “Estimates 1962/63 Antiquities”, 1962, No. 6.

preserving the Dar es Salaam War Cemetery, with 1770 and 34 graves of the first and second World War, respectively.¹⁸⁰ In addition to these graves are 112 graves of the German and Belgian soldiers and those of other nationalities who died during the First World War.¹⁸¹ The construction by CWGC of the Dar es Salaam War Cemetery along the Bagamoyo Road started in 1968 and was officially inaugurated on 3rd December 1969.¹⁸² The CWGC Tanganyika Agency also maintained Upanga and Kinondoni war cemeteries.¹⁸³ It should be noted that, in British times, only two war cemeteries existed at Upanga and on the sea front in Dar es Salaam.¹⁸⁴ Approximately 660 First World War graves on the sea front were relocated by CWGC to Dar es Salaam War Cemetery in 1968 to give way for the construction of Ocean Road.¹⁸⁵

In 1974, the government carried out what was called a “regrouping exercise,” which involved the exhumation of the war graves in 25 areas of Tanzania, the remains of which were transported to Dar es Salaam to be reburied by CWGC at the War Cemetery there.¹⁸⁶ Statistics indicate that 1000 war graves were exhumed from different parts of the country and transported to Dar es Salaam for reburial at the Dar es Salaam War Cemetery.¹⁸⁷ This was in response to the request made by the West German embassy in 1960 for the Tanganyika government “to carry out the exercise of finding out the places with graves of the German soldiers (who died in the First World War) which [were] not being maintained” so that immediate steps could be taken to ensure their proper maintenance.¹⁸⁸ The Tanganyika government responded by circulating letters to all regional and district authorities

¹⁸⁰ The Citizen Reporter, “World War I, II Heroes Honoured in Dar City”, *The Citizen*, 14th November 2016, p. 3; MZA, M7/3, M.A. Katongo (CWGC Tanganyika Agency) to Director General (CWGC London), 11th May 1972, p. 6.

¹⁸¹ The Citizen Reporter, “World War I, II Heroes Honoured in Dar City”, *The Citizen*, 14th November 2016, p. 3.

¹⁸² MZA, M7/3/192, M.A. Katongo (CWGC Tanganyika Agency) to The Director General and Secretary (CWGC London), 14th April 1970, p. 3. It is interesting to note that during the construction of Dar es Salaam War Cemetery, the University College of Dar es Salaam offered plants obtained from its nursery, which was appreciated by the Principal Secretary of CWGC Tanganyika Agency in his annual report of CWGC for 1970.

¹⁸³ MZA, M7/3/192, M.A. Katongo (CWGC Tanganyika Agency) to The Director General and Secretary (CWGC London), 14th April 1970, p. 3.

¹⁸⁴ MZA, M7/3/15, Report on the Graves of the 1914–1918 War, June 1943, p. 2.

¹⁸⁵ The Citizen Reporter, “World War I, II Heroes Honoured in Dar City”, *The Citizen*, 14th November 2016, p. 3.

¹⁸⁶ MZA, M7/1, T.H. Wildy to Mbeya Regional Commissioner, 1st October 1974, p. 8.

¹⁸⁷ The Citizen Reporter, “World War I, II Heroes Honoured in Dar City”, *The Citizen*, 14th November 2016, p. 3.

¹⁸⁸ MZA, M7/3/195, Principal Secretary to H. Vogt (Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany), 26th October 1970, p. 1.

requesting them to carry out the exercise and submit reports showing (a) “the names of places having those graves,” (b) “the number of graves in each place” and (c) “the names of soldiers who were buried there.”¹⁸⁹ Between November and December 1970 reports accumulated in the Ministry of Regional Administration and Rural Development, although most of them showed that there were no such graves.¹⁹⁰

The government allocated Tanzanian Shillings 60, 000 as an annual budget for the maintenance of European war graves in the country during the 1970s.¹⁹¹ Although some members of parliament challenged the government’s decision to shoulder the cost of maintaining these graves, they were told that the move was meant “to establish good relations with other people in the world” and that the government had willingly agreed to take on this responsibility from the British in 1961.¹⁹² The maintenance of German war graves was also funded by the German War Grants Commission of West Germany,¹⁹³ which donated some amount of money for the maintenance of German war graves in Usagara and Tanga in 1969/70.¹⁹⁴ The annual remembrance services were, as now, held at the Dar es Salaam War Cemetery during Heroes’ Day, although not regularly. Evidence at hand indicates that one such event took place on 13th November 2016.¹⁹⁵ It should be borne in mind that before 1974 ceremonies or services of remembrance were held independently at different war grave sites distributed in different parts of the country.¹⁹⁶ Ceremonies of remembrance are associated with ceremonial parades and the laying of wreaths, usually attended by dignitaries.¹⁹⁷

¹⁸⁹ MZA, M7/3/195, Principal Secretary to H. Vogt (Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany), 26th October 1970, p. 1.

¹⁹⁰ Correspondence in MZA, M7/3/170, “War Graves”, 1970/71, pp. 1–15.

¹⁹¹ MZA, M7/4, “Taarifa za Makaburi”: Saving Telegram No.RA/W.20/1, 17th May 1971, p. 1.

¹⁹² MZA, M7/4, “Taarifa za Makaburi”: Saving Telegram No.RA/W.20/1, 17th May 1971, p. 1.

¹⁹³ MZA, M7/3/170/192, “51st Annual Report of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (Tanganyika Agency)”, 14th April 1970, p. 9.

¹⁹⁴ MZA, M7/3/170/192, “51st Annual Report of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (Tanganyika Agency)”, 14th April 1970, p. 9.

¹⁹⁵ The Citizen Reporter, “World War I, II Heroes Honoured in Dar City”, *The Citizen*, 14th November 2016, p. 3.

¹⁹⁶ MZA, M7/3, “53rd Annual Report of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission”, 23rd March 1972, p. 3.

¹⁹⁷ Similar ceremonies were performed in British times. Correspondences in TNA, 11239 Vol. XI, “Remembrance Sunday”, 1952.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the political landscape which characterized colonial commemorations and heroism in British Tanganyika. The chapter has shown that the British strove to suppress German colonial influence in the eyes of the Africans by: (1) manipulating Germany's colonial past, (2) erasing all forms of German heroic memories (3) taking full advantage of their political power to delimit and control German political activities, and (4) allying with the local people to tarnish the image of the Germans. British actions, however, did not go unchallenged. The Germans, as we have seen, reacted by engaging in political activities which jeopardized British imperial interests. As a matter of fact, the race for imperial commemoration in Tanganyika manifested in forms of moves and countermoves.

Left with no choice, the Africans were dragged into these bi-polar politics of commemoration and heroism by allying with either the British or the Germans. Their participation in these politics was not without positive results. The Hehe people of Iringa, for example, got back the skull of their chief from Germany. Despite British efforts to obliterate German colonial legacy in Tanganyika, German imperial image embedded in buildings, monuments and in other important cultural sites survived through independence. Evidence for this argument is provided in chapter six which explain the extent to which Dar es Salaam city centre bore German architectural imprints which is the country's cultural heritage pride. British imperial intervention notwithstanding, German imperial memories remained almost unchallenged. They were, to use Dominick Geppert and Frank Lorenz Müller's words, "present in the demarcation of state borders, in architecture and urban geographies, on the pedestals of monuments, in books . . . [and as shown in chapter five] in public rituals and in political debates."¹⁹⁸ The presence of the Askari monument and Commonwealth War Graves in the city of Dar es Salaam exemplify, in my view, the legacy of the above bi-polar politics of commemoration and heroism.

¹⁹⁸ Geppert and Müller, "Beyond National Memory", p. 1.