Queen's University

From the SelectedWorks of Daniel McNeil

2011

"The Rivers of Zimbabwe Will Run Red With Blood": Enoch Powell and the Post-Imperial Nostalgia of the Monday Club

Daniel McNeil, *Queen's University*

Available at: https://works.bepress.com/danielmcneil/2/

Journal of Southern African Studies, Volume 37, Number 4, December 2011

*'The rivers of Zimbabwe will run red with blood': Enoch Powell and the Post-Imperial Nostalgia of the Monday Club**

DANIEL MCNEIL
(Media and Cultural Studies, Newcastle University)

In his influential account of post-colonial melancholia, Paul Gilroy suggests that contemporary reports of violence in Southern Africa reveal Britain's inability to work through its grim history of imperialism and colonialism. Gilroy's study links recent discussions of tragic Southern African themes to Enoch Powell's 'rivers of blood' speech in 1968. However, it does not mention Powell's critique of Britain's 'post-imperial nostalgia' in a speech about Rhodesia later that year. This is not entirely surprising – the Conservative Central Office did not disseminate Powell's call for Britons to move beyond sentimental attachment to 'kith and kin' in Rhodesia, and Rhodesian sympathisers in the Conservative Monday Club attempted to work around Powell's refusal to support the 'White Commonwealth'. Moreover, Powell opposed non-white 'communalism' whether he was emphasising the importance of the British Empire to English identity or challenging the 'harmful myth' of empire as an English nationalist. Consequently, this article uses archival material relating to the Monday Club and the Rhodesian Ministry of Information in order to document three of the main strands of post-colonial melancholia that apply to Powellite figures on the right who defended (white) minority rule in Rhodesia and/or demonised (non-white) minority cultures in the United Kingdom.

Psychoanalytic work on melancholia is increasingly being used to help academics analyse the social memory of Southern Africa. In one of the recent articles that reflects this trend, Ross Truscott employs Alexander and Margarete Mitscherlich's post-Freudian analysis of mourning and melancholia in order to engage with Oppikoppi, a predominantly Afrikaans South African music festival, which denigrates, preserves and transforms the past.[1] However, such discussions of melancholia are not confined to academic journals. Outside of academia, melancholia has also been used to describe the personal memories of Southern African writers who live in the 'overdeveloped world' – for example, Jason Cowley, a journalist, magazine editor and critic, has alluded to the plight of the 'melancholy white exile' from Zimbabwe in his review of Peter Godwin's *When a Crocodile Eats the Sun*.[2] Such reflections about the role of melancholia inside and outside of academia have often been stimulated by Paul Gilroy's *Postcolonial Melancholia*.[3] This is because of Gilroy's status – Colin MacCabe

*I would like to thank the archivists who assisted my research at the Borthwick Institute of Historical Research at York University as well as the Brynmor Jones library at the University of Hull. I would also like to acknowledge the insightful comments and suggestions offered by the anonymous reviewers of the *Journal of Southern African Studies*, as well as Morris Szeftel and Leanne Taylor.

1 R. Truscott, 'National Melancholia and Afrikaner Self-Parody in Post-Apartheid South Africa', *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society*, 16 (April 2011), pp. 90–106.

2 'Stick Around and You Might Just Learn Something', *The Observer*, 4 March 2007.

3 See, for example, P. Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (New York, Columbia University Press, 2005). Also see P. Gilroy, 'Elements of Post-Colonial Melancholia: The Wellek Lectures', The Critical Theory Institute, The

ISSN 0305-7070 print; 1465-3893 online/11/040731-15
© 2011 The Editorial Board of the *Journal of Southern African Studies* http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2011.613691

considers Gilroy 'the most influential intellectual writing in Britain today'[4] – and the fact that his work has adapted the Mitscherlichs' approach in order to address the relationship between Britain and Southern Africa.

According to Gilroy, the repetition of tragic Southern African themes in contemporary British news stories 'are notable … not only because they convey the catastrophic consequences of intermixture and the severe problems that arise once colonial order has been withdrawn or sacrificed but because, like … Enoch Powell's "rivers of blood" speech, they are deployed to contest and seize the position of victim'.[5] As a result, his work on post-colonial melancholia in the twenty-first century, like his earlier work on the 'new racism' of English ethnic nationalists who saw no room for optimism about British multiculturalism in the 1970s and 1980s,[6] notes Powell's influence on the strategies used to manage non-white cultures in Britain. However, it does not mention Powell's critique of British 'post-imperial nostalgia' with regard to 'kith and kin' in Rhodesia.

Gilroy is not alone in omitting any mention of Powell's position on Rhodesia. The Conservative Central Office also refused to disseminate Powell's views on Rhodesia and the Commonwealth in 1968, and many Rhodesian sympathisers in the Conservative Monday Club worked around his refusal to support the 'White Commonwealth'. In order to address the relationship between Powell's position on Rhodesia and defenders of the 'White Commonwealth', this article draws on archival material relating to the Monday Club and the Rhodesian Ministry of Information (RMI). It focuses on the correspondence of Harold Soref, Patrick Wall and Hugh Maude – three prominent members of the Monday Club who had personal and business ties to Rhodesia – and argues that three of the main strands of post-colonial melancholia relate to Powell's post-imperial nationalism as well as these Powellite supporters of the Rhodesian Front. The first main strand of post-colonial melancholia involves the belief that racial intermixture will lead to violence and economic instability. The second emphasises the importance of strong white rule to limit racial violence and industrial retardation. The third attempts to contest and then seize the position of victim, alleging one set of standards for the 'civilised' West and another set of standards for 'failed, incompetent and pre-modern states'.[7] In short, the article argues that these three elements provide a powerful framing device for the study of Powellites who defended (white) minority rule in Rhodesia and/or demonised (non-white) minority cultures in the United Kingdom.

Powell and the 'White Commonwealth'

Powell's opposition to 'New Commonwealth' or non-white immigration from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean in the 1960s is well known. However, it is also important to remember that he worried about 'Old Commonwealth' countries – colonies that had been granted self-governing status before 1945 and were led by political parties with predominantly white members – being too culturally heterogeneous and failing to contain political conflict within the boundaries of liberal democratic debate. Put another way, he was concerned about non-white 'communalism' – by which he meant 'racial' loyalty dictating the political decisions of

Footnote 3 continued
University of California, Irvine, 13, 14 and 16 May 2002; 'Why Harry's Disoriented about Empire: The Chronic Pain of Loss Feeds our Melancholic Attachment', *The Guardian*, 18 January 2005.

4 C. MacCabe, 'Paul Gilroy: Against the Grain', *Open Democracy*, 19 April 2006. Also see A. Bonnett, *Left in the Past: Radicalism and the Politics of Nostalgia* (London, Continuum, 2010).

5 Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia*, p. 105.

6 See, for example, P. Gilroy, 'Police and Thieves', in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (ed.), *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in'70s Britain* (London, Hutchinson & Co, 1982); *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (London, Unwin Hyman, 1987).

7 Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia*, p. 105.

an individual – whether he was emphasising the importance of the British Empire to English identity in the 1940s and 1950s, or challenging the 'harmful myth' of empire as an English ethnic nationalist in the 1960s.[8]

When he stood on guard for the British Empire, Powell repeatedly drew attention to the supposed dangers of non-white 'communalism'. During the time he spent involved in British military operations in India in 1946, Powell combined his love for the jewel of the British Empire with warnings about Indian immigration to the UK.[9] He did not believe that Indian decolonisation or immigration should be permitted until British officials were satisfied that Indians were able to perform as rational citizens, i.e. private individuals who come together to form a public and understand the importance of respecting liberal democratic institutions of the British Empire.[10] Sometimes Powell emphasised the importance of a 'White Commonwealth' that understood this bounden duty – his maiden speech to Parliament in 1950 asked Churchill to replace the Indian Army with a Colonial Army of Gurkhas, Malaysians and Africans 'stiffened with units from the White Commonwealth'.[11] Sometimes he simply emphasised the dangers of multiracialism – reflecting on the strike of white bus workers in West Bromwich, who opposed the employment of a single Indian conductor in 1955, he wrote that 'any readily visible differences between human beings inevitably result in political frictions . . . where any considerable part of the population has distinctive characteristics I believe that the working of institutions such as ours cannot fail to be endangered'.[12] Powell's denunciation of the Hola camp massacre in Kenya in 1959, when 11 Africans died and 77 others were injured because they refused to bend to the will of the 'colonial rehabilitation' programme developed by Mr. Sullivan, Commandant of the Camp, also reflected his concerns about political and racial differences threatening the integrity of liberal democratic institutions. Although his principled opposition to the scandal and its subsequent cover up is often invoked to question anyone that labels him a 'racist', he had little interest in abstract declarations of African humanity. Even if the men killed and wounded were considered to be 'sub-human', Powell insisted that British imperialists had a moral responsibility to their colonial subjects and rejected the possibility of 'African standards in Africa, Asian standards in Asia and perhaps British standards here at home. We must be consistent with ourselves everywhere'.[13]

After Macmillan's speeches about the 'wind of change' in Ghana and South Africa in 1960, which seemed to accept imminent independence for African colonies and the decline of British influence in Southern Africa, Powell followed a similar path to the one he had taken when his parents dissuaded him from attending the Royal Academy of Music. Once the decision was made about his schooling, Powell rarely listened to music because 'it doesn't do to awaken longings that can't be fulfilled'.[14] Once it was clear to Powell that nothing could be done to stop decolonisation, he insisted that the empire had been absolutely irrelevant to Britain. Between 1961 and 1964, he warned 'ordinary Britons' about the 'gigantic farce' of the British Commonwealth.[15] Then, as Shadow Minister of Defence between 1965 and 1968,

8 P. Brooke, 'India, Post-Imperialism and the Origins of Enoch Powell's "Rivers of Blood Speech"', *Historical Journal*, 50, 3 (2007) pp. 669–87. A.M. Smith, *New Right Discourse on Race and Sexuality: Britain 1968–1990* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 139.

9 Powell Archive, Churchill Archive Centre, Cambridge (Hereafter POLL), 3/1/4, J.E. Powell, 'Paper on Indian Policy', 3 December 1946, Para 17.

10 POLL, 3/1/1, J.E. Powell, 'Indian Self-government', November 1945, Delhi.

11 J.E. Powell, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 472, 16 March 1950, pp. 1,315–19.

12 POLL, 1/1/11, J.E. Powell to A.S. Reeve, 26 February 1955.

13 J.E. Powell, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 610, 27 July 1959, pp. 232–7.

14 H. Pedraza, *Winston Churchill*, *Enoch Powell and the Nation* (London, Cleveland Press, 1986), p. 81. J.C. Mortimer, *In Character* (London, Allen Lane, 1983), p. 50.

15 J.E. Powell, *The Times*, 2 April 1964. Also see Powell's speech to the Royal Society of St. George, 22 April 1961 and his speech at Trinity College, Dublin, 13 November 1964.

he opposed sanctions against Rhodesia following its Unilateral Declaration of Independence because he rejected the Labour government's claims that the British Commonwealth needed to be protected.

The Monday Club and the Rhodesian Lobby

While sharing Powell's opposition to British and United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, the Monday Club hoped to defend Tory traditions and Britain's special ties to 'kith and kin' in the 'White Commonwealth'. The Monday Club was formally founded as a pressure group on 1 January 1961 by Paul Bristol, a young member of the Chelsea Conservative Association,[16] and the Conservative Central Office quickly identified the club's desire to 'discredit the policy of the government in Africa'.[17] For young Conservative intellectuals it offered an alternative to the Bow group, an influential Conservative research organisation that, in 1960, urged the British government to introduce self-government in Kenya within the decade because it believed that it was far more dangerous to err on the side of caution than of speed.[18] *Bury the Hatchet*, the Monday Club's first pamphlet on the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (popularly known as the Central African Federation) reflects the influence of members of the Rhodesian settler lobby and Roy Welensky, the Central African Federation's second and last Prime Minister (1956–63).[19] It warned its readers about the dangers of 'speedy' decolonisation and promoted a paternalist approach, 'with stress being placed upon the need to encourage higher standards of education amongst the African population and to remove all remaining discriminatory practices'.[20] In addition, it emphasised that the policies of the Federation were more realistic than the decolonisation policies of the Conservative left and more progressive than South Africa's apartheid policies.[21]

The Central African Federation formally dissolved in 1963, the year after the advent of African nationalist majorities in the legislatures of two of its three territories. After the formal dissolution of the Federation, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland became the independent states of Zambia and Malawi respectively. Southern Rhodesia, whose settlers had achieved responsible self-government in 1923 under a racially-exclusive franchise, reverted to being a self-governing colony under a constitution that continued rule by the minority of white settlers. However, as a result of the tensions generated by the end of federation and the rise of African nationalism, the right-wing Rhodesian Front (RF) swept aside the old ruling settler élite. It was initially led by Winston Field. Then, when Field baulked at a unilateral declaration of independence (UDI), he was succeeded by Ian Smith, a former RAF fighter pilot. Before the British government had ratified the colony's change of name, from Southern Rhodesia to Rhodesia, Smith's government had seized the powers of the crown from Britain and with it those aspects of government, such as defence and foreign affairs, which had previously been excluded from settler control.

The RF's decision to pursue UDI in 1965 also influenced the changing direction of the Monday Club. Echoing RF claims, the Monday Club 'began to adopt the view that Africans

16 P. Murphy, *Party Politics and Decolonisation: The Conservative Party and British Colonial Policy in Tropical Africa, 1951–1964* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 204.

17 Conservative Central Office (CCO 3/6/16), Chief Organisation Officer to Slinn, 25 April 1962. Murphy, *Party Politics and Decolonisation*, p. 205; J. Ramsden, *The Winds of Change: Macmillan to Heath, 1957–75* (London, Longman, 1996), p. 148.

18 R. Rose, 'The Bow Group's Role in British Politics', *Western Political Quarterly*, 14, 4 (1961), p. 871.

19 Murphy, *Party Politics and Decolonisation*, p. 205.

20 The Monday Club, *Bury the Hatchet* (London, Monday Club, 1962).

21 S. Onslow, 'The Cold War in Southern Africa', in S. Onslow (ed.), *Cold War in Southern Africa: White Power, Black Liberation* (London, Routledge, 2009), p. 12.

would, for many years to come, be incapable of exercising power responsibly outside traditional tribal structures. In what was very much a logical extension of this shift from the rhetoric of multiracialism, the club began to express support for the policies of South Africa and Portugal and to demand greater domestic restrictions on coloured immigration at home'.[22] It also gave greater emphasis to its belief that economic mismanagement, communism and black demagogues threatened those colonies that become independent under African rule. Some of these changes in the Monday Club have been associated with Labour's election victory and Bristol's replacement as chairman of the club by Paul Williams in 1964. However, Bristol had already precipitated a break with a more paternalist approach when he appointed Harold Soref as Chairman of the Monday Club's Africa group. The son of Paul Soref, a Romanian-born merchant shipper and 'Rhodesian pioneer', and his wife Zelma (née Goodman), Soref was the founder and editor of *Jewish Monthly* (1947–1951), managing director of a shipping firm with interests in South Africa (1959–1976) and Conservative MP for Ormskirk (1970–1974). In 1959 he was expelled from the Conservative Commonwealth Council after he explicitly challenged the official policy of Britain and the Central African Federation by telling an audience in Northern Rhodesia that multiracial societies had never worked and that the choice the territory had to make was between remaining 'white' or becoming 'black'.[23]

Along with its change of emphasis on Southern Africa in the mid-1960s, the Monday Club became an increasingly vocal opponent of the Conservative Party's perceived failure to evolve a dynamic application of 'traditional' Tory principles under the leadership of Edward Heath. It feared that the party, Britain and the Commonwealth were under attack from a variety of pernicious influences including, but not limited to, communists, lecturers, students, pornographers, Penguin books, the BBC, *The Guardian* and the jazz reviews in *The Times*. Such symbols of a left-wing, libertarian, politically correct and/or vaguely hip conspiracy to destroy British society were regularly invoked in The Monday Club's pamphlets. For example, Soref provided the forward to a pamphlet that chastised the National Council for Civil Liberty for its support of 'drug addicts, pornographers and subversives … Black power, prison power, strike power and student power'.[24] Furthermore, Patrick Wall co-wrote a pamphlet on student power that denounced the absenteeism of senior academic staff, the incompetence of junior lecturers and the 'permissive morality' in universities that drains the 'lifeblood of our civilisation'.[25] By 1972, the Monday Club had 55 affiliated university groups and around 5,000 members (including 34 MPs) to confront these alleged threats to Tory tradition.[26]

Powell and the Tory Outsiders

Powell did not join the Monday Club or want to be seen to be leading an intra-party group. However, he regularly gave speeches to the organisation and worked closely with its leading members with regard to issues such as economic planning, Ulster, 'New Commonwealth' immigration and race relations legislation. In words that capture Powell's

22 Murphy, *Party Politics and Decolonisation*, p. 207.
23 *Ibid*. Also see *Rhodesia Herald*, 25 August 1959.
24 S. Swerling, *Some Uncivil Liberties: A Critical Appraisal of the National Council for Civil Liberties* (London, Monday Club, 1973), p. 3.
25 P. Wall and J. Smith, *Student Power* (London, Monday Club, 1968), p. 17.
26 S. Heffer, *Like the Roman – The Life of Enoch Powell* (London, Faber Finds, 2008), p. 479. Syed confirms at least 2,500 members. P. Syed, 'Factionalism within the Monday Club', *Government and Opposition*, 7, 4 (1972), p. 471, fn. 21. Walker suggests around 4,000 to 6,000 members. M. Walker, *The National Front* (London, Macmillan, 1978), p. 118. The Monday Club's newsletter claimed 10,000 members in issue 69, May/June 1971.

classical scholarship, the Monday Club became a 'self-appointed Praetorian guard of Powell and the Powellite interest'.[27]

Following Powell's infamous speech on non-white immigration to the United Kingdom – in which he cast himself as the Roman who saw the River Tiber foaming with much blood – Soref, Wall and Maude agreed with the Fifth Marquess of Salisbury, the first President of the Monday Club, that 'Mr Powell is clearly not a racialist. He is just a very worried man'.[28] Like Salisbury, they had all developed ties to Churchill while playing important roles in the British military effort during the Second World War – Soref was a member of the Royal Scots Regiment and Intelligence Corps during the Second World War; Maude was a captain in the British army who was introduced to his friends in Rhodesia as one of Churchill's wartime secretaries; and Patrick Wall was a full-time officer in the Royal Navy between 1935 and 1950 who achieved the rank of major. Unlike the Marquess, Soref, Wall and Maude were not members of the Tory élite tied to the Church of England.

It is important to emphasise that this article draws on the archives of a group of Monday Club members who, much like Powell, were all outsiders as far as the Tory establishment was concerned. Powell's uncompromising personality and grammar school education meant that he was distanced from the Tory elite. His outsider status was confirmed by his decision to serve as an Ulster Unionist and, in a similar fashion, Maude found it difficult to obtain a foothold in the Tory élite in England when he divided his time between Ireland and Rhodesia. Unlike Powell, who regularly defended the status of the Church of England, Soref held various posts in the Anglo-Jewish community and Wall was a devout Roman Catholic. Wall achieved greater permanence in Conservative circles than Soref. He served as a Conservative Member of Parliament for Haltemprice (1954–83), and for Beverley in Yorkshire (1983–87), and as National Chairman of the Monday Club (1978–80), before being knighted in 1981. However, he remained keenly aware of the privileges accorded to the Church of England by the Tory élite.

The correspondence of Wall, Maude and Soref reveals that members of the Monday Club and the RMI hoped that Powell would use his critical distance from the Tory establishment to become a Churchillian leader. They were particularly determined to obtain a figurehead who could rally the masses against multiracialism and UN-led internationalism, and were quick to push the arguments he made in directions that reflected their beliefs and concerns more than his. Following the speech on 'New Commonwealth' immigration that Powell delivered to the AGM of the West Midland Area Conservative Political Centre on the 20th of April 1968 – popularly known as the 'rivers of blood' speech – Wall sought to transform support for Powell's position into a clarion call for visionary leaders of a 'White Commonwealth':

> The furore of the past days has not been wholly due to Mr. Powell's views on immigration . . . are our leaders so obsessed with internationalism, multiracialism and do-goodism, that they have forgotten that Britain's electorate have a pride in their country . . . [and that] we have special ties with Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Rhodesia, South Africa and the United States and that many states of Africa or Asia only pay lip service to multi-racialism when it suits them . . . A leader with a genuine programme of a return to patriotism and self-discipline could sweep the nation.[29]

In letters to Maude, R.B. Pakenham of the RMI predicted that Powell could help Britain 'destroy the myth of Afro-Asian power and restore the privilege of the white races,' so long as the middle and upper classes were willing to cast aside their veneer of respectability and join

27 Heffer, *Like the Roman*, p. 573. Also see M. Hanna, 'Immigration and the Monday Club', *Race Today*, 4, 1 (1972), p. 5. Syed, 'Factionalism within the Monday Club', pp. 486–7.

28 *Daily Telegraph*, 24 April 1968.

29 *The Monday Club Newsletter* (April 1968). For more on Wall's links to South Africa see J. Major, 'Patrick Wall and South Africa', *South African Historical Journal*, 52, 1 (2005), pp. 102–18.

the dockers demonstrating against 'coloured immigration'.[30] Soref went even further and longed for Powell to drop his overly academic tone so that he would continue to be seen as a true ally of the 'common man'. After making sure that the first function of the Monday Club Action Committee was to honour Powell with a dinner on 7 September 1968, Soref was particularly disappointed that Powell delivered a 'boring', analytical speech. When Powell received a standing ovation as the guest of honour at another Monday Club dinner on 20 November 1968, Soref was forced to accept the fact that he would remain an iconic figure on the Tory right even if he was unwilling, or unable, to deliver another emotive attack on non-white immigration.[31]

Powell's Post-imperial Nationalism

After re-emphasising the dangers of 'imperial sickness' and post-imperial nostalgia in *The Spectator* in September 1968,[32] Powell clearly expressed the need for a new start between Britain and Rhodesia in a speech to the AGM of the Wolverhampton South West Conservative Association at Churchill Hall on 6 December 1968. On the one hand, the iconoclastic speech on Rhodesia added further distance between Powell and a Conservative Shadow Cabinet he considered out of touch with the people. On the other hand, it reflected Powell's profound distrust of undisciplined forces of popular mobilisation. Throughout the speech, Powell pronounced various statements as facts. His audience was told, for example, that Britain had no power in Central Africa and that sanctions against Rhodesia had failed. He made it clear that a British Parliament could not transfer ultimate sovereignty over Rhodesia 'under a constitution which did not, so far as human foresight and contrivance can go, guarantee unimpeded progress to majority rule'. Britain's only alternative was to acknowledge that Rhodesia had achieved independence, as the United States had, by successful rebellion: 'The independence of Rhodesia is something stronger than the law. It is fact. To recognise fact is neither shame, nor dishonour, though regret there is and will be'. Thus, after contrasting 'honourable Rhodesians' with Pakistanis and Ghanaians who were willing to settle for 'pie-crust constitutions' that could be broken at a later date, Powell expressed his desire to accept the loss of a Rhodesian colony that had fought for King and Country.

Powell's opinions on Rhodesia did not shake the British people – like his earlier warnings about non-white immigration – and members of the Monday Club continued to ask a 'true patriot' to 'do or say something to warn and wake up the people of the United Kingdom' regarding the potential loss of Rhodesia.[33] Powell would not substantially alter his critique of post-imperial nostalgia. However, he did reflect members of the Rhodesian lobby who seized the position of victim when he railed against the supposed hypocrisy of politicians and activists who criticised white-minority rule in Rhodesia and promoted the 'madness' of multiracialism in the United Kingdom. In 1969, he asked the members of the House of Commons why sanctions so appropriate to Rhodesia were not applied to other countries 'in a world half full of tyrannical regimes of various kinds',[34] and in 1972 he expressed his disgust at British individuals who singled out Rhodesia for criticism when there were 'so many vile regimes in Africa'.[35]

30 York University, Borthwick Institute of Historical Research, Hugh Maude Rhodesian and South African Papers (hereafter MAU), R.B. Pakenham to H. Maude, 26 April 1968.
31 MAU, H. Soref to H. Maude, 8 September 1968 & 22 November 1968.
32 'Imperial Sickness', *The Spectator*, 13 September 1968.
33 MAU, The Journals of Hugh Maude, 28 January 1969; H. Maude to J.E. Powell, 1–2 March 1969; J.E. Powell to H. Maude, 11 March 1969.
34 Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 788, 16 October 1969, col. 642.
35 *Sunday Express*, 29 October 1972.

Powell's post-imperial nationalism thus shared three of the interlocking strains of post-colonial melancholia that can be applied to the Monday Club's support of the Rhodesian Front Party as well as more recent reactions to Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe in elements of the British media. First and foremost, Powell shared the anxieties of Maude, Wall, Soref and their comrades in Rhodesia about the 'catastrophic' consequences of racial intermixture during the 1960s and 1970s. Secondly, he contended that only strong white rule would limit racial violence and industrial retardation in Africa. Last but not least, he used Britain's response to Rhodesia's UDI to contest and then seize the position of victim.

Discourses of Racial Purity

The first strand of post-colonial melancholia needs little elaboration. Powell's rhetoric remained appealing to opponents of 'race mixture' when he implored his audience not to turn their backs on white women who were said to be under threat from marauding hordes of non-whites in the UK. Powell's concern with the elderly white widow on a predominantly black street, who featured in his speech in Wolverhampton in April, drew on long-established colonial fears about threats to 'racial purity'. He also repeated colonial tropes in his earlier narratives involving a young white girl in an otherwise all-black class in Walsall in February, and his later comments about a young white widow with two white girls in a speech in Eastbourne in November.[36] Furthermore, his speeches reflected fears about racial violence and racial amalgamation in the United States. American race riots following the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. had occurred in the weeks preceding his speech on 20 April 1968, and Powell used these violent images to warn his English audience about the 'tragic and intractable problem ... interwoven with the history and existence of the States itself ... coming upon us here by our own volition and neglect'.[37] He went even further in private conversations, insisting that 'the integration of races of totally disparate origins and cultures is one of the great myths of our time. It has never worked throughout history. The United States lost its only real opportunity of solving its racial problem when it failed after the Civil War to partition the old Confederacy into a 'South Africa' and a 'Liberia'.[38]

The journals of Hugh Maude also assume that racial mixture would produce violence and hatred. In 1965, Maude expressed his belief that 'South Africans of Dutch German and foreign extraction have been brought up to hate and despise the black and coloured – many have their blood in their veins. They dislike it. They are ashamed. They are unable to expunge it. So one explanation for hate is this mixture of blood'.[39] In addition, his private reflections about Powell's 'rivers of blood' speech in 1968 revealed his fears of 'coloured immigrants who breed, when in security, quicker than the white. It looks as if the English people will finally become coloured if preference is given to the black and coloured immigrants'.[40]

---

36 W. Webster, 'There'll Always be an England: Representations of Colonial Wars and Immigration, 1948–1968', in S. Howe (ed.), *New Imperial Histories Reader* (London, Routledge, 2010), pp. 300–1.

37 Powell's concern about 'importing' Black Power was also expressed in letters in 1967 and private conversations in 1969. Writing in the *Daily Telegraph* on 23 December 1967, Powell complained about the BBC's decision to broadcast an interview with Stokely Carmichael. In his notes on a meeting with Enoch Powell on 6 November 1969, Michael Strachan recorded Powell's belief that a Black Power movement would soon emerge in the UK.

38 A. Roth, *Enoch Powell: Tory Tribune* (London, Macdonald & Co., 1970), p. 341.

39 MAU, The Journals of Hugh Maude 1965.

40 MAU, The Journals of Hugh Maude, 27 April 1968.

'The White Man's Burden' in Southern Africa

Members of the Monday Club reflected the second major strand of post-colonial melancholia when they emphasised the importance of responsible European leadership in limiting the 'barbarity' of multiracial environments. Much like the well-known comments of Sir Hugh Trevor-Roper about the 'unrewarding gyrations of barbarous tribes in picturesque but irrelevant parts of the globe',[41] members of the Monday Club and their allies were more comfortable talking about different levels of 'civilisation' in Rhodesia and worked from the misguided premise that Africa had no history or economic development before the arrival of Europeans. According to Captain P.B. Marriott, one of the leading British supporters of white rule in Rhodesia and South Africa, 'Africans have yet to demonstrate that they have the self-control and forbearance to participate in the running of a civilised democratic state without tutelage . . . less than fifty years ago almost all Africans were primitive savages engaged in tribal wars of extermination, and perpetrating crimes of bestialities of which cannot be described. In vast areas of central Africa this is the condition into which they have relapsed at the present time'.[42]

Alongside pamphlets insisting that generous, good-hearted European entrepreneurs brought civilisation to Africa, members of the Monday Club received many letters imploring them to defend white conservatives (or 'realists') and prevent a dystopian future under the rule of white leftists or black demagogues. Wall's correspondence is a useful example of this kind of Afro-pessimistic discourse because he was promoted as a tireless advocate of Rhodesia by his friends (and its best propagandist by his political opponents).[43] In 1963 he received letters from Mrs C.C. Milton claiming that moderate Africans 'say to us many times – "We want the White Man to look after us, we are still children and not able to look after ourselves"', and from her husband, Mr Milton, which outlined the dangers inherent in 'power hungry people who in spite of a thin veneer of education are not many years removed from savagery'.[44] Wall's reply is equally illuminating as he imagines 'no room for the moderate in Africa in the next few years. It is clear that the European either has to rule or to get out and I am convinced that the white man in Southern Africa is there to stay'.[45]

Although Wall often used paternalistic rhetoric about the duty of whites to educate Africans about the responsibilities of government, his correspondents in Rhodesia often developed a position based more explicitly on white superiority. Austin Ferraz, editor of *The Sunday Mail* of Salisbury in 1966 and 1967, told Wall that the Rhodesian government had gradually improved the intellectual capacities of its 'pure Africans'. According to Ferraz, this was a powerful feat when 'out of the 20 million negroes in the US almost none have achieved anything and those who are claimed to have done so – like Ralph Bunche and Thurgood Marshall – are whiter than they are black'.[46] He went on to praise whites in Southern Africa for their ability to peaceably organise nations with vastly different types of races, civilisations and abilities, and accepted separate development in Rhodesia as the best hope for the future.

---

41 H. Trevor-Roper, 'The Rise of Christian Europe', *The Listener*, 28 November 1963, pp. 871–5.

42 University of Hull, Brynmor Jones Library, Papers of Sir Patrick Wall (Hereafter DPW), 48/491. P.B. Marriott, *Britain and South Africa Forum Newsletter*, 27 September 1966.

43 DPW/48/66, H. Soref, Anglo-Rhodesian Society Minutes 20 October 1966. 'Rhodesia's Best Propagandist Abroad', *The Guardian*, 11 May 1967. For more on the concept of Afropessimism see H. Wasserman and A.S. de Beer, 'Afro-optimism/Afro-pessimism and the South African Media', *Critical Arts*, 23, 3 (2009); D. McNeil, 'Black Devils, White Saints & Mixed-Race Femme Fatales: Philippa Schuyler and the Winds of Change', *Critical Arts*, 25, 3 (2011).

44 DPW/48/251, Mrs C.C. Milton to P. Wall, 5 April 1963; Mr G. Milton to P. Wall, 10 April 1963.

45 DPW/48/251, P. Wall to Mr and Mrs Milton, 20 May 1963.

46 DPW/48/490, A. Ferraz to P. Wall, 6 September 1966.

Indeed, he attributed lynchings and violence in America to the competition between blacks and the 'more advanced' whites.[47]

Closely aligned with Ferraz and the *Sunday Mail* of Salisbury, the RMI also emphasised the importance of white leadership and black subservience. Its circulation of comments made by Chief Simon Sigola MBE to various press outlets (as well as to U Thant, Secretary-General of the UN, President de Gaulle and President Johnson), is particularly instructive on this point.[48] The carefully crafted press statement emphasises the peaceful nature of Rhodesia, the rightful rule of chiefs and the deep wish of black Africans 'to be taught to be civilised. It is no good our people taking over the Government of the country now, like the countries to the North of us. We want to be educated first'. Papers sent to members of the Monday Club by the RMI also recycled this theme, and Harvey Ward, the Director of the Rhodesian Broadcasting Company, sent Maude a broadcast from his 'World Survey'. This is worth quoting at length for its emphasis on the critical role of European civilisation in establishing and maintaining peace in segregated communities.

> Prior to the withdrawal of the colonial powers all of Africa, except Liberia and Ethiopia, enjoyed governments that were either white or under white guidance and control. These governments ensured orderly administration and maintained peace, law and order. They respected national and tribal customs and traditions, only eliminating completely barbaric customs and baits such as ritual murder, cannibalism, the slaughter of twins, inter-tribal raiding and warfare. Subject to these limitations, the nations and tribes inhabiting the colonial territories continued to live in accordance with their traditional laws and customs. The result was that the Europeans and the various nations and tribes lived in harmony, though, generally speaking, they led different social lives and segregated their living areas.
>
> Though segregated by residence, habit, custom and culture, the areas were peacefully multiracial.
>
> This continues to be the way of life in South Africa and Rhodesia but has been changed in many of the black ruled states.[49]

Building on the propaganda of the RMI, Soref contrasted 'the considerable achievements of Rhodesia ... with the mentality of the Black African leaders, who would "see the rivers of Zimbabwe run red with the blood" of White Africans, yet none the less continue to seek British aid'.[50] Speaking at the Monday Club's One Day Policy Conference in London on 1 July 1968, his words also reveal the impact of the 'rivers of blood' speech and Powell's concerns about the stresses placed on the British welfare state by 'coloured immigrants'. Moreover, they illuminate the importance of conspiratorial accounts that helped members of the Monday Club and the RMI move between the second and third strands of post-colonial melancholia.

Conspiracies against Western Civilisation

While emphasising the importance of violence to the 'black psyche', Soref, Maude, Wall and their contacts at the RMI assumed European technological superiority and largely dismissed the possibility of the 'coloured races' organising any effective military coups on their own. The spectre of Communist agitators haunted many texts produced by the Monday Club and the RMI, and it is no accident that 'conspiracy' appears 15 times and 'conspiratorial' is used three times in Donal Lowry's recent article on the impact of anti-communism on White Rhodesian political culture.[51] *The Puppeteers*, co-written by Soref and Ian Greig, one of the original members of the

47 DPW/48/493, A. Ferraz to P. Wall, 21 July 1967.
48 MAU, Press statement of the RMI, 7 January 1967.
49 MAU, Harvey Ward, 'World Survey', Rhodesian Broadcasting Corporation, 12 February 1968.
50 R. McWhinnie, 'Monday Club Policy Conference', *The Monday Club Newsletter*, July 1968.
51 D. Lowry, 'The Impact of Anti-Communism on White Rhodesian Political Culture', *Cold War History*, 7, 2 (2007).

Monday Club, targeted communist organisations committed to 'the elimination of the white man in Africa'. Furthermore, Soref's columns in *The Rhodesia World* called on Rhodesia to unite anti-Communist forces and remind the world 'what Britain once stood for – when she truly was great'.[52] Even when supporters of white minority rule in Rhodesia used African Americans with 'white blood' to prove points about pseudo-scientific racism, they were keen to uncover the pernicious influence of Communist politics. For example, when the Anglo-Rhodesian Society challenged UN sanctions on Rhodesia, they depicted Ralph Bunche, Undersecretary-General of the UN in 1968, as 'the most influential, best known Negro in the world … an out-and-out Communist … for a long time on the Subversive list of the FBI'.[53]

In a similar manner, letters from the RMI tended to identify an 'Afro-Asian bloc' as the most powerful racial/political enemy in Southern Africa. Pakenham, for example, had little time for attacks against the Soviet Union when,

> the last great war in the world will be white versus colour. The colour would be led by the Japanese … I am depressed when I can see how the whites can lose it by their pusillanimous appeasement of their avowed enemies … One of these days the white peoples and nations, including Russia, will have to get together, sink their differences and present a united front to the coloured world. I am hoping this will happen before Britain becomes a coloured country![54]

Some prominent Rhodesian Front activists, such as Lord Graham, left the party in order to align themselves with the Southern African Solidarity Conference and emphasise the plotting of the UN and, on occasion, a Jewish conspiracy.[55] Others, such as K. Riddell, Pakenham's colleague at the RMI, preferred to focus on Israel's admission to the club of white nations after the Six-Day War.

> The fact that Israel can 'clobber' the whole Arab world on her own, may be salutary for some of those coloured folk who look forward to wiping out the white man in the near future! It may also provide some comfort for those politicians in England and America who fear and appease the Afro-Asians … I hold no particular 'brief' for the Israelities, but I certainly prefer them to the 'wogs' and Nasser.[56]

The RMI's concerns about the strength of white politicians in Britain, not just the military orientations of the Soviet Union and Israel, is an important reminder that members of the Monday Club restrained much of their venom for a 'liberal élite'. These liberal fifth columnists were thought to undermine white allies in Rhodesia and 'confuse' black Africans. They were also considered culpable in the creation of a 'chocolate-coloured Afro-Asian mixed society',[57] or a 'coffee-coloured Britain',[58] which would entice communists and rootless, cosmopolitan consumers. At the outset of his membership in the Monday Club, Wall described the danger of British extremists on the left who were blind to the real needs of black Africans. His letter to Lady Chegwidden on 16 December 1963 chastised 'the do-gooder intellectuals who have considerable influence in the BBC, ITV and the press'. According to

---

52 I. Greig and H. Soref, *The Puppeteers* (London, Tandem Books, 1965). E. Butler, *The Rhodesia World*, 6 November 1966. Also see J. Taylor, 'Memory and Desire in Going Home: The Deconstruction of a Colonial Radical', in Eve Bertelson (ed.), *Doris Lessing* (Johannesburg, McGraw Hill, 1985), p. 60.

53 DPW/48/66, Minutes of the Anglo Rhodesian Society (Scarborough and district branch), p. 1,968.

54 MAU, Pakenham to Maude, 15 August 1967. For more on the Rhodesian Front's attempts to attribute African nationalism to external agents such as the 'Afro-Asian bloc' see Donal Lowry, 'The Impact of Anti-Communism on White Rhodesian Political Culture', pp. 176–7.

55 Lowry, 'The Impact of Anti-Communism on White Rhodesian Political Culture', p. 186.

56 MAU, K. Riddell to H. Maude, 9 June 1967.

57 *The Spectator*, 4 December 1964.

58 Staffordshire Records Office, Staff Archive, file d3123 7, Letter to J.E. Powell, 22 April 1968. Also see A. Whipple, 'Revisiting the "Rivers of Blood" Controversy: Letters to Enoch Powell', *Journal of British Studies*, 48 (2009), pp. 729–31.

Wall, these *bêtes noires* of the Monday Club were 'determined to show that the white man can do no good in Africa[,] which is wholly a black man's country [sic]. This idea would of course in the long run do more harm to the black man than to the white but it is one that is fostered by a vast propaganda campaign in this country'.[59] In *The Times of Malta* in 1967, Wall assumed a liberal 'imposition' of one-man-one-vote in Africa would usher in military dictatorships, civil wars and 'Chinese infiltration',[60] and these fears were also evident in his attacks on the Labour Party's support of increased UN sanctions against Rhodesia in the House of Commons on 17 June 1968:

> We believe the African majority must find its rightful place in the political, social and economic life of their countries. We believe that this takes time. The trouble with hon. members opposite is that they think that it can be done overnight, and close their eyes to the evidence which is so obvious in Africa today, of country after country which has authoritarian government, Red revolution, bloody revolution, massacre of the opposition and massacre of the government. Country after country suffers forms of dictatorship and if 'one man, one vote' takes place, it is once and that is all.

Like Powell, Wall compared the Rhodesians to American patriots who refused to be governed from thousands of miles away. Drawing on his military expertise and his correspondence with the RMI and the Anglo-Rhodesian society, he even advised Parliament about the dangers involved in any actions that insulted the white Rhodesians.

> All the sinews of modern war, economic and military, are on the side of the white minority. I hope to God that they will never have to use them, but if they do it is obvious who will win. The whole of Africa together cannot expel 4 million whites from Southern Africa, any more than the Arabs can expel one and a quarter million Jews from Israel.

The rhetoric of Maude's pamphlet on *Southern Africa, Rhodesia – Yesteryear, To-Day and Tomorrow*, co-written with Harvey Ward, was also shaped by his correspondence with the RMI and Powell's infamous speech on non-white immigration. His manifesto claimed to speak on behalf of 'poor Africans' who could only repeat the cries of discrimination dictated by white leftists, and insisted that white Communists (or white Communists masquerading as Liberals[61]) would impose 'what has taken the Whites over a thousand years to get used to ... [and] destroy what other whites worked for'.[62] This reflected letters from Pakenham that wondered if 'the Liberal cum Socialist multi-racial fanatic ... wants to abolish all racial discrimination or whether he wishes to discriminate against the white man only', and condemned 'Liberal-Socialist one worlders who want chaos so that they can build their horrible edifice on the wreckage and rubble of Western civilization'.[63] It also evoked Powell's sneering comments about immigrants who were taught to chant the word 'racialist' by the sponsors of race relations bills. Much like Wall, Maude and the RMI, Soref thus condemned the 'double standards' of liberals and leftists who supported black majority rule in Rhodesia and black minority cultures in the UK. In his articles for *The Daily Telegraph*, Soref claimed that these 'progressives' ignored the 'facts' about the 'tribal conflict and corruption' of blacks, and threatened the future of democracy in Southern Africa and Western Europe.[64]

---

59 DPW/48/214, P. Wall to Lady Chegwidden, 16 December 1963.

60 'The End of the Road in Rhodesia', *The Times of Malta*, 28 October 1967.

61 The Monday Club criticised the BBC's use of the word 'liberal' to describe Mrs Ruth First, a Communist, in a television documentary called *90 Days*. 'BBC Sorry over "Liberal" Communist', *The Daily Telegraph*, 2 September 1966. Also see DPW 48/493.

62 MAU, H. Maude (and H. Ward), 'Southern Africa, Rhodesia – Yesteryear, To-Day and Tomorrow', 17 April 1968.

63 MAU, R.B. Pakenham to H. Maude, 4 May 1966 and 21 November 1966.

64 'Double Standards in Racial Issue', *The Daily Telegraph*, 12 September 1967.

Victims of 'Perverted Progressives'

Although the RMI and Powell influenced the shape and contours of the rhetoric employed by members of the Monday Club, other sources influenced by psychoanalysis were required to tie the third strand of post-colonial melancholia – the ability to contest and seize the position of victim – to the diagnosis of a liberal 'death wish'. One remarkable newsletter obtained by Maude in 1965 outlined the views of the Racial Preservation Society (RPS) and condemned 'progressive conservatives' as well as liberals, Communists and left-wingers who, while suffering from a disease called 'ethno-masochism', had infiltrated and perverted the British government. According to the RPS, 'ethno-masochism' was,

> a self-destructive impulse with an erotic basis. It leads the victim to desire the destruction of his own race, the active promotion of miscegenation or race-mixing being a common feature of the disease. Other symptoms involve a burning desire to see one's own race humiliated and degraded and relishing the downfall of co-racialists overseas ... [which] undoubtedly explains the fellow-feeling that 'liberals' have for other deviants such as homosexuals.[65]

Reading this list of supposed perversions linked to homosexuality and miscegenation, one might turn back to Siobhan Somerville's contention that the invention of homosexuality in American culture was intimately related to the regulation of the colour line in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[66] However, Rhodesian sympathisers tended to direct their attention to counter-cultural youth movements of the 1950s and 1960s – expressed in the romantic racism of tracts such as Norman Mailer's 'White Negro' and Jerry Farber's *The Student as Nigger*[67] – in which students and hipsters on both sides of the Atlantic associated their masculine vitality and solidarity with the 'force vitale' of Negritude. For example, Mrs Marriott, Vice President of the Scarborough and District branch of the Anglo Rhodesian Society, described her dissatisfaction with American, Germanic and Anglo-Saxon internationalists on the left 'whose philosophies have so permeated the youth of the country that we have now arrived at the inconceivable situation where university students and other entrepreneurs are now denying us the right of FREE SPEECH – in THIS – our own, our native land!'[68]

In response to the New Left, the RMI and its British sympathisers portrayed Rhodesia as a fantasy England that an 'unforgiving history had swept from its rightful bed'.[69] In 1966, Ian Smith claimed that Churchill would emigrate to Rhodesia if he were still alive, repeating the claims of Soref and the RMI that Rhodesia symbolised Britain at its best.[70] This mythic history demanded villains along with its Churchillian heroes, and linked leftist folk devils to Nazism as well as communism. On 2 December 1966, when Harold Wilson prepared to meet Ian Smith on HMS Tiger to discuss the possibility of a settlement between Britain and Rhodesia, the RMI compared the Labour Prime Minister's 'megalomania' and 'international socialism' to Hitler and National Socialism.[71] In 1968, Wall concluded his speech to the House of Commons with a warning that 'ordinary people in this country are scared to sign a petition presented by the Anglo Rhodesian Society against [sanctions] ... because they think

65 Racial Preservation Society, *Southern News*, 5 (1965).

66 S.B. Somerville, *Queering the Color Line: Race and the Invention of Homosexuality in American Culture* (Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2000).

67 N. Mailer, *The White Negro* (San Francisco, City Lights Books, 1957). J. Farber, *The Student as Nigger* (New York, Contact Books, 1969). For more on the Monday Club's response to the New Left, hipsterism and student protest see, J. Guinness, 'Norman Mailer's Politics', *The Monday World* (Winter), 1970/1971.

68 DPW/48/66, Minutes of the Anglo-Rhodesian Society (Scarborough and district branch), 1968.

69 B. Schwarz, 'Empire: For and Against', *Twentieth Century British History*, 6, 3 (1995), p. 367.

70 J. Taylor, 'Memory and Desire in Going Home: The Deconstruction of a Colonial Radical', in E. Bertelson (ed.), *Doris Lessing* (Johannesburg, McGraw-Hill, 1985), p. 60.

71 MAU, Pakenham to Maude, 1 December 1966. For other attempts to link Wilson to Hitler, see K. Riddell to Maude, 7 March 1967 and 24 July 1967.

that the Government might take action against them … similar to that carried out by Himmler and Hitler in Germany'.[72] Going further, a 1969 Monday Club pamphlet on immigration and repatriation written by George Young, an Intelligence Officer during the Second World War who served in the Foreign Office between 1946 and 1961, defined the 'liberal neurosis' as a desperate need to liberate 'heathens' and genuflect to 'the extravagances of Afro-Asian nationalism'. According to Young, it was not surprising that these 'surface phenomena at times remind us of the Nazis … [because] Naziism was born of the disillusionment of German liberalism after paradise failed to appear from the destruction of the traditional German order'.[73] In addition, Nicholas Bruen challenged the supposed 'totalitarianism' of the New Left in *The Monday World*, the Monday Club's literary magazine. Writing in 1973, Bruen claimed that Angela Davis turned to Black Power after receiving instruction from Marcuse and other neo-Marxist professors in Germany, who were described as 'evil men' who 'pose as liberators of the blacks, but whose sole purpose is to destroy society, enslaving the black man alongside the white'.[74] Using similar rhetorical tactics in 1977, Powell compared attempts to silence his comments about the Race Relations Act and impending 'racial war' in the United Kingdom to the isolation of those who, in the 1930s, had warned of the risks of war with Germany.[75]

'Post-imperial delusions' and 'national conceit'

Much more work needs to be done in order to address the Monday Club's cultural project after the 1973 oil crisis as well as Margaret Thatcher's election as Conservative Party leader and the disintegration of the Portuguese empire in 1975. Consequently, this heuristic article concludes by suggesting some possible directions for future research about the Monday Club's continuing investment in colonial frameworks that demanded responsible rulers for non-white groups, and by summarising the significance of Rhodesia to three of the main expressions of post-colonial melancholia. It does so by documenting one final exchange of letters between Wall and A.T. Culwick, an Oxford-educated expatriate, in 1975.

After asserting that his views emerge from an adult life spent entirely in Africa, Culwick rejected British predictions that an African majority government would not occur in ten or fifteen years.

> I see no solution of the Rhodesian problem or of many others in Africa or, indeed, elsewhere in the world, so long as the West refuses to acknowledge the importance of race. For all practical purposes, the genus Homo embraces three species, differing congenitally from one another both physically and mentally. I think we shall get precisely nowhere politically so long as we disregard this fundamental biological fact.
>
> My experience in Africa has taught me never to put a Black man in charge of any people other than his own. Disregard of this basic principle accounts for so much of the major trouble in the Sudan, Nigeria, Uganda, Zanzibar, Rwanda, Burundi, the Congo and elsewhere. And if the Black man cannot govern different Black men successfully, how can one expect him to govern Whites who are, strictly speaking, zoologically a different species?
>
> I think this biological aspect of politics deserves close attention.[76]

Such a letter reminds us about the fears regarding miscegenation and black majority rule in Africa, but Wall's reply is equally important because it suggests a British society that imposes

72 P. Wall, Parliamentary Debates (Commons), 766, 17 June 1968, cols. 784–91.
73 G. Young, *Who Goes Home? Immigration and Repatriation* (London, Monday Club, 1969), pp. 10–12.
74 N. Bruen, 'Female of the Species', *The Monday World*, Spring 1973.
75 'Speech to Young Conservatives', Manchester, 21 January 1977; *Daily Telegraph*, 22 January 1977.
76 DPW/48/515, A. Culwick to P. Wall, 1 November 1975. Also see MAU, A.T. Culwick, Rhodesian Local Government Association, 25 May 1968.

one set of standards for Tory traditionalists and another set of standards for groups who proclaimed Black Power.

> I agree with you in the ideal situation one shouldn't hand over the power to the indigenous races on that continent for another hundred years or more I have no doubt that there is quite a lot in what you say towards the end of your letter but anyone who even speculates on these lines in this country at the moment is immediately dubbed a racist and a fascist![77]

Wall sympathised with the plight of white paternalists in Southern Africa who were labelled 'racists' and 'fascists' – he was sometimes considered a 'fascist beast' because of his defence of white-minority governments in Rhodesia and South Africa[78] – and the Monday Club did not ignore British 'kith and kin' in Zimbabwe or the importance of South Africa to the Cold War after Margaret Thatcher's election as Prime Minister in 1979 and the formal independence of Zimbabwe in 1980. However, it would increasingly focus on policies and positions opposing urban uprisings and multicultural policies in the UK in the late 1970s and early 1980s. As a result, it avoided some of the contradictions it held as a purportedly 'non-racialist' group who supported a white minority government in Rhodesia while refusing to tolerate any state support for non-white minority cultures in the UK. Powell had moved to avoid such tensions in the 1960s when he targeted 'post-imperial delusions', 'imperial nostalgia' and the 'make believe' of the Commonwealth,[79] and there are elements of tragedy and farce in the alliance of ethnic nationalists and old colonialists who use the economic devastation of contemporary Zimbabwe to insist 'Enoch was right'. Nonetheless, the analytical framework of Paul Gilroy's post-colonial melancholia suggests that the substance of Powell's 'de Gaulle-like national conceit'[80] – his desire to fashion an everlasting England that could stave off the threat from non-white communalism and play a major role in European affairs – was prompted by similar anxieties to the Monday Club. Such desires and anxieties are not just the preserve of conspiratorial groups and political outsiders who rarely listen to music. As the increasing interest in melancholia in Britain and Southern Africa reveals, it is not unusual to awaken longings that can't be fulfilled.

Daniel McNeil
Media and Cultural Studies, School of Arts and Cultures, 2.76, Armstrong Building, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK. E-mail: daniel.mcneil@ncl.ac.uk

77 DPW/48/515, P. Wall to A. Culwick, 13 November 1975.
78 DPW/48/522, P. Wall to Bazin, 14 December 1977.
79 Heffer, *Like the Roman*, pp. 189, 387, 392, 477, 480, 535.
80 *Sunday Telegraph*, 17 October 1965.