

Henrice Altink

Henrice Altink is a lecturer in modern history at the University of York (United Kingdom). She has written her PhD on representations of Jamaican slave women in discourses of slavery and abolition (London: Routledge, forthcoming) and has published articles on Jamaican slave women, the workings of the Apprenticeship System in Jamaica, and the border in the Caribbean island of St. Martin. This article is part of a new research project that explores notions of womanhood in the Afro-Jamaican community in the post-emancipation period.

The Society for Caribbean Studies Annual Conference Papers

edited by Sandra Courtman

Copyright remains with the author

Vol. 8 2007 ISSN 1471-2024

<http://www.caribbeanstudies.org>

‘The Case of Miss Leila James B.A.’: Class, Race, Gender and National Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Jamaica

Henrice Altink

Abstract

In 1912, Leila James, an African Jamaican girl won the first scholarship for girls to study at a university abroad. A year later, the Jamaica Schools Commission decided to amend the rules for the competition, which triggered a fierce debate in which the government was accused of class, race and gender prejudice. In 1921, Leila James again captured public attention when a commission appointed by the governor investigated her dismissal as sub-examiner in the Education Department. The public debate about her dismissal and the discussion of the commission’s report in the Legislative Council also contained accusations of class, gender and colour discrimination. This article first of all explores the ways in which ideas about class, colour and gender shaped the two debates surrounding Leila James. Second, it examines the extent to which these ideas intersected with notions of national identity. In doing so, it aims to make a contribution to the scholarship on Jamaican nationalism, which has thus far largely ignored the years surrounding the First World War.

In 1920 and 1921, an investigation was carried out into the dismissal of Leila James, a university-educated African Jamaican woman, as acting sub-examiner in the Education Department, one of several posts opened up to Jamaican women as a result of the war. A commission appointed by the governor took evidence from officers in the Education Department and also from Leila James herself and concluded in its report from February 1921 that Leila had been unfairly dismissed. On the basis of the commission’s findings, the Legislative Council, which consisted of fourteen official and nominated members and fourteen elected members (including five African Jamaicans), decided that the government

should give Leila one year's salary and another position within the civil service, which was an exclusive club in terms of gender, class, and colour.¹

Leila's dismissal in 1920 was not the first time, however, that she had captured public attention. In 1912, she had won the first Girls' Scholarship to study at an English university. A year later, the Jamaican government decided that in addition to taking the Cambridge Senior Exam, applicants for the Girls' Scholarship would also have to appear before a selection committee that would judge their personal qualities. This change in the rules led to a major debate in which many argued that it was caused by the fact that 'a little dark-skinned girl of humble origin'² - Leila was dark-skinned and her father was a dispenser - had won the first Girls' Scholarship and that the change aimed to retain a social hierarchy carried over from slavery that placed black Jamaicans in unskilled or semi-skilled work at the bottom, coloured African Jamaicans who were small planters, professionals and clerks in the middle, and whites at the top.³

Based on editorials, letters to the editor, and reports of Legislative Council debates in the *Gleaner*, Jamaica's biggest-selling newspaper at the time, this article examines the ways in which ideas of class, race and gender shaped the two debates and also the extent to which these ideas intersected with notions of national identity. By the beginning of the twentieth century, there was a distinct sense of Jamaicaness, as is evidenced in the frequently articulated slogan 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans', which was repeatedly expressed in the two debates. It will be argued here that this slogan was interpreted differently by different sections of Jamaican society and that after the First World War, these different interpretations formed the basis of two distinct forms of Jamaican nationalism: a *colonial nationalism*, mainly but not solely articulated by white Jamaicans that favoured minor reforms that would give Jamaica more autonomy and respect within the Empire, and an *anti-colonial nationalism*, mostly expressed by middle-class African Jamaicans, that called for far-reaching reforms to create a more inclusive Jamaica.⁴

I

In 1881, the government set up a scholarship to study abroad for the boy or girl with the best score in the Cambridge Senior Exam. Because secondary girls' education was less developed than that of boys, the prize was invariably won by a boy.⁵ This led an inspector of the English board of education to recommend in 1911 that a separate Girls' Scholarship be established.⁶ The Jamaica Schools Commission agreed with him and proposed a Girls' Scholarship that was accepted by the Legislative Council in March 1912.⁷ That the Schools Commission did not see the scholarship as a means to widen the sphere of Jamaican women can be concluded from its assumption that upon their return home, winners would become teachers in secondary girls' schools, the quintessential middle-class female profession at the time.⁸

Shortly after Leila had sailed for England, a subcommittee of the Schools Commission proposed that the scholarship that was set up in 1881 should become a Boys' Scholarship for which applicants would have to sit the Cambridge Senior in one principal and one subsidiary

subject and that applicants for the Girls' Scholarship would have to take the Higher local Certificate in one principal and two subsidiary subjects, and also show a selection committee that they had such personal qualities as sympathy; were devoted to games; had special interests, such as needle work; and were physically fit and proficient in music and art.⁹

The new rules, which were approved by the executive in February 1913, considerably angered the locally-born and near-white editor of the *Gleaner*, Herbert G. Delisser. In three editorials, he not only set out how the new rules made it more difficult for girls to get a higher education but also asked the elected Council members to demand an amendment.¹⁰ The editorials triggered a fierce response, especially from middle-class African Jamaicans. They feared that if the change in the Girls' Scholarship rules was not undone, the government would soon set up tighter criteria for the Boys' Scholarship and thereby practically end an important means of upward mobility for their group, as Higher Education granted access to the professions and more senior ranks within the civil service. They firstly argued that the new rules were informed by class prejudice. 'No poor peasant girl' could, in their opinion, win the Girls' Scholarship because her parents could not afford to give her music or art lessons and were not cultured enough to instil in her the qualities valued by the selection committee.¹¹ And secondly, that the rules reeked of colour prejudice. J. T. Munroe, the secretary of the Jamaican Union of Teachers (JUT) stated, for instance, that the selection committee was 'an attempt at blighting the prospects of our intelligent *coloured* girls' because 'no sensible individual would think that here, where race prejudice is only kept down by force of circumstances, fair play would be exercised'.¹²

Although Delisser admitted that a selection committee could do injustice because 'we all have our prejudices', he disagreed with Munroe that the aim of the selection committee was to prevent African Jamaican girls from winning the award and argued that by raising the colour question, Munroe had done much to hinder the progress of these girls.¹³ Delisser was not the only participant in the debate who denied practices that ascribed a high value to whiteness and shades close to white in an attempt to safeguard his own privileged position. When asked by a *Gleaner* reporter whether the new rules would prevent 'the darker girls from winning the scholarship', J. R. Williams, the Director of Education, argued that they did not discriminate against them but gave them opportunities because they made schools place a higher value on good conduct and this benefited all girls enrolled in secondary schools.¹⁴

The new rules were not only seen to discriminate between girls of different classes and colours but also between girls and boys. It was argued that the Girls' Scholarship was fifty pounds less than the Boys' and that more was demanded of entrants for the Girls' Scholarship competition than for the Boys'. Demands to place the Girls' Scholarship on an equal footing with the Boys' were justified with arguments that emphasised women's similarity with or their difference from men. One *Gleaner* reader stated, for instance, that 'one need not be a devoted follower of Mrs Pankhurst to be able to appreciate that there should be intellectual equality of opportunity between men and women', while Delisser supported his demand for parity with the idea that women were the weaker sex by mentioning, for instance, that the new rules would turn applicants into 'physical wrecks'.¹⁵

The slogan 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans' was indirectly articulated in the scholarship debate, particularly in remarks about J. R. Williams. Oxbridge-educated Englishmen with little or no expert knowledge were usually appointed as heads of departments.¹⁶ Williams, however, was a locally-born man of English descent, who had been a school inspector.¹⁷ His appointment in 1909 let even the least nationally inclined to rally behind the slogan. Delisser mentioned, for instance, that he had always refrained from using the phrase but welcomed Williams' appointment because he knew the local situation better than English ex-pats and could thus do more to improve Jamaica.¹⁸ By 1913, however, he and various other white or near-white participants in the debate who wanted more parity between locals and ex-pats had to admit that appointing local men to senior positions in the civil service did not necessarily benefit the island. The new rules, which Williams fervently defended, blocked, according to them, 'the path of educational progress' of all islanders and thereby hindered Jamaica's progress.¹⁹ According to Munroe and most other middle-class African Jamaicans in the debate, however, the new rules targeted only the educational progress of African Jamaicans and were part of a larger project to prevent their social advancement. One *Gleaner* reader, for instance, likened them to the abolition of the open civil service exam in 1911, which had made it harder for African Jamaicans, especially the poorer and darker-skinned, to enter the civil service.²⁰ These two interpretations of the new rules suggest, then, that shortly before the First World War, most middle-class African Jamaicans meant by the slogan 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans' their full inclusion into society, which required the dismantling of the class/colour hierarchy, while other islanders interpreted the phrase as securing and advancing their privileged position in society, which was built on exclusionary class/colour practices.

James Allwood, the white elected member for St. Ann, took up Delisser's call to amend the rules. He was especially concerned to remove the selection committee because as the Girls' Scholarship was paid for by taxpayers' money, as opposed to the Rhodes' Scholarship, it should, in his opinion, be awarded on the basis of merit alone, that is, an exam. By proposing the motion that the Legislative Council would not approve of the £75 instalment for the next Girls' Scholarship unless the rules were amended, Allwood forced Williams to revise the rules.²¹ When the revised rules were voted down because they retained the selection committee, Allwood moved that a committee be set up to rewrite the rules.²² This was accepted and as a result, it was decided that from 1914 onwards the Girls' Scholarship should be awarded on the basis of an exam in one principal and one subsidiary subject.²³

II

As most secondary girls' schools preferred English-born teachers, Leila could not find a teaching position upon her return home and therefore applied in April 1916 for the post of acting sub-examiner, which consisted mainly of checking payments made to teachers and reviewing applications for teaching positions. In February 1920, the Legislative Council approved a new staffing scheme for the Education Department that implied the abolition of the post of sub-examiner.²⁴ It was, however, not until 1 April 1920 that P. J. O'Leary Bradbury, the English-born Director of Education, told Leila that 'there was no money on the estimates to pay her'.²⁵ Leila's friends informed the African Jamaican member for St. Ann, D. Theo Wint, of the clumsy way in which she was dismissed. He succeeded with the help of two other African Jamaican members – H. A. L. Simpson and J. A. G. Smith – to convince the governor to set up a commission to investigate Leila's dismissal.²⁶ Four men unfamiliar with the workings of the Education Department were appointed and given not only the task of assessing whether Leila had been dismissed without proper notice but also of determining whether she had satisfactorily performed her duties.²⁷ This was largely on the insistence of Wint, who had hoped that this would counteract suggestions that Leila's work had been insufficient and which were used by some to argue that winners of government scholarships had proved a failure and that they could thus be abolished.²⁸ Wint failed, however, in making the commission also look into the 'working and staffing of the education department'.²⁹ This is unsurprising, however, as the staffing of the civil service was an important means used by the government to keep the class/colour hierarchy in tact and thereby contain the threat posed by the largely disenfranchised black mass and the increasingly politically-vocal, coloured

middle-class. The open civil service exam had allowed African Jamaicans of all colours and classes to enter the civil service. By substituting this in 1911 for a system whereby only those who had passed the Cambridge senior with a certain number of passes in certain subjects were put on a list and interviewed when a vacancy emerged, the government tried to keep the top rank positions reserved for Englishmen, the slightly less senior for white Jamaicans and well-off, light-skinned African Jamaicans, and the most junior for less well-off and darker-skinned African Jamaicans.³⁰

That Wint saw Leila's dismissal largely as the result of class and colour prejudice within the civil service can also be concluded from the fact that he supported the motion put forward by the African Jamaican member George Young that Leila be given one year's salary paid for by Bradbury with the argument that it was the government's task to ensure that Departments were free from prejudice by purging them of men like Bradbury who were 'not charitably disposed to everybody'.³¹ Various other council members interpreted Leila's dismissal in the same way, including the white member for St. Mary, who mentioned that there were also other Departments that displayed 'a partisan spirit' and that he wanted to see 'peace and good will exist between all *classes*'.³²

As the First World War acted as a catalyst for nationalist feeling, it is not surprising that the slogan 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans' was more, albeit it still mostly indirectly, articulated in the debate about Leila's dismissal than in the one about the Girls' Scholarship. According to one *Gleaner* reader, for instance, the dismissal showed once more the 'practice of exploiting Jamaica for the youth of other countries'.³³ Like this reader, Delisser also articulated a *colonial nationalism*. In his editorials, he presented Leila's dismissal as a *single* case of injustice, the result of an unfortunate mistake that should be rectified by giving her a year's salary and another position.³⁴ In doing so, he suggested that there was no need for the commission to investigate the workings of the Education Department, which had the potential to undermine the class/colour hierarchy and thereby threaten the privileged status of his own group. Wint and some other Council members, on the other hand, saw Leila's dismissal as an *exemplary* case of injustice suffered by Jamaicans of a certain class and colour, linking it to a recent dismissal in the Railway Department. Their *anti-colonial nationalism* can be seen most clearly in their attack on the government's attempt to brush discriminatory practices in the Education Department under the carpet by appointing only yes-men unto the commission and in their call upon the government not to use the same approach as in previous cases of

injustice, namely that of automatically defending the head of the Department, as this would lead it to lose the confidence of the Jamaican people, who wanted Bradbury dismissed.³⁵ Anti-colonial nationalists, then, placed a lot of emphasis on reforms, as a means to create a more inclusive Jamaica.

Considering its concern to retain the class/colour hierarchy, it is unsurprising that the government was keen to see that Leila's dismissal was treated as a *single* case of injustice and was rectified by a means that would not affect the staffing of the civil service. It therefore not only firmly denied that colour prejudice played a role in the dismissal but also objected to Young's motion on the grounds that it would produce 'disunion in Jamaica by raising racial or class warfare'.³⁶ Probably because he feared that the governor would put forward a less satisfactory solution to compensate Leila, H. A. L. Simpson suggested that the government and not Bradbury should pay Leila's back salary, which was accepted by the other elected members.³⁷

During the discussion of the commission's report, the attorney-general argued that Leila was dismissed because she had 'been brought in as a result of the war and that as a woman, she had not been able to perform all the duties of sub-examiner'.³⁸ Those who presented Leila's dismissal as an *exemplary* case of injustice did not use his explanation to argue that her dismissal was part of the government's attempt to roll-back the gains that Jamaican women had made during the war. Nor did they use Leila's case to illustrate that women in the civil service were restricted to lower ranks and lower levels of pay than men. And as those who wanted to amend the rules of the Girls' Scholarship, they articulated contradictory remarks about women's ability. Simpson, for instance, argued on the one hand that Leila's academic achievements proved that women were as intelligent as men, while stating on the other that he had taken up her case because 'it could not be expected that she could put her case in the same manner as Mr. Bradbury'.³⁹

Equal gender relations, then, were not a primary concern of anti-colonial nationalists in the years following the First World War and race clearly functioned in their struggle as what Evelyn Higginbotham has called a 'meta-language'; that is, it subsumed other sets of social relations.⁴⁰ This is not to say, however, that some anti-colonial nationalists did not challenge the existing gender relations. The JUT was a focal point for the struggle against colonialism in the interwar years. At its 1936 annual meeting, Mary Morris-Knibb, who became the first

Jamaican woman elected onto a local council, demanded that women could become president of the union. Most female attendants, however, helped to sustain the gender status quo by arguing that female members of the JUT should stay ‘quietly beside their men folk’.⁴¹

That female anti-colonial nationalists both challenged and reinforced existing gender ideals was largely the result of their education. Most of them had gone to secondary girls’ schools, which taught not only subjects that prepared them for paid work, like book-keeping and shorthand, but also housewifery and other subjects based on the idea that marriage and motherhood were a woman’s main destiny.⁴² As Leila, who became an important player in the struggle for independence in the 1940s and 1950s, had also attended a prestigious girls’ school, it is not surprising that she equally expressed a belief in women’s similarity with and difference from men. For example, by not launching a complaint herself and asking to be represented by a legal adviser, she helped to strengthen the idea that women were the weaker sex, while she challenged existing gender ideals, for example, by stating that she had not applied for a lectureship in hygiene, which Bradbury had recommended and was deemed to be more in line with her feminine nature, because this post involved more routine work and paid less than that of sub-examiner.⁴³

III

The two debates examined in this article suggest that the Jamaican government tried to retain the class/colour hierarchy largely by upholding the gender status quo. It, for instance, approved of a change in scholarship rules that attached a lower value to the Girls’ than the Boys’ Scholarship; prevented girls from a certain class and colour from winning the award; and rather than abolishing the post of sub-examiner, it replaced it by a second-class clerkship and gave it to a white, non-university educated male.⁴⁴ It could be argued, then, that those who interpreted the slogan ‘Jamaica for the Jamaicans’ as full citizenship for African Jamaicans undermined their struggle to realise this aim by: ignoring gender prejudice, as in Leila’s dismissal; presenting gender prejudice as less important than class and colour prejudice, as in the scholarship debate; and providing contradictory claims about women’s ability.

The slogan ‘Jamaica for the Jamaicans’ was, as we have seen, also interpreted as giving locals the same opportunities as English ex-pats, which was seen not to require the dismantling of

the class/colour hierarchy. By showing the co-existence of the two interpretations of the phrase 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans', this article has tried to fill a gap in the historiography on Jamaican nationalism. Based on their assumption that only demands for independence reflect nationalist thinking in colonial contexts, most scholars have not only ignored the years before 1936 when the first demands for self-government were made, but also expressions of colonial nationalism.⁴⁵ Although the two debates examined here contain only a few and rather limited expressions of early Jamaican nationalism, they suggest that we can gain a better understanding of Jamaican nationalism if we shift our attention from the late 1930s to the beginning of the century when the slogan 'Jamaica for the Jamaicans' gained currency and also if we examine the interaction of notions of national identity with ideas of colour, class and gender.

Notes

¹ A secondary school education provided the necessary qualification for entry into the lower levels of the colonial administration. As secondary education was fee paying, few black Jamaicans had access to it. This and the fact that secondary education for girls was less developed than that for boys meant that the lower ranks of the colonial administration were largely occupied by coloured middle-class men. A university degree provided access to the more senior ranks in the administration. Few African Jamaicans managed to get a higher education, while those who did often found the more senior posts in the administration closed to them.

² 'A Scholarship Regulation Mystery', *Gleaner*, 1 April 1913.

³ For more on the class/colour hierarchy, see P. Bryan, *The Jamaican People 1880-1902: Race, Class and Social Control* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991), chaps 5 and 11; H. Johnson, 'The British Caribbean from Demobilization to Constitutional Decolonization', in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 4, eds J. M. Brown and W. R. Louis (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 597-622 and 'The Black Experience in the British Caribbean in the Twentieth Century', in *Black Experience and Empire*, eds P. D. Morgan and S. Hawkins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 317-46; and K. Post, *Arise Ye Starvelings: The Jamaican Labour Rebellion of 1938 and its Aftermath* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1978).

⁴ Scholars have thus far paid scant attention to early expressions of Jamaican nationalism. They have instead concentrated on the late 1930s, when the first demands for self-government were made, and on the 1940s and 1950s, when the Jamaica Labour Party and the People's National Party kept the demand for self-government alive and eventually brought it to fruition. See, for instance, A. Bogues, 'Nationalism and Jamaican Political Thought', in *Jamaica in Slavery and Freedom: History, Heritage and Culture*, eds K. E. Monteith and G. Richards (Barbados: University of the West Indies Press, 2003), 363-87; D. Benn, *The Caribbean: An Intellectual History 1774-2003* (Kingston: Ian Randle, 2004), chap. 3; and G. K. Lewis, *The Growth of the Modern West Indies* [1968] (Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers, 2004), chap. 7.

⁵ Brian L. Moore and Michelle A. Johnson, *Neither Led nor Driven: Contesting British Cultural Imperialism in Jamaica 1865-1920* (Kingston: Ian Randle, 2004), 228-40.

-
- ⁶ 'Important Report on Secondary Education in this Island', *Gleaner*, 26 October 1911.
- ⁷ Message from his Excellency the Governor to the Honourable Legislative Council, 2 March 1912, Colonial Office (hereafter, CO) 137/693; and Extracts of Legislative Council Minutes, 28 March 1912, CO 137/693. The Schools Commission was set up in 1887 and was responsible for all the secondary schools in the island.
- ⁸ 'Educational Conditions Shown', *Gleaner*, 8 March 1912.
- ⁹ The exam would count for 75 per cent of the overall mark and the evidence submitted to the selection committee for 25 per cent. The Higher Local Certificate was the girls' exam designed by the University of Cambridge.
- ¹⁰ 'New Regulations Governing the Girls' Jamaica Scholarship', *Gleaner*, 25 February 1913; 'Producing Physical Wrecks and then Demanding Physical Fitness', *Gleaner*, 26 February 1913; and 'An Arrangement that is Sure to Lead to Injustice and Create Discontent', *Gleaner*, 27 February 1913. Delisser was of Portuguese-Jewish and African descent. In the beginning of his career as a journalist and novelist he did not deny his African background but by the 1920s he identified himself primarily as a white man and expressed at times a strong anti-black sentiment. For a short biography, see W. A. Roberts, *Six Great Jamaicans* (Kingston: The Pioneer Press, 1952), 104-21.
- ¹¹ See, for instance, 'Matters Discussed in the Legislative Council of Jamaica Yesterday', *Gleaner* 27 March 1913; 'The Scholarship given for Girls in Jamaica', *Gleaner*, 3 March 1913; 'The Discussion Regarding the Girls' Scholarship', *Gleaner*, 5 March 1913; and 'Meeting of Wolmer's Trustees', *Gleaner*, 5 March 1913.
- ¹² 'A Vexed Issue', *Gleaner*, 22 May 1913. Emphasis mine. Munroe meant by 'coloured' all Jamaicans who were not white.
- ¹³ 'The Raising of Prejudice that had Better Be Allowed to Die', *Gleaner*, 22 May 1913.
- ¹⁴ 'Jamaica Scholarship for Girls and the Regulations Proposed for Governing It', *Gleaner*, 4 March 1913. For similar remarks by Williams, see 'Matters Discussed in the Legislative Council of Jamaica Yesterday', *Gleaner*, 27 March 1913.
- ¹⁵ 'Letter to the Editor', *Gleaner*, 3 April 1913; and 'Producing Physical Wrecks and then Demanding Physical Fitness', *Gleaner*, 26 February 1913.
- ¹⁶ Lewis, *The Growth of the Modern West Indies*, 107-08.
- ¹⁷ 'Some Character Sketches: Mr J. R. Williams', *Gleaner*, 9 July 1910.
- ¹⁸ 'Our Education Chief', *Gleaner*, 20 July 1909.
- ¹⁹ See, for instance, 'The Jamaica Girls' Scholarship Must be Revived without Delay', *Gleaner*, 1 April 1913; 'Letter to the Editor', *Gleaner*, 3 March 1913; 'The Discussion Regarding the Girls' Scholarship', *Gleaner*, 5 March 1913; 'The Jamaica Girls' Scholarship Must Not Now be Abandoned', *Gleaner*, 27 March 1913; 'Some Further Thoughts on the Girls' Scholarship Question', *Gleaner*, 3 April 1913; 'Letter to the Editor', *Gleaner*, 4 April 1913; and 'The Composition of Boards that Look after Educational Affairs', *Gleaner*, 7 August 1913.
- ²⁰ 'Letter to the Editor', *Gleaner*, 3 March 1913.
- ²¹ 'Matters Discussed in the Legislative Council of Jamaica Yesterday', *Gleaner*, 27 March 1913. On the Rhodes' Scholarship, see Moore and Johnson, *Neither Led nor Driven*, 242-43.
- ²² 'Vexed Question of the Jamaica Girls' Scholarship Decided by Legislature', *Gleaner*, 19 June 1913; and 'The Honourable Legislative Council of Jamaica in Session', *Gleaner*, 19 June 1913.
- ²³ 'Close of Summer Session of the Legislative Council', *Gleaner*, 28 June 1913; and Letter from Governor Manning to Lewis Harcourt, Secretary of State for the Colonies, 13 August 1913, CO 137/698. The exam for the Scholarship was to be set by the University of Cambridge Local Examination Syndicate.

-
- ²⁴ ‘Sitting of the Leila James Commission, *Gleaner*, 25 November 1920.
- ²⁵ ‘Resumption of the Leila James Commission’, *Gleaner*, 9 December 1920.
- ²⁶ Minutes of the Legislative Council, Tuesday 6 April 1920, CO 140/256.
- ²⁷ ‘A Commission Now Appointed’, *Gleaner*, 20 November 1920; ‘The Case of Miss Leila James B.A.’, *Gleaner*, 26 July 1920; and Sessional Papers, Tuesday 6 April 1920, CO 140/256.
- ²⁸ On these suggestions, see, for example, ‘Letter to the Editor’, *Gleaner*, 22 March 1921.
- ²⁹ ‘Session of Local Legislature’, *Gleaner*, 29 May 1920.
- ³⁰ E. Brown, *Injustices in the Civil Service* (New York: Jamaica Progressive League, 1937), 5-7.
- ³¹ ‘Yesterday’s Proceedings of Honourable Legislative Council’, *Gleaner*, 2 April 1921.
- ³² *Ibid.* Emphasis mine.
- ³³ ‘Letter to the Editor’, *Gleaner*, 5 October 1920.
- ³⁴ ‘Do the Right Thing’, *Gleaner*, 4 March 1921; and ‘The Right Thing’, *Gleaner*, 4 April 1921.
- ³⁵ ‘Yesterday’s Proceedings of Honourable Legislative Council’, *Gleaner*, 2 April 1921.
- ³⁶ ‘The Business Transacted by the Legislators of this Island’, *Gleaner*, 6 April 1921; and Letter Probyn to W. L. Spencer Churchill, Secretary of State, 31 March 1921, CO 137/747.
- ³⁷ ‘The Work Done in the Honourable Legislative Council’, *Gleaner*, 6 April 1921.
- ³⁸ ‘Yesterday’s Proceedings of the Honourable Legislative Council’, *Gleaner*, 2 April 1921.
- ³⁹ *Ibid.*
- ⁴⁰ E. B. Higginbotham, ‘African-American Women’s History and the Metalanguage of Race’, *Signs* 17, no. 2 (1992), 253.
- ⁴¹ ‘Business Transacted by Conference of Jamaica Union of Teachers Y’day’, *Gleaner*, 9 January 1936; and ‘The Women’s Session by a Woman in the Back Seat’, *Jamaica Union of Teachers Magazine* 8, no. 2 (1936), 19.
- ⁴² Moore and Johnson, *Neither Led nor Driven*, 234-40.
- ⁴³ ‘Resumption of the Leila James Commission, *Gleaner*, 9 December 1921; ‘Leila James Commission Resumes Sitting’, *Gleaner*, 22 December 1921; and ‘Work of the Leila James Commission’, *Gleaner*, 23 December 1921. As the government did not live up to its promise to find Leila another position within the civil service, she moved to Costa Rica where she set up a secondary school for children of West Indian migrants. When this school was destroyed by a fire, she moved to Bermuda in 1925 where she set up another school. In the 1930s, she spent time in Ghana with her Jamaican husband Harold Tomlinson. In 1939, shortly after her return to the island, she helped to set up Jamaica Welfare Limited, an organisation that worked towards the uplift of rural African Jamaicans and which she served as supervisor of home economics training till her retirement in 1959. ‘Leila James Tomlinson, First Jamaica Scholar’, *Gleaner*, 11 April 1976; and ‘Leila James Tomlinson’s Selfless Life Extolled’, *Gleaner*, 9 July 1979.
- ⁴⁴ After Leila was dismissed, Mr Soutar was appointed as a second-class clerk. He was given the tasks that Leila had previously carried out. His appointment was defended by the Director of Education on the grounds that Soutar had been in the Department longer than Leila James and that he had served on the front. ‘The Leila James Commission’, *Gleaner*, 8 December 1920.
- ⁴⁵ The Jamaica progressive League, set up in New York in 1936 by Jamaican ex-pats, was the first to openly demand self-government.