

THE MUSEUM AND THE GAME RESERVE: DR. ERNEST WARREN AND RE-PRESENTATIONS OF NATURE IN EARLY TWENTIETH- CENTURY NATAL

Shirley Brooks
School of Life and Environmental Sciences (Geography)
University of Natal, Durban

Paper for the History/African Studies Seminar Series
August 2000

Note: This paper represents work in progress.
Please do not cite without permission.

INTRODUCTION

This paper is part of a wider project (a doctoral thesis) in which the social, cultural and political history of “wildlife conservation” in KwaZulu-Natal is being investigated. This work is informed by my background in historical/ cultural geography and its particular geographical focus is the two oldest game reserves in Zululand and indeed in Africa - the Hluhluwe and Umfolozi game reserves, proclaimed in 1895 and, since 1989, amalgamated into one entity, the Hluhluwe-Umfolozi park under the control of the KwaZulu-Natal Nature Conservation Services (KZNCS). These reserves came under the control of a statutory body, the Natal Parks Board (NPB) from 1947 until 1997, when the NPB and the KwaZulu Department of Nature Conservation combined to form the KZNCS. Between 1910 and 1947, the game reserves fell under the Natal Provincial Administration, and before this they were “run” (if this is the right word, as there was very little infrastructure and no tourists) first by the British Zululand administration under the Colonial Office, and from 1897 by the Natal colonial administration.

A central interest in this writing and research is in tracing the process through which these reserved spaces were reinvented as “spaces of nature” - in short, the social construction of nature in this region, and in particular, the social construction of a space of nature in Zululand. The set of broader theoretical ideas within which this work is located, is explained elsewhere and will not be further elaborated here.¹ In order to make sense of the present paper, however, it is necessary to explain briefly that the reserves were not initially conceived as “spaces of nature” in the modern sense: that is, their origins did not lie in any perception of an external “nature” to which one escapes, a landscape in which one “recreates” oneself, an apparently timeless wilderness, a fragile and disappearing nature; or any of the familiar tropes that now fashion contemporary western ideas about what spaces and objects fall into the category “natural”. (The link between these tropes and a commoditized nature that is being shaped in particular ways by the consumptive discourses of tourism, must be noted but is not discussed here).

¹ Shirley Brooks, “Time, Space and Nature: The Nostalgic Space of the Game Reserve”, *Transformation*, forthcoming.

My research has shown that the origins of the Hluhluwe and Umfolozi game reserves are to be sought, not in the desire to protect animals from people, but rather in the perceived need to protect people from animals. The case for this argument too is made elsewhere.² To summarise, the approach that proved most fruitful in attempting to explain the origins of the game reserves, was not to try to identify nineteenth-century ideologies of nature, but rather to explore the dominant human discourses about wild animals at the time, and to consider how these were worked out in the specific political and economic context of late nineteenth-century Zululand so as to produce the reserved spaces we know as “game reserves”.

The two most important discourses in this period I have characterized as those of “pursuit” and “containment”. The discourse of pursuit encompasses ideas about wild animals and their preservation held by (white) sport hunters. It is from this set of ideas that colonial game laws emerged.³ But the Zululand game reserves - proclaimed in 1895, but proposed two years earlier by the Zululand administration and to my knowledge the earliest in colonial Africa - were not primarily the idea of sport hunters. Rather, they were the result of a particular accident of ecology. Parts of Zululand were endemic nagana areas, and nagana, a devastating cattle disease, was widely thought to be associated with wild animals. (“Indigenous knowledge” said so, and this was also accepted by white hunters and traders). The reserves were thus set up in terms of a discourse of containment: wild animals were to be kept away, as far as possible, from domestic cattle because they were a source of contagious disease. An interesting point to emphasise is that this outcome was significantly influenced by Zulu understandings of health and disease. In the absence of western biomedical research into nagana, and in a context where conciliation was politically important, the Resident Commissioner felt he had little option but to adopt the Zulu version of the causes of nagana disease. Game reserves were part of his strategy for separating domestic from wild animals in British-administered Zululand.

Attitudes towards wild animals and wild spaces, then, were not primarily constructed at this time in terms of an explicit ideology of nature, as one would understand it in the modern or contemporary sense. Quite different ideas about “natural” spaces and about wild animals were, I argue, grafted onto the reserves later. The focus of this paper is the way in which new ideas about nature percolated into the debate about the Zululand game reserves in the early twentieth century. A key figure in introducing this deeply ideological discourse about nature into Natal was the newly appointed director of the statutory Natal Government Museum in Pietermaritzburg, a state institution formally created out of the museum that had been set up under the auspices of the Natal Society by a group of enthusiasts fifty years before. Dr. Ernest Warren became very involved in the struggle that unfolded in the 1920s over the Zululand game reserves. His ideological assumptions and social practices, as they relate to the (re)presentation of nature and the “reinvention” of the game reserves as explicitly “natural” spaces, are the subject of this paper.

² Shirley Brooks, “The Origins of the Hluhluwe and Umfolozi Reserves: Discourses of Pursuit and Containment, 1887 to 1903”, Unpublished Paper, 2000.

³ John MacKenzie’s work on hunting and British imperialism remains the best source. See John MacKenzie, *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 1988).

LOCATING DR. WARREN: SCIENCE, NATURAL HISTORY, AND THE ZULULAND FAUNA

The ideas about nature - and more specifically about wild animals - articulated by the zoologist Dr. Ernest Warren suggest a broader and less obviously self-interested view than had featured in the history of the game reserves thus far, that is, in the discourses and social practices according to which the reserves were conceptualised and maintained. The self-interest of sport hunters and livestock owners is easy enough to understand. Sport hunters, closely associated with the colonial state, were concerned to assert ownership over the wild animals they valued as trophies. At the heart of their version of the colonial appropriation of nature, was the pursuit of wild animals as an individualistic activity affirming personal and, by extension, imperial authority. The material interest of the individual is even clearer in the case of stock farmers. Where human livelihoods are at stake, nature or “the wild” is necessarily viewed as a threat. However, Warren articulated another view, one that took a self-consciously objective (yet at the same time ideological) position. The purpose of this section is to place this view in context.

From the time of his arrival in Natal in 1903, Warren conceptualised wild animals in a way that was qualitatively different from the way they were commonly represented in the colony. The focus here is on the perspectives Warren brought to bear on wild animals and game reserves in Zululand. These representations were not static: they passed through several stages and became more strategic as the threat to wildlife and game reserves mounted, and as Warren tried to influence public opinion to oppose the killing of wild animals and the abolition of the game reserves in Zululand.

Two preliminary points must be made. First, it is important to stress that the responses and representations discussed in this paper - while they are part of broader social currents and intellectual debates of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Britain - reflect an essentially counter-hegemonic discourse in the context of Natal and South Africa more generally. At the time of Warren’s retirement in 1933, the dominant views of wild animals remained more or less in place, and Warren himself often stated that he was widely regarded as a “fanatic”. On the other hand, degree of influence is difficult to measure, and there may well be a sense in which Warren and his allies did influence public opinion (that is, white, middle-class, urban opinion), during the first decades of the twentieth century. This was, after all, the period of transition from the gun to the camera, and it preceded the emergence of mass wildlife tourism.

Secondly, it would be misleading to present Dr. Warren as having single-handedly introduced into Natal a totally new conception of wild animals. One of the key differences in Warren’s language, when compared with that of the dominant settler and other discourses, was his insistence on using the word “fauna” rather than “game”. This broadened the focus from game animals to include all classes of wild animal and to accord them new significance. Hunters valued the animals they pursued in terms of their “pluckiness” or “wiliness”, as well as of course the size of the animal, the length of the horns and the splendour of the head when displayed as a trophy in their homes. Warren, in contrast, saw all animals as part of what he called the “characteristic fauna” of a country - what we might think of, today, as its indigenous wildlife. This placed an entirely different value on animal nature.

A corollary to Warren's view of "game" was his attitude to animals that were commonly thought of as vermin. In his correspondence, Warren was always careful to refer to these animals as "so-called vermin", and he disapproved of the nineteenth-century game-keeping practices that continued to play an important role in the management of wild animal populations in African game reserves well into the twentieth century. Warren's strongest comment on this point is his remark, made towards the end of his career in Natal, that:

The game conservators have been very unwise in the past in destroying all carnivora as "vermin" and the balance is therefore gravely upset. Also, from every point of view except that of the "sportsmen" the carnivora are as interesting as the herbivora.⁴

It would be wrong to suggest that Warren, as a trained zoologist, was the only person using the more neutral "fauna" instead of "game" in the early twentieth century. By the turn of the century, the term "fauna" had also been adopted by sport hunters, in an attempt to cast their interest in game preservation in a more acceptably scientific light - hence, for example, the Society for the Preservation of the Wild Fauna of the Empire (SPWFE), formed in 1903. It was by no means unusual for hunters to consider themselves naturalists, and to take seriously the task of "collecting" animals for museums. "Fauna" was not necessarily a new word, although Warren was certainly one of the first people, in the context of the social construction of nature in Natal, to insist on its consistent useage in place of "game".

There also existed, when Warren arrived in Natal, an interest in natural history that was *not* connected to hunting. As already noted, a museum had been formed in Pietermaritzburg in the 1850s, and it had been run on a voluntary basis by members of the colony's foremost intellectual association, the Natal Society. It was this museum that Warren was employed to transform into a modern natural history museum, run on scientific lines. Many of the existing collections, formed by amateur curators, reflected a delight in the empirical work of collecting and labelling. Serious natural historians had embraced the Linnean system of classification, according to which a standardized Latin name was given to each species within various categories of animal, or genera. A study by Lynn Merrill on the subject of Victorian natural history, emphasises its practitioners' fascination with the observation, description, and classification of natural objects. These practices, she argues, changed people's relationship to "nature", making it seem more autonomous and encouraging a view in which "natural objects were increasingly valued for themselves, not as reflections or projections of human needs".⁵

It is important to consider the relationship between natural history and zoological science at the turn of the century, and to explain how Dr. Warren fitted into this. Warren did not scorn "amateurs", but instead supported the amateur study of natural history. He worked closely with the Pietermaritzburg naturalists, most of whom were on the Museum Committee. The year after his arrival, Warren was involved in founding the Natal Naturalists Association, which aimed to "bring together those interested in Natural

⁴ Ernest Warren Correspondence (EWC), Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg. EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Warren to C.W. Hobley, Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire, c/o Zoological Society of London, 10 April 1930. Warren concluded that, unfortunately, it would not be practicable to re-introduce into the (unfenced) reserves animals such as lions, to help restore the balance. After all, "if a lion scratched a native or happened to kill a goat, there would be no end of fuss".

⁵ Lynn Merrill, *The Romance of Victorian Natural History* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1989), p.92.

History for the purpose of mutual instruction, and assistance".⁶ Women, who were rarely trained scientists, could and did play an active role in this society, which however appears to have been relatively short-lived. Warren and his wife were both members, and the Minute Book of the Association is full of observations and pencil drawings of various forms of wild life studied on field excursions.⁷

In correspondence with the Principal Under Secretary in 1905, Warren spelt out his view of his responsibilities as Director of the Natal Government Museum. Requesting the renewal of his railway pass, which he had already held for two years, Warren emphasised how inconvenient it would be for him to have to fill out separate forms for journeys "which are necessary for me to take in investigating the fauna of the country".⁸ When the Principal Under Secretary refused permission, Warren fought back. Noting that "during the two years I have been in Natal a Museum has been founded which will ultimately be a credit to South Africa in general, and Natal in particular", Warren argued:

The position of Director of a Museum entails the survey and investigation of the fauna of the country in which it is situated. This is especially the case in a new country like Natal. The whole of the colony is under my jurisdiction with respect to its fauna, and in my opinion a Railway Pass, if supplied to any Department, is especially appropriate to me as Director of the Government Museum.⁹

Nobody laughed at Warren's rather grandiose vision of his job - "the whole of the colony is under my jurisdiction with respect to its fauna" - and no-one seriously challenged the changes he made at the Natal Museum, although there were rumblings of discontent when the new museum building in Loop Street was reopened to the public in November 1904. Warren had strong ideas about what should be displayed in a museum, and how it should be displayed. He had stated in an interview published in the *Natal Witness* soon after his arrival that "the present classification ... is naturally very defective. The labelling is simply done on pieces of dirty card".¹⁰ As to the actual contents of the museum, Warren felt that "all branches are exceedingly deficient", especially insects, fishes, lizards and snakes: "there is scarcely anything".¹¹ Warren set about making good some of these deficiencies through collecting trips, in particular the one to Zululand in 1903, discussed in the next section.

In place of the familiar and somewhat promiscuous clutter of the old museum, the new one had zoological specimens arranged along strictly scientific lines.¹² Foreign as well as local species were included, because Warren felt that "representative species of

⁶ Natal Museum Collection (NM), Natal Archives Depot. NM 1/2, Minute book of the Natal Naturalists Association 1904-1909. Inaugural Meeting of the Natal Naturalists' Association held in library of the Natal Government Museum on Dec 24, 1904.

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ NM 2/1, Official Correspondence. Minute Paper NGM 93/04, "Application for Renewal of Railway Pass", Warren to the Principal Under Secretary, 23 December 1904.

⁹ NM 2/1, Official Correspondence. Minute Paper NGM 93/04, "Application for Renewal of Railway Pass", Warren to the Principal Under Secretary, 23 January 1905. This argument impressed the Colonial Secretary, who intervened and made sure that the pass was granted. "Warren does very good work and does not mind how much he does and he seems to feel being deprived of a pass which he has had in the past ... He's very well "up" but it is not always easy to "get it out" he is rather inclined to be diffident about his achievements". (Colonial Secretary to Principal Under Secretary, 30 January 1905).

¹⁰ *Natal Witness*, 10 April 1903, "Witness" Special, p.5.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Natal Witness*, 30 November 1904, p.5.

foreign forms should be exhibited, in order that the Colonial youth might be able to obtain a clear view of the various modifications of the mammalian organisation".¹³ In his first annual report, Warren explained the principle according to which the collection was organised:

The first desire was to represent by characteristic species the various orders and families of the mammalia. This idea is attempted in the wall-cases of the larger of the two Mammal Rooms. Passing from left to right we have Primates, Chiroptera, Insectivora, Carnivora, Rodentia, Ungulata, Cetacea, Marsupialia, and the Monotremata. The SA species here introduced are sharply marked off from the foreign species by the colour of the labels. The labels of the indigenous species are buff, and of the foreign species stone-grey.¹⁴

A letter writer to the *Natal Witness*, identified only as "Curio", disapproved of the new and to his mind narrowly scientific arrangement:

A tour of inspection round the Natal Government Museum forces one to query the title, which is surely a misnomer, and should read "Natural History Museum", for it is purely a Natural History museum with some catering in addition for geologists. The popular side ... is conspicuous by its absence.¹⁵

"Anthropologist" agreed, and objected to the insistence on Linnean classification, or as he put it, "the prominence given everywhere ... to that dead language - Latin". Latin names, in his view, conveyed "no meaning to anyone but about one in ten thousand":

It seems to me that the museum is arranged to give the seal of approval to a few petty, narrow-minded scientific men, and that the public interest is sacrificed to pander to this.¹⁶

There is a general question here about the extent to which a split had developed between the professional zoologist and the amateur naturalist, with the emergence by the end of the nineteenth century of specialised scientific disciplines such as botany, zoology, geology, and even sub-disciplines like ornithology. Lynn Merrill detects a growing intellectual gulf between scientific practitioners and amateur naturalists in Britain over the course of the nineteenth century. She argues that, because the motivations of amateur natural historians were primarily aesthetic rather than analytical, they were mainly interested in naming and ordering, whereas professional scientists wanted to understand the dynamic connections between living organisms. As a result,

... Victorian amateur naturalists clung to the traditional definition of a species. As the century advanced, the definition would change radically, as far as biologists were concerned, but naturalists would continue to prefer the older, more static idea.¹⁷

There is no doubt that the scientific debates of the second half of the nineteenth century were extremely wide-ranging. They raised philosophical, even metaphysical questions about the nature of man, "his" place in the natural world, his relationship to God, and the prospects for human progress. Robert Young, the radical historian of science, argues that the nineteenth-century debates around the theory of evolution - debates in which virtually every intellectual person was involved - are often interpreted as resulting in the triumph of rationalism over Christianity, or the death of God, but this is wrong. In Young's view, "Science did not replace God: God became identified with the laws of nature".¹⁸ For Young, the reification of nature involved in this transition, led to an

¹³ *First Report of the Natal Government Museum, Year ending 31st December 1904, Colony of Natal. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Excellency the Governor (Pietermaritzburg, Davis and Sons, 1906), p.14.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Natal Witness*, 1 December 1904, "Curio" to Editor, p.6.

¹⁶ *Natal Witness*, 6 December 1904, "Anthropologist" to Editor, p.6.

¹⁷ Merrill, *The Romance of Victorian Natural History*, p.86.

¹⁸ Robert M. Young, *Darwin's Metaphor: Nature's Place in Victorian Culture* (Cambridge,

uncritical acceptance of science as being fundamentally progressive. In reality, Young argues,

an exclusively contemplative relationship to nature or to humanity is out of the question except as a result of the praxis of those whose interests are served by such a posture.¹⁹

For contemporaries like Olive Schreiner, however, the new progressive naturalism was infinitely liberating. Darwin and the evolutionists appeared to have extended the limits of human possibility, freeing people from the shackles of religion, in the form of the Christian model of the origins of life, and making possible virtually unlimited human progress through scientific enquiry. Schreiner's view of the importance of the wild animals of South Africa was articulated in the early 1890s, in an article in which she suggested that part of the newly conquered Matabeleland be retained as a vast preserve, or living museum dedicated to scientific research.²⁰ Schreiner accorded the survival and protection of natural organisms great importance. The "astonishing fauna" of southern, central and tropical Africa were, in her view, priceless treasures that were being thoughtlessly destroyed and the opportunities they provided for scientific study recklessly squandered. As she expressed it in the 1891 essay on Matabeleland, "no part in the globe has been within the memory of man, and even still is, so rich in beautiful and rare forms of sub-human life" as Africa; and "no other presents the same vast field for scientific research".²¹ This was an age in which, as she put it:

... the study of a single small, deep-sea creature of a form intermediate between the vertebrate and invert orders has thrown a flood of light on our biological knowledge, and when the discovery of a few fossilized hoofs has helped to revolutionize our view of vital phenomena.²²

For Schreiner, it was obvious that the loss of these "multitudinous forms of life" must cripple and limit the field of scientific study, inflicting a "direct and serious loss on human knowledge and progress".²³ Very few people, in her view, understood this:

... perhaps it is only the man more or less interested in the results of scientific research who can fully appreciate the importance of preserving for the future all forms of natural life, from the lion and crocodile to the humblest wood-dove and fly.²⁴

The intellectual link between Schreiner and Ernest Warren is developed briefly below.

The main intellectual influence on Olive Schreiner was Professor Karl Pearson. Pearson was a substantial figure in progressive scientific circles in England in the 1880s, when Schreiner lived there and participated in the advanced discussion group of which Pearson was a dominant member, the Men and Women's Club.²⁵ A trained barrister, Pearson had also studied mathematics, physics and engineering, and after spending some time at the bar, took a post lecturing in mathematics at University College, London, in 1884. In addition, he lectured to working-class audiences and published on socialism and "freethought"; that is, the notion that scientific knowledge and an understanding of processes of social evolution, based on biological research,

Cambridge University Press, 1985), p.240.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.241.

²⁰ Olive Schreiner, "Note D: Our Waste Land in Mashonaland (1891)", in Olive Schreiner, *Thoughts on South Africa* (Africana Book Society, Johannesburg, 1976).

²¹ *Ibid.*, p.394.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ See Ruth First and Ann Scott, *Olive Schreiner* (London, Andre Deutsch, 1980), pp.159-169; pp.285-88.

freed the individual to develop a high standard of morality and personal integrity.²⁶

Pearson's was an all-embracing philosophy of science, with far wider connotations than simply the practice of science itself. For him,

... science, no less than theology or philosophy, is the field for personal influence, for the creation of enthusiasm; and for the establishment of ideals of self-discipline and self-development. No man becomes great in science from the mere force of intellect, unguided and unaccompanied by what really amount to moral force. Behind the intellectual capacity there is the devotion to truth, the deep sympathy with nature, and the determination to sacrifice all minor matters to one great end.²⁷

And Professor Karl Pearson was one of the teachers of the young zoologist Dr. Ernest Warren. Warren was a trained academic zoologist, with a doctoral degree from University College, London, obtained in 1898 when he was twenty-seven. His scientific research interests, like Pearson's, lay in the fields of biometry and statistics, and Warren at twenty-eight had already published research papers on his microscopic and statistical studies. In 1899 Warren was appointed an Assistant Lecturer at University College and was also Curator of the College's museum. In 1900 he became Assistant Professor of Zoology at the College. Warren knew Pearson well enough to ask him to act as one of his three referees when applying for the post of the Director of the Natal Museum.²⁸ Warren heard about the job from another influential zoologist, Professor E. Ray Lankester, Director of the Natural History Museum at South Kensington, and decided to apply for it.²⁹ He was thirty-one at the time.

Pearson's high opinion of Warren as a scientist is clear from his letter of reference, which significantly begins by placing Warren at what Pearson regarded as the cutting-edge of biological research at the turn of the century:

I have known Dr Ernest Warren for a number of years as one of the most able and earnest [sic] of our younger biologists. He is the author of a series of papers published partly in the Transactions of the Royal Society, partly in the Quarterly Journal of Microscopic Science, and partly in Biometrika, of which journal I am one of the Editors. I have thus a very intimate acquaintance with his scientific work, I have no hesitation in saying that it marks a man of great ability, great patience and much originality. He has worked steadily and effectively along a branch of science, which is only just receiving recognition and his papers will thus grow both in value and in scientific appreciation.³⁰

It seems highly likely that Pearson influenced Warren in shaping the latter's unusually broad view of science, his sympathy for natural history, and his strong sense of the social importance of both. If not Pearson himself, then certainly the intellectual atmosphere within which Pearson worked, and in which Warren trained, did so.

²⁶ Pearson's "The Ethic of Freethought", a collection of his lectures and papers from the previous five years, was published in 1889.

²⁷ First and Scott, *Olive Schreiner*, citation from Karl Pearson's writings, p.286.

²⁸ NM 2/2. Museum Employees. Minute Paper NGM 2/03, "Testimonials in favour of Ernest Warren, D. Sc. Lond", 30 January 1903. Includes "List of Academic Distinctions" and "List of Original Papers". Warren's other referees, who also spoke very highly of him, were W.R. Weldon, Lineus Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy at the University of Oxford, and E.A. Minchin, Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy in University College, London.

²⁹ One reason why he did so is suggested by the reference letter from Minchin, who said that the University College museum could not afford to pay Warren a salary commensurate with "his attainments and position amongst zoologists".

³⁰ NM 2/2. Museum Employees. Minute Paper NGM 2/03, "Testimonials in favour of Ernest Warren, D. Sc. Lond.", 30 January 1903. Pearson to the Electors of the Curatorship of the Natal Government Museum, 14 October 1902. With respect to Warren's work as a museum curator, Pearson noted: "Dr. Warren is a man of great energy and much force of character, and I feel certain he would make his mark in Natal".

This influence is clearly visible in Warren's correspondence during his thirty-year period of office at the Natal Museum. For Warren, "real" science was always broad, open-minded and lacking in what he called "dogmatism". Informed appreciation of the natural world, particularly of living matter, for him exerted a moral influence for good. In a sense this was, as Robert Young notes, a new religion. The scientific debates in which Pearson, Schreiner, and also the next generation of scholars (like Warren) were involved, are not best understood as "the overthrow of the relatively static theistic cosmology by a secular and progress one", but rather should be seen as "the development from one theodicy - in both its scientific and its social aspects - to another".³¹

The actual colonial situation was, of course, one in which a pragmatic, utilitarian science dominated. The government bacteriologists and entomologists involved in *nagana* research - Sir David Bruce has already been discussed in the previous section - epitomised this kind of science. To an extent, Warren was resigned to this. When in 1920 an official Zoological Survey was proposed, Warren supported it, merely noting that:

Considerable stress was laid on the economic side of the subject, such as an investigation of trypanosomes, the geographical distribution of mosquitoes and ticks, etc.³²

Warren seems to have felt an affinity to few if any of the South African scientists of his period, and was sceptical about the depth of their understanding of the broader philosophical questions involved in scientific research. On one occasion during the battle for the game reserves, for example, Warren voiced his disquiet about a panel of "experts" that was being assembled:

... there is a difficulty in the matter of a scientific committee, in that it might possibly do more harm than good. I know sufficient about science to realise that all scientific men are not free from prejudice and bigotry and they may not have the slightest regard for living nature from an aesthetic aspect.³³

When it came to the question of the destruction of wild life and to the general attitudes of the South African - and in particular, the Natal - public towards wild animals in the first decades of the century, Warren's response was far from resigned (although, as noted below, he became deeply discouraged in later years). Warren's response to this crisis, and his arguments about the importance of conducting disinterested biological research, are strikingly similar to Olive Schreiner's responses and arguments, twenty years before. For example, soon after the start of the First World War, Warren wrote warmly to a zoological colleague in Holland who had undertaken to do some research on South African mammalia:

Anyone having volunteered to assist in the embryological research here described can be assured that he has rendered real aid to the science of embryology and has helped to avert the reproach that Science in the twentieth century has not succeeded in unravelling the secrets of the embryological developments of South African mammals, which are known to be eminently varied and interesting, and at the same time some of the animals are rapidly disappearing and becoming extinct.³⁴

³¹ Young, *Darwin's Metaphor*, p.199.

³² EWC, File "September 1919 to April 1920", Warren to E.C. Chubb, Curator, Durban Museum, 5 February 1920. In another letter on the subject, Warren remarked that the government would probably insist on the Survey having a "definitely practical bearing, such as the distribution of injurious insects, flukes, etc." (EWC, File "September 1919 to April 1920", Warren to E.C. Chubb, Curator, Durban Museum, 11 December 1920).

³³ EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Warren to Dr. George Campbell, 24 April 1930.

³⁴ EWC, File "January 1914 to February 1915", Warren to Prof. Hubrecht, Utrecht, Holland, 15 December 1914.

The conviction of a wasting resource and the sense of urgency about the need to retrieve it through scientific study, are very similar to Schreiner's.

Warren also shared Schreiner and Pearson's belief in the importance of public education. As noted in the next section, the educative function of the museum was central to his conception of his task there, and this idea crucially informed all the "representations" of nature discussed in this paper. Towards the end of his career, however, Warren became more fatalistic, and a deep sense of failure creeps into his correspondence. While most of Warren's correspondence is conceived in a rationalist, and rather formal, mode, even when writing to friends, at this time Warren's letters sometimes struck a totally different note. His comments in a letter to the wildlife artist, Strathmore Caldecott, written in 1928, suggest that while Warren had become disillusioned about the "progressive" side of progressive materialism (in particular, the efficacy of public education), he retained a broad conception of science and an almost mystical materialism:

I enclose a copy of an article on the White rhinoceros which I have sent to the Cape Times. I have just touched upon the fact that the boasted spread of education gives no indication of lessening the evil; a change of heart and a greater appreciation of beautiful things whether in Nature or Art in both the physical and super-physical planes will alone be adequate to effect a transformation. You will notice that I say *superphysical*, as I am one of those who hold that this physical experience of ours is but a mote in an all embracing ocean of universal life, of indescribable beauty. With such a conviction the wretched things of life are really of very small moment, but we are weak and our vision is so limited.³⁵

A final point to be made about the influence of Karl Pearson and progressive materialism, is that Warren was by no means immune from the view of biological evolution that lent itself to convictions which, in Pearson's case at least, drew him into the study of eugenics. Warren did not participate actively in these debates. His views were more sympathetic to theories of environmental determinism than to strict eugenics, although of course the two were related. Warren was certain that much of Africa was unsuitable for permanent settlement by white people, and he used this as an argument for the retention of the Zululand game reserves. In his view:

The Reserves are of much greater value to the Country than a few additional European settlements in a district which can never be a real white-man's country in which vigorous children can be raised generation after generation.³⁶

In an interesting juxtaposition of environmental protection and environmental determinism, Warren went further, arguing that "from Zululand Northwards and right up to Egypt no permanent white race will ever be established", and that the imperialist idea of extending "civilization" into Northern Rhodesia and Central Africa was nothing but "foolishness", a "sickening platitude".³⁷ The environmental implications of attempting to do the impossible were alarming, and the effects on the "white race" he also thought were injurious.

One needs to juxtapose against these beliefs Warren's enthusiasm, for most of his thirty-year career in Natal, for public education. Quite early on in his period of tenure, in 1909, a proposal was made to the Museum Board of Trustees that Africans be banned from the museum. As it was, they were allowed in only on one day of the week. Warren took a firm stand against this, insisting that access to the museum should remain as

³⁵ EWC, File "February 1928 to June 1928", Warren to Caldecott, 15 February 1928. If the younger, vigorous Warren had sounded like Olive Schreiner, this is even more reminiscent of her.

³⁶ EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Warren to Senator Clarkson, 29 November 1930.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

open as possible, given the colonial context. (The atmosphere, in the wake of the 1906 Bambatha Rebellion, was particularly poisonous). The reasons for this decision were published in the *Natal Witness*:

... The matter of the coloured race being admitted to the Museum on the Sunday afternoon was very fully discussed at the last meeting of the Trustees, and it was emphatically resolved that all disorderly or disreputable persons should be absolutely excluded; but the Board did not feel itself justified in taking steps for the exclusion of any particular race.³⁸

Warren's attitude towards Africans was partly that of the average ethnologist of the period. For example, he believed that the museum had a duty to try to obtain specimens of material culture that were being lost as social practices rapidly changed.³⁹ On the other hand, he was reluctant to deny to anyone the benefits of education, and it is surely rather to his credit that he insisted the museum remain open - albeit under certain conditions - to Africans.

EXHIBITING NATURE AT THE NATAL MUSEUM: A DISCOURSE OF ILLUSTRATION

Both sport hunters and livestock owners supported the administration's maintenance of game reserves in Zululand, but valued these spaces for different reasons. In the first case, the reserves were hunting preserves and breeding grounds for game animals; in the second, they represented control and containment of a dangerous nature. In each case, wild animals were viewed in certain ways and particular social and spatial practices followed from these perceptions.

My argument here is that Dr. Warren introduced into this debate new ideas about nature, new attitudes towards wild animals, and new spatial connections between the game reserves and metropolitan spaces - in particular, the space of the museum. It is not possible to characterise Warren's counter-hegemonic ideas in a single phrase, and thus two separate discourses are identified in the analysis. First, I consider the meanings, attitudes towards animals, and social practices associated with the setting up of the mammal halls at the Natal Museum, and refer to this as a discourse of "illustration". I then turn to the more explicitly protectionist, and discursive rather than material, representations developed by Warren as he realised that wild animals in Zululand were under threat. This I characterise as a discourse of "redemption".

i) The Museum Mammal Halls: Perspectives on Stuffed Animals

In his first annual report for the Natal Government Museum, written in 1904, Warren outlined his views on what a museum should display, why, and how the collections should be arranged. In his view, the museum should be as comprehensive as possible:

³⁸ NM 2/1, Loose Copy of Letter to the Editor of the *Natal Witness*, Warren to Rose, 31 January 1908.

³⁹ In his first annual report, Warren noted that "the Ethnological Dept is indebted to Mr C.R. Saunders, who has instructed his Native clerk, Mr Kambule, to procure Native objects from Zululand for the Museum ... in the near future in Zululand and Natal the use of these things will completely die out; as unfortunately, from an ethnologist's point of view, the native population is being very profoundly modified by its contact with the white man". *First Report of the Natal Government Museum, Year ending 31st December 1904, Colony of Natal. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of His Excellency the Governor* (Pietermaritzburg, Davis and Sons, 1906), p.14.

A museum should, in my opinion, consist of a series of parallel halls, which in the rear can be extended indefinitely in length as the collections grow. About eight halls would be required (1) Arts and Antiquities, (2) Ethnology, (3) Mammals, (4) Birds, (5) Reptiles, Amphibia and Fishes, (6) Invertebrates, (7) Plants, (8) Geology.⁴⁰

While all branches of natural history were equally important, Warren recognised that the branch that had most appeal for the public - and therefore the greatest potential for public education - was the mammalia: that is, the large animals that made for exciting and spectacular displays. To revisit the debate discussed above, about whether or not to exhibit foreign mammals, Warren agreed up to a point with the view that “the fauna and flora of the Country, in which a Museum is situated, should constitute the subject matter which the Museum should illustrate and explain”.⁴¹ He argued, though, that the museum had a duty to “illustrate and explain” the order of nature more generally, and for this reason decided to include (carefully marked) exotic specimens as well.

The key word here is “specimen”. The animals displayed in the Natal Museum were there first as representations of types. They were intended, in an important sense, to serve as illustrations of the basic principles of science and natural history. In Warren’s words, the function of the examples of “characteristic species” on display in the museum, was to represent, for the Natal public, “the various orders and families of the mammalia”.⁴² Within the broad category of the mammalia, the ungulates were by far the largest group and - perhaps because the sport hunting discourse had already identified them as objects of value - were also the most popular. Warren felt that it would be confusing to introduce the ungulates in amongst the other mammal species on display in the museum. He decided to set up a “special Ungulate Room”, containing “all the South African Ungulates which the Museum possesses”, with the exception of the very largest:

The large mammals [such] as Rhinoceros, Giraffe, Hippopotamus, are placed out of classification down the middle of the larger Mammal Hall. These will shortly be protected by a looped rope supported by 16 iron standards 42 inches high.⁴³

In April 1904, a year after his arrival in Natal, Warren had submitted a report to the Museum Board of Trustees in which he laid out his position even more clearly. A list of specimens was included with the report which, in Warren’s view, “it is highly desirable should be acquired before the opening of the Museum”.⁴⁴ Warren laid out the principles along which the list had been organised:

In this, the first list, I have paid especial attention to the Mammalia, and have carefully selected type species which are particularly adapted for exhibiting the characteristics of the various orders of the Mammals. The collection thus obtained would give the public a general idea of the class, Mammalia, and they would then be able to understand the peculiarities of the African mammalian fauna.⁴⁵

It was extremely important to Warren that the specimens were obtained as soon as possible, and certainly before the opening of the halls, “so that the Mammal Halls should be of striking interest from the beginning”.⁴⁶

If the animals were specimens, then they were also more than that: they were beginning to be seen as embodiments of a nature that was valued for its own sake,

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p.

⁴⁴ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 51/1904, “Zoological Specimens for the Museum”, Director to Chairman, Museum Board of Trustees, 10 April 1904.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

conveying a moral message to urban audiences. Already in 1904, Warren was moving towards a more sophisticated idea of display than simply static presentations of types of animals, one specimen for each type, mounted in more or less the same posture without any attempt at creating an illusion of life. In addition to using his specimens to illustrate the existence of the various species and to educate the public with respect to the order of nature, Warren also wanted to convey an impression of living nature. He was moving towards the idea of re-creating, as far as was possible in the museum, given the technology available at the time, an illusion that the viewer was a spectator of nature, was not indoors, but was outside watching a “natural” scene. The first such scene produced at the Natal Museum was given priority through its location at the centre of the South African ungulate collection:

In a centre-case of the Special Ungulate Room, facing the entrance, there is a natural group of Water Buck, consisting of male, female, and young. The Museum taxidermist, Mr Teschner, is to be congratulated on this successful piece of work. It is hoped that several other natural groups may shortly be produced.

Other natural groups were indeed produced and Warren became increasingly convinced that taxidermy was an art which could be used to “re-create” nature inside the museum. From the start, Warren knew that a taxidermist who was an artist rather than just a workman, was an invaluable asset to the museum, and he considered himself fortunate to have discovered a taxidermist in Durban of the calibre of Teschner. Teschner had artistic ambitions far beyond the business he ran in Durban, mounting heads for sport hunters. When he was first employed by the museum, Warren urged the Secretary of the Committee to treat Teschner well:

From his work which I have seen I think the Committee would make a great mistake if they do not take the opportunity of securing his services, for decent taxidermists are scarce and difficult to obtain ... I have some doubt whether he will remain longer than two or three years, as I judge from what he said to me that he hopes to obtain some appointment in one of the large European museums by displaying his ability in our new Natal Museum.⁴⁷

Teschner in fact continued to work for the museum until 1912 and produced many “natural groups” of South African mammals, a new mammal hall being built to accommodate them.

Warren’s emphasis on the importance of creating an illusion of life in the animals on display in the museum, and his sense that they were not just “specimens”, and certainly should not be viewed as “trophies”, emerges clearly in a letter he wrote to the firm Messrs Rowland Ward in London in 1912, when threatened with the loss of the museum taxidermist, Teschner. He made it clear to the firm - most of whose work was of course undertaken for sport hunters, who wanted the animals they had shot mounted as trophies, what would be required were the firm to undertake some taxidermic work for the Natal Museum:

As explained in previous correspondence the general standard of our mounted mammals is exceptionally high, and I trust that only the best workmanship with life-like attitudes would be given ... please state what difference, if any, if mounted in a lying position or head turned round. Our animals are mounted in groups and a uniform standing position would not do. I could indicate the attitude required such as grazing, looking to the right or left etc.⁴⁸

For Warren, taxidermy was best understood as an art; the taxidermist was not simply a workman, but was an artist. He had to begin with the raw material of a dead animal, and out of this had to produce the illusion of life, in effect staging an encounter between

⁴⁷ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 34/03, “F. Teschner, Durban. Employment Zululand Expedition”, Warren to Cooper, 11 May 1903.

⁴⁸ NM 2/2, “Personnel”. Loose sheet, Warren to Messrs Rowland Ward, Piccadilly, London, n.d. (1911).

the human viewer of the exhibit, and “nature” in the form of the re-created animal.

This material suggests that Warren’s experiments at the Natal Museum in the first decade of the twentieth century, were an early version of the taxidermic art refined and perfected by workers at large American museums in the early twentieth century, of whom the prime example is Carl Akeley. The latter personally shot and supervised the mounting of the animals needed for his impressive hall of African mammals at the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, a display that was opened in 1936 (after Akeley’s death) but was in preparation for many years. Warren’s “natural groups” can be seen as a precursor to the ambitious museum diorama, analysed by Donna Haraway, whose provocative essay on the Carl Akeley African Hall is a landmark in writing about material representations of nature in modern western culture.⁴⁹

Haraway stresses that the African Hall at the American Museum of Natural History, with its dramatically backlit dioramas, every detail of rock and plant perfectly captured, is the product of a particular social history: that is, the history of representations of nature in the first decades of the twentieth century. First, this is a history of a specific technology, taxidermy, soon to be replaced by the camera. While some unease about the ethics of killing did exist during this period, and was felt by scientist/artists like the taxidermist Carl Akeley, at this time the camera had not yet succeeded the gun as the primary means through which living nature could be “captured”; frozen in time and preserved. Ultimately, as Haraway notes, the camera was to prove “superior to the gun for the possession, production, preservation, consumption, surveillance, appreciation, and control of nature”.⁵⁰ In the interim, the African Hall was Akeley’s attempt to turn taxidermy into a transcendent art form, elevating it, in Haraway’s phrase, from “upholstery” to “epiphany”.⁵¹

Taxidermy as a means of materially preserving and (re)presenting nature is, as Haraway points out, extremely interesting. Instead of revealing, as the camera does, intimate and unposed glimpses of the natural world, the artist working with taxidermic techniques works with dead matter to create a carefully sculpted illusion. The calculation involved in creating the African Hall at the American Museum of Natural History was tremendous. Only perfect animal specimens were selected for mounting. Most were presented in family groupings with a carefully planned gender composition: usually one or two female animals were pictured together with their young and a large male animal assuming a dominating, protective position. Haraway suggests that these dead animals, obtained in the field in Africa, were transformed through the taxidermic process into something else, a message for urban Americans:

No visitor to a merely physical Africa could see these animals. This is a spiritual vision made possible only by their death and literal re-presentation. Only then could the essence of their life be present. Only then could the hygiene of nature cure the sick vision of civilized man. Taxidermy fulfills the fatal desire to represent, to be whole; it is a politics of reproduction.⁵²

The relationship between images of wild animals created through taxidermic

⁴⁹ Donna Haraway, “Teddy Bear Patriarchy: Taxidermy in the Garden of Eden, New York City, 1908-1936”, Chapter 1 in Donna Haraway, *Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science* (Routledge, New York, 1989). This essay was first published in *Social Text* in 1983.

⁵⁰ Haraway, “Teddy Bear Patriarchy”, p.45.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p.38.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p.30.

reconstruction, and the images created by the emerging technology of photography, is key. During the period dealt with in this paper, the two technologies were in competition, and the more powerful of the two - given the difficulties involved in approaching wild animals to photograph them, as well as the cumbersome equipment that was needed in order to take a photograph - was still the taxidermic. Both technologies were intended to give the illusion of the animal as it was in life. Both constituted, in a sense, staged encounters with a nature that may not have been present in any living sense, but which provided the opportunity for the viewer to imagine a live encounter of this kind. While taxidermy of this ambitious kind was more or less confined to the museum, to which the public had access, the camera introduced possibilities of the private "capture" of images of nature. This tension is illustrated by a fascinating struggle in 1903 over ownership of the image (material and photographic) of the endangered white rhinoceros.

Sir Charles Saunders was the Chief Magistrate and Civil Commissioner of Zululand in late 1902, when two white rhinos met their end in the Mahlabatini district. As white rhinos were royal game under the game law, the fact of these deaths was reported to Saunders. The story that follows touches on contemporary debates about the role of the colonial state in public education and private experiences of nature, as well as the respective social functions of taxidermy and photography.

Saunders' intention with respect to the two rhino specimens, had been to donate one - the more complete specimen, as it included the skin as well as bones - to the Durban Museum, and the other to the Natal Government Museum in Pietermaritzburg. The Natal Government Museum, on hearing about the other skeleton, immediately laid claim to it. Writing to the Natal Colonial Secretary, the Museum Chairman, Arnold Cooper, noted:

White Rhinoceros are Royal Game and belong to the Crown so that Government has a first claim upon them. The Director of the Museum is very anxious to obtain both specimens as the best should be exhibited in the Museum at Maritzburg and the other would be most valuable for the purposes of exchange as White Rhinos are becoming exceedingly scarce.⁵³

His reasoning in making this demand was that the Durban Museum was only a "Borough Institution", and not directly connected with the colonial government, so that the Government Museum had first priority.

Saunders reacted with proprietorial outrage, warning the Colonial Secretary that, "if I expressed myself as one feels inclined to ... I am afraid my language might be more forcible than is desirable in Official correspondence".⁵⁴ In his own view, he, Saunders was the person who had gone to the trouble of rescuing the bones (or at least ordering their rescue); he had taken an active interest in game preservation and felt he deserved some credit for "having conserved what is now left in this Province".⁵⁵ Saunders felt, in essence, that the rhino specimens were his to dispose of as he thought best. Saunders' letter ends with a rhetorical point that is nonetheless illuminating in light of the above discussion about images of wild nature and the history of their capture through the re-constitutive arts of taxidermy and photography. Saunders wrote:

⁵³ NM 2/3, "Collection of Specimens, 1889-1903", Minute Paper NGM 10/1903, "Desirability of Procuring the Skeleton of a White Rhinoceros at present at the Mahlabatine [sic] Magistracy", Cooper to Colonial Secretary, 5 May 1903.

⁵⁴ NM 2/3, "Collection of Specimens, 1889-1903", Minute Paper NGM 10/1903, "Desirability of Procuring the Skeleton of a White Rhinoceros at present at the Mahlabatine [sic] Magistracy", Saunders to Colonial Secretary, 14 May 1903.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

My desire for some time past, has been to get a photograph of this interesting object in life, and I hope and think that desire is near realization as my present kit contains three expensive cameras, bought almost entirely for that purpose. It will interest me much to know whether, if this desire is attained, the Chairman of the Museum will claim any photograph I may get as belonging to the Museum over which he presides.⁵⁶

The competition between camera and gun continued well into the 1920s. Attitudes changed slowly. This is illustrated by a piece on Zululand in the *Zululand Times Annual* of 1924 written by the Zululand Game Conservator. The conservator assured his readers that “Zululand provides good sport for the hunter”, and photographs of fallen koodoo and other animals provided proof that “good bags of game” could still be obtained in Zululand. As he saw it:

... the country offers a great variety of easily accessible sport to the right sort of man, he who seeks good trophies for his collection, coupled with the exhilarating sport of a clean nature, and a temporary respite from the worries of civilization ...⁵⁷

In the same article, Vaughan-Kirby also gave practical advice about the best time of year to undertake such a shooting expedition. This gives a clear insight into the extent to which he understood his function as conservator to be protection of animals inside the game reserves, so that they could be shot by sport hunters outside: the classic gamekeeping job description.

... generally speaking, those who visit the country early in the season will be the most fortunate, as during the summer months grass and other cover will have attained sufficient height to tempt much game out of the Reserves, where the early comer will probably find them, and be enabled to secure animals, which later on in the open season will have retired - either on account of the shooting or of their own free will - into the Game Reserve.⁵⁸

Yet the discourse of sport hunting was beginning to be diluted, even in Zululand. This was partly due to the introduction of new technologies, in particular the camera, which (unlike taxidermy) provided the means for “capturing” nature without killing it. The gamekeeper’s 1924 article ends by expressing the wish that more sportsmen would take up photography:

... it may be taken from one who knows that there is infinitely more satisfaction to be obtained from the successful portrayal by photography of any wild game in its native haunts than from shooting it. And for those who are fond of excitement I can most highly recommend it - shooting them is nothing, one can be 50 yards distant and do that, whereas one has to be not more than 20 yards, and if possible less, from an animal to reproduce it of any size whatever on a plate or film.⁵⁹

As if in illustration of the transition, an advertisement page in the 1924 *Annual* explicitly juxtaposes a camera and a gun. The top half of the page is taken up by a line drawing of a shiny rifle butt, above which is the caption “We Cater for the Sportsman’s Needs”. Below this advertisement by J.F. King Ltd. of West Street, Durban, is an illustration of a box camera, the latter apparently “specially manufactured for the Colonies” and sold by Wileman and Moore, “Chemists, Druggists and Photographic Dealers”, also of West Street, Durban.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.* The irony was that, once Saunders had been somewhat placated by Dr. Warren, and had (reluctantly) agreed to send both specimens to the Natal Government Museum, the rhino remains turned out to be unusable.

⁵⁷ “Game of Zululand”, *The Zululand Times Annual*, 1924 (Eshowe, The Zululand Times, December 1924), p.108.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p.114.

ii) Collecting Practices in the Game Reserves

To return to the early years of the century, this section considers the practices associated with museum collecting, particularly collecting in the game reserves, and considers the extent to which they differed, in practice and in intent, from sport hunting activities. The requirements of taxidermy were quite specialised: hence the advisability of the museum controlling every step of the process, from killing, to preservation of the skin and bones, to the reconstruction in the museum workshops. The services of the museum taxidermist and the museum collector (appointed in 1904) were thus indispensable and money had to be spent on “collecting trips”. The Zululand game reserves, and Umfolozi in particular, were the focus of the first such trip, organised by Dr. Warren almost as soon as he arrived in Natal.

The collecting trip of 1903 was Dr. Warren’s first foray into the Zululand game reserves. Warren decided to travel personally to Zululand in June, in part to check on the standard of workmanship of the new taxidermist, Teschner, and partly to make personal contact with the key official in Zululand, Saunders. Warren was keen to smooth over Saunders’ hurt feelings with respect to the white rhinoceroses incident, or as he put it more diplomatically in his report to the Museum Committee, to “increas[e] the interest of the Chief Commissioner in the Government Museum”.⁶⁰ On this first occasion, Warren returned from the game reserves with “fine examples of the following animals: “Waterbuck (male and female), Bushbuck, Klip Springer, Wild Dog, Porcupine, Baboon, [and] White faced Monkey”.⁶¹ These waterbuck formed the basis for the first successful “natural group” mounted by Teschner on his return to the museum workshops. A second trip was organized for 1904.

The 1903 and 1904 collecting trips to Zululand are significant from at least three points of view. First, they suggest that the reserves were, at least to some extent, taking on new social functions in that they were providing the material basis for reconstructions of “living nature”, presented to urban audiences at the museum. One ought not to make too much of this. Although metropolitan audiences might, by looking at exhibits like the natural group of waterbuck, have gained a new sense of a “natural space” such as that of the game reserve, they would not have been aware of precisely where the specimens came from. The reserves were not understood at this time as in any sense “public” spaces. Also, it would be absurd to suggest that Warren relied exclusively on the Zululand game reserves for his African specimens. For one thing, not all the species he wanted for the museum occurred there. During the first years of Warren’s directorship, collectors operating in East Africa and elsewhere were commissioned to shoot specific animals for the museum, and specimens were also obtained (usually through exchange) from other museums, or purchased from private collections.⁶²

⁶⁰ NM 2/3 “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 46/1903, “Zululand Expedition”, Warren’s Report to Museum Committee, 30 June 1903.

⁶¹ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 46/1903, “Zululand Expedition”, handwritten note, Warren to Cooper, ? July 1903.

⁶² See, for example, NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 33/1903, “Re. Collection of Specimens in Central Africa”; NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 82/1904, “Purchase of Skins from Capt F. Taylor”; NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 34/1904; Minute Paper NGM 13/1908, “Purchase of Elephant from Port Elizabeth Museum”; NM 2/1, Minute Paper NGM 18/1911, “Licences on certain Big Game in Nyasaland and British East Africa”.

Nonetheless, the game reserves, Hluhluwe and Umfolozi, were the focus of the 1903 trip and its successor in 1904. This was at the suggestion of Saunders. When the Governor of Natal, Plowman, had appealed for help in facilitating the museum expedition (in April 1903), Saunders had replied:

The Government and myself will be only too glad to do what we can in assisting to procure specimens of game for the Museum. We expect to be in the neighbourhood of the two best reserves from about the middle of next month to about the middle of June, and in the course of our work must go through these reserves, which are that situated between the two Umfolozi Rivers and the one on the Hluhluwe River.⁶³

The reason that Saunders was to be in the area of the game reserves at this time was that he was supervising the work of the Zululand Delimitation Commission. This point is taken up below.

Warren was successful in repairing relations with the Civil Commissioner. By the following year, 1904, the new function of the reserves as sources for museum specimens was well established, at least in the mind of key Zululand officials like Saunders. In 1904 it was the latter who initiated a collecting expedition, suggesting that, if specimens were still needed, the museum might like to return to Zululand. This time the focus would be exclusively on the Umfolozi reserve. There was even a possibility that the museum might be allowed to acquire its own white rhinoceros, which the previous year had been quite out of the question. Warren wrote to Cooper in May 1904:

The Delimitation Commission will be obliged to pass through the Reserve about the middle of June. The Chief Commissioner has informed me that if the Board will send up a taxidermist to meet them in the Reserve he may be able to secure for the Museum, Cape Buffalo, perhaps a White rhinoceros and skeleton complete, Koodo and a pair of Wart Hogs. It is a great opportunity which may not occur again, and I think it is most desirable that the suggestion should be acted upon.⁶⁴

Interestingly, this enthusiasm on the part of Saunders was the result of his visit to Pietermaritzburg, where he had viewed Teschner's work at the museum. As Warren put it:

Mr Saunders was so pleased the other day with the mammals already set up at the Museum that he suggested that as the Commission is bound to pass through the Reserve he will endeavour to get the animals we want, even to the extent of a male White Rhinoceros if the Board will send Teschner to prepare the skins and to bring them down.⁶⁵

If the collecting trips to the game reserves were beginning to suggest new social functions for the reserve spaces, it is important to consider the question of the extent to which the new discourse about science and nature actually affected practice. How far did the practices of "collecting" differ from those associated with sport hunting? The point is perhaps an obvious one, but it is nonetheless worth making, that the taxidermic exhibition or display of animals as exhibits in a museum involves their killing. The art of taxidermy, unlike the art of photography, is predicated on death occurring before the re-creation and re-presentation of the animal at the museum. In 1904, the museum hired its own "collector", Fred Toppin, who was responsible for "securing" specimens for the museum. On other occasions, the museum was reliant on hunters, like Saunders, to obtain the specimens. Were the social practices associated with sport hunting, really any different from those of sport hunting? The 1903 and 1904 trips to Zululand are also

⁶³ NM 2/3, "Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903", Minute Paper NGM 17/1903, "Collecting Expedition to Zululand", Saunders to Plowman, from Delimitation Commission camp, Mlalazi District, 21 April, 1903.

⁶⁴ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 53/1904, "Animals for the Museum from the Reserve between the two Umfolosi Rivers", Warren to Cooper, 31 May 1904.

⁶⁵ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 53/1904, "Animals for the Museum from the Reserve between the two Umfolosi Rivers", personal letter, Warren to Cooper, ? May 1904.

illuminating on this point.

Warren certainly saw the activities of hunting and collecting as distinct. In connection with the 1904 trip, Warren assured the Museum Chairman that “it will be in no sense a hunting trip and that he [Saunders] hopes that this suggestion of his for assisting the Museum will not create such an idea.”⁶⁶ Such an idea had, in fact, been created in 1903 when the first trip was being organised. At this time, Warren had received requests from members of the public asking that they be allowed to join the expedition, for example the following:

I understand that an expedition is about to start from Maritzburg to obtain specimens of big game etc for the museum. Can you tell me if there is any chance of anyone else being taken on, and if so, to whom application should be made?⁶⁷

Another petitioner argued that he should be “allowed to make one of the party” because “I think I can be of use to you, knowing as I do the habits of game, and had [sic] considerable experience of big game shooting in Zululand and elsewhere”.⁶⁸

Sport hunters like these were informed that “no organised party is going to Zululand to shoot for the Museum”, and that “there is only a taxidermist going to preserve specimens shot by the CC and CM who has undertaken the hunting”.⁶⁹ In a letter to the Colonial Secretary, Cooper, the Chairman of the Museum Committee, explained that the Committee had decided that all the shooting should be done by Sir John Dartnell and Saunders.⁷⁰ For Cooper, this made sense because “these gentlemen know good specimens and are good sportsmen and the selection will be well left in their hands”.⁷¹ The aim of the shooting party associated with the museum, was to shoot only what was necessary. Saunders was particularly emphatic on this point:

After all the trouble one has gone to to try and preserve what little big game was left after the first outbreak of Rinderpest I must strongly object to anyone being allowed to get amongst it whose one idea is to slaughter all he can ... If the shooting takes place in the present instance under my supervision I will [ensure?] that only such specimens as can be spared for the Museum are shot.⁷²

Dr. Warren did not do the “collecting” himself; yet he did not express specific qualms about the need to shoot animals in order to build up a good collection in the Natal Museum. The representations involved in the passionate anti-hunting propaganda he wrote later in his career, are not present in his early correspondence and only emerge strongly after the Mammal Halls at the Museum were more or less complete. This is hardly surprising: if Warren wanted a collection, then he would have to obtain it through

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

⁶⁷ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 29/13. “Frank Fynney and G. Flee Apply for Permission to Accompany Hunting Party to Zululand”, George Flee to Claude Fuller, Honorary Secretary, Natal Government Museum Committee, 15 May 1903.

⁶⁸ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 29/13. “Frank Fynney and G. Flee Apply for Permission to Accompany Hunting Party to Zululand”, Fynney to Fuller, 14 May 1903.

⁶⁹ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 29/13. “Frank Fynney and G. Flee Apply for Permission to Accompany Hunting Party to Zululand”, Fuller to Flee and Fynney, 21 May 1903.

⁷⁰ NM 2/3 “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 29/1903, “Zululand Expedition”, Cooper to the Colonial Secretary, ? May 1903.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*

⁷² NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 17/1903, “Collecting Expedition to Zululand”, Saunders to Plowman, from Delimitation Commission camp, Mlalazi District, 21 April, 1903.

his own efforts. Dead animals donated by the general public were rarely up to the standard required for mounting. If one wanted a museum, animals had to be killed, and subsequently stuffed (to become specimens rather than trophies). Collecting trips had to be organised which might, on the surface, appear very similar to hunting parties. For example, both hunting and collecting expeditions needed to employ numbers of Africans to assist with carrying, camp maintenance, and most importantly transporting dead animals back to camp and the heavy work of skinning and preservation.

However, the reasons why wild animals were killed by museum employees were substantively different, both in meaning and in the degree of care exercised, from those same activities when carried out by sport hunters. Compared with sport hunting, there is a significant change of emphasis, indicated for example by the euphemistic use of the word “collecting” rather than “hunting” or “killing”. For one thing, the actual pursuit is de-emphasised; it is only the end result that matters. For people like Warren, who was instinctively anti-hunting (and who became passionately so later, as this paper explains), this kind of killing was acceptable because it served a superior moral purpose: it was undertaken in the interests of “science”. The correspondence invariably refers to the “specimen” having been “secured”, rather than the animal having been shot.

Also, if sport hunting was selective, focusing on certain valued game animals, then killing in the interests of science was even more selective, with particular animals chosen as representative of particular species. When a suitable exhibit had been created of any particular species, no more animals were needed: there was no incentive, as in sport hunting, to shoot a trophy with, say, a more impressive pair of horns.⁷³ Warren insisted that the shooting as well as the taxidermy was done professionally, and that as few animals as possible were destroyed, with the minimum of cruelty.

The third key point to be made about the 1903 and 1904 collecting trips to Zululand is the degree to which these activities depended on the assistance and logistical support of the Zululand Delimitation Commission. Warren later became highly critical of the attempt to introduce white settlers into Zululand. However, virtually from the moment he stepped off the boat at Durban, he and the Natal Museum were implicated in this process. The Natal authorities were eager to grasp the opportunity offered by the fact that the Delimitation Commission, under Saunders’ control, was working in the game-rich interior of Zululand, and the Governor initiated contact with Saunders even before Warren took over the reins as Director of the Museum. Thus Warren found himself part of - or at least benefitting directly from - a process which, as he later realised, constituted the major threat to the survival of the “characteristic fauna” of the country, animals which he was attempting to represent for the edification of the public at the museum.

These contradictions only became evident later. At the time, again perhaps understandably, Warren did not reflect critically on the delimitation process, and later when he did reflect in it, his major concern was never the impact of delimitation on the African occupants of Zululand. Saunders, who was intimately involved in the process,

⁷³ This general point is qualified by the fact that museums at this time also kept spare specimens for the purposes of exchange with other institutions.

and who had served under the British administration in Zululand, differed in this respect. His sense of the injustice of what was being done emerges strongly from his original letter to the Governor, Plowman, in which Saunders agreed to assist the museum with their 1903 expedition. Saunders remarked that he would be relieved to be working in the more sparsely populated interior, where the game reserves were. Delimitation was “a hideous business in these densely populated parts ... I wish to goodness the whole thing were over”.⁷⁴

It is clear that the initial collecting for the museum could not have been done successfully without the support of Saunders and the Delimitation Commission. The key figure, from the museum’s point of view, was the taxidermist, Teschner, who was heavily reliant on the resources of the Commission. He lived in the Commission camp, used its members as hunters, and when he ran out of money to pay the carriers he had employed, was assisted in this by Saunders. From Umfolozi, Warren reported that the taxidermist was well liked and “held in high esteem by all the camp”.⁷⁵ Saunders and the other members and support staff of the Delimitation Commission were “taking a keen interest in the Museum”, and had promised to “do their best to obtain as many specimens as possible of mammals, birds, reptiles and fish”.⁷⁶ Teschner was invited to continue on with the Commission into Amatongaland, where species were available that could not be collected further south in Zululand, and the Museum authorities agreed to this. The first trip was highly profitable for the Museum, as Teschner eventually returned on 12 September 1903 with eighty-one mammalian skins, some of which were used for mounting and display, and others for exchanges with other museums.

Collecting was not an entirely pleasant activity and the game reserves were not entirely pleasant places. In 1905, the museum collector Toppin went back to Umfolozi to get further specimens. Three of the letters Toppin sent back to the museum are marked “Umfolosi Junction”, and it is clear that the collector was working in the game reserve. He found the place “dreadfully lonely” and also uncomfortable: “there are millions of ticks, you get nearly eaten to death in the bush”.⁷⁷ He was also bitten by a snake, which objected to being “collected” for the Museum. Ironically, Toppin had already informed Warren that “this is a good locality for Reptilia”, although there seemed to be more large game in the reserve than small mammals.⁷⁸ The letters, particularly after the snake bite episode, give the distinct impression that Toppin was eager to get out of the Umfolozi game reserve as quickly as possible, with or without his specimens.

After the first intensive period of “collecting”, the work focused on the museum workshops in Pietermaritzburg as Teschner and his African assistants laboured to mount the animals that had been acquired. The museum responded opportunistically when the occasion arose to acquire specimens they still needed. The following two

⁷⁴ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 17/1903, “Collecting Expedition to Zululand”, Saunders to Plowman, from Delimitation Commission camp, Mlalazi District, 21 April, 1903.

⁷⁵ NM 2/3, “Collection of Specimens, 1889 to 1903”, Minute Paper NGM 64/1903, “Report, covering list of specimens obtained in Zululand”, Warren to Cooper, 17 June 1903.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 10/1905, “Collectors Proposed Visit to Zululand”, Toppin to Warren, Junction of Black and White Umfolosis, 28 July 1905.

⁷⁸ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 10/1905, “Collectors Proposed Visit to Zululand”, Toppin to Warren, Junction, 2 Umfolosis, 5 July 1905.

incidents reveal something about the social context within which the re-assessment and re-presentation of nature described in this paper was taking place. The first occurred in 1908.

Despite increasing space problems, Teschner had pushed ahead with the mounting of a pair of (black) rhinoceroses as a natural group, and as Warren noted, "it is believed that the result will be almost unique".⁷⁹ The rhinos were completed in September 1908 and were squeezed into the existing mammal hall (a new building was constructed to hold the mammal collection in 1911). They were got there with the help of convict labour. As Warren informed the Assistant Under-Secretary:

The Museum has just completed the mounting of a pair of Rhinoceroses, and the specimens are in the taxidermist workshop in the Museum Gardens. To carry the specimens, and place them in position in the Museum it will require 25 strong natives. Could you kindly arrange that 25 native convicts should be lent to the Museum for this purpose? I should be very glad if the natives could be sent to-morrow morning, Saturday, Sep 19th at 9 o'clock. It is probable that there will be rain after the present hot wind and it is desirable that the specimens should be removed from the damp workshop as soon as possible ... The "boys" would be required for only about an hour.⁸⁰

It is likely that at least some of these "boys" would have been in jail following their participation in the Bambatha Rebellion of 1906: as in the case of his earlier close co-operation with the Zululand Delimitation Commission, Warren's, and the museum's, complicity in the everyday processes of colonial domination, is clear.

The second incident illustrates the fact that, for some employees, collecting could prove fatal. In anticipation of the space that would soon be available at the museum, Warren mentioned to the Natal Provincial Secretary, Hershensohnn (to whom, after 1910, he reported) that he would like to set up a display of that very large mammal, the hippopotamus, which like the rhino was classified as royal game. In October 1910, Hershensohnn telephoned Warren at the Museum offering him a hippo which, the District Native Commissioner (Addison) informed him, was scheduled to be destroyed in the north of the Ubombo District. The hippo had apparently been harassing people in the area. Fynney, the Magistrate at Ingwavuma, had ordered its destruction and the Provincial Secretary had authorised the permit.

Warren immediately wired Fynney and followed this up with a longer explanatory letter. He explained that "We are having a new Mammal Hall erected, and the hippopotamus is wanted for forming a natural group with a specimen that we already have".⁸¹ Warren wrote:

I should be much obliged if you would kindly assist the Museum in procuring the complete skeleton, skull and skin, assuming that the animal is a full sized one. It is very essential that the skin should be pared down on the spot by a trained native, as otherwise it would go bad and be useless for mounting purposes. On the skin being thinned down it would be comparatively light; and cut into two pieces, it could readily be transported by native carriers to the nearest railway station. The skeleton and skull could be tied up in some 4 or 5 sacks and similarly transported. Would you be able to procure such native carriers? And could you give me an estimate of the cost to the Museum?⁸²

Warren, added, as an afterthought, a request that Fynney at some time also present the

⁷⁹ "Fourth report of the Natal Government Museum for year ended 31 December 1907" (Unpublished report. Natal Museum Library, NM Annual Reports, 1904 to 1930), p.6.

⁸⁰ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 29/1908, "Removal of Rhinoceros. Urgent". Warren to the Assistant Under Secretary, 18 September 1908.

⁸¹ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 84/1910, "1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum", Warren to O. Fynney, Magistrate, Ubombo, 4 October 1910.

⁸² *Ibid.*

Museum with “one or more specimens of lions’ skins”.⁸³ The museum already had lions on display, but these were, in Warren’s view, inferior because they had been obtained from Zoological Gardens: “natural wild specimens are desired”.⁸⁴ Already, lions from zoos were considered less authentic than lions from game reserves: they were not, somehow, as “wild” or as “natural” as they should have been. (It is, of course, unlikely that the public would have noticed the difference!)

Fynney differed from Zululand officials like Saunders in that he had no interest in the Natal Museum. Warren received a rather unhelpful telegram from him, on 7 October 1910, informing him that the hippo was to be killed on the 18th, and stating that the “museum native” (Johannes) should make his way from the station to Chief Fogoti’s main kraal - a distance of seventy miles. There was no transport available because the place was in a tsetse fly belt.⁸⁵ Warren asked Hershensohnn to have the killing delayed until proper arrangements could be made. He insisted that Johannes be met at the station and taken to the remote spot, rather than left to find his own way there. Apart from anything else, a heavy cutting-board would have to be got to the “place of execution”, and Johannes could not possibly do this alone.⁸⁶ It would take at least four carriers to carry the board and the preservatives for treating the hippo hide.⁸⁷ Warren estimated that “15 carriers will be ample for the return journey to convey skin and skeleton of hippopotamus and also apparatus to the rail-head”.⁸⁸ Johannes left Pietermaritzburg by train on 26 October 1910.

The story now became a farce that turned, without warning, into a tragedy. It demonstrates the limits of official co-operation between the museum and the Zululand officials, as well as the disregard for African life that was characteristic of the period. (To his credit, Warren did not share this disregard when it came to individuals, as the story shows). First, the hippo disappeared and could not be found. On receiving a telegram from Fynney to this effect in mid-November, Warren wrote to the Provincial Secretary, expressing his opinion that “the hippopotamus can scarcely be a danger and terror to the natives if the police are unable to locate it”:

To expedite matters I suggest that perhaps the permits to kill the hippopotamus might be limited to, say, three weeks from the present date, so that the animal cannot be killed when the Museum native has returned. On the part of Mr. O. Fynney there is certainly a lack of enthusiasm to assist the Museum, since he has not even replied to my letter of October 4th.⁸⁹

A few days later, Warren wrote to the Provincial Secretary again (this time a confidential letter). He had by now been informed by an experienced hunter that “hippopotamuses are perfectly harmless, except occasionally to boats”.⁹⁰ The hunter he had spoken to was

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 84/1910, “1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum”, Telegram, Fynney to Warren, 7 October 1910.

⁸⁶ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 84/1910, “1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum”, Warren to Hershensohnn, 15 October 1910.

⁸⁷ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 84/1910, “1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum”, Warren to Hershensohnn, 18 October 1910.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 84/1910, “1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum”, Warren to Hershensohnn, 15 November 1910.

⁹⁰ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 1/1911, “Hippo in Ingwavuma District, which is about to be Destroyed”, Warren to Hershensohnn, Confidential, 19 November 1910.

... profoundly sceptical that in the present case there was any danger whatsoever. On discussing the matter with him I am strongly of the same opinion, and I fear that sometimes the plea of danger to the natives is raised as an excuse for the sport of killing an animal and obtaining the value of the hide.⁹¹

Warren was upset at the thought that the museum had been implicated in such an undertaking. In addition, the museum had, at great expense, sent a "skilled native" employee to Ubombo for nothing. Warren was inclined to suggest that the permit be revoked immediately:

If a specimen is not forthcoming for the Museum, may I suggest that the permit for killing a hippopotamus be cancelled before the return of our native.⁹²

On 7 December, Warren received a further telegram from Fynney stating that "your native" was suffering from malaria, and that the hippo still could not be found. Warren lost patience. As he complained to Hershensohnn, it was now about seven weeks since Johannes had been sent to Ubombo; the hippo had not been located; and "it is therefore proved that the hippopotamus cannot be a danger to the natives".⁹³

Particularly as Johannes had contracted malaria, it was, Warren said, "imperative that he should now be allowed to return".⁹⁴ Hershensohnn informed Warren that the permit to destroy the hippo would be withdrawn when Johannes left Ubombo. Nothing further was heard and on the very last day of 1910, Warren sent a telegram to Fynney:

Anxious about Museum native who has not yet returned. Please send him to Maritzburg as soon as he can travel.⁹⁵

Warren was away on leave in January 1911, and no sooner had he departed than Hershensohnn contacted the Acting Director of the Museum, informing him that a second chance had arisen to obtain a hippo, this time in Ingwavuma District. The Acting Director responded enthusiastically, but immediately realised that the continued absence of Johannes was a problem. As he told Cooper, the Chairman of the Museum Committee:

I am unable to say exactly where Johannes is, the Magistrate at Ubombo in answer to a wire wired that he did not know where the native is and had heard nothing of him since sending word for him to return here - not very satisfactory is it?⁹⁶

Hershensohnn had suggested that, should the Museum be willing to carry the expenses, and to agree to provide detailed instructions for skinning the hippo, the Magistrate at Ingwavuma or some other responsible person - perhaps a policeman - could be tasked with supervising the skinning and preservation. The Museum accepted this offer.

The ill-considered enterprise was brought to an abrupt end by a telegram from Addison (as District Native Commissioner) sent to Hershensohnn on 6 January 1911:

Before instructing Magistrate Ingwavuma in terms of your wire I should like to point out that if a hippo is desired for museum a specimen can easily be obtained in Lower Umfolozi Division near to railway and without much risk of fever to those shooting and preserving it. To get this hippo from Ingwavuma to museum will not only occasion much expense and trouble but I consider it unfair to send European Policeman to fever stricken locality where animal lives. I understand from Mr Fynney that Museum native sent to Ubombo for same purpose recently is now dead from fever and

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 1/1911, "1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum", Warren to Hershensohnn, 7 December 1910.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

⁹⁵ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 1/1911, "1 Hippo Authorised ... to be destroyed to be handed over to the Natal Museum", Warren to Fynney, 31 December 1910.

⁹⁶ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 1/1911, "Hippo in Ingwavuma District, which is about to be Destroyed", Acting Museum Director to Cooper, 5 January 1911.

have little doubt fever would be contracted by those superintending killing of animal in question as neighbourhood is equally deadly at this time of year.⁹⁷

Johannes was never to return from Zululand: he had died there, quite unnecessarily, as Addison's telegram makes clear. The lack of concern with respect both to African life, and to the museum's loss of its most skilled African workman, is striking. The reservations expressed about the welfare of a putative "European policeman" were not extended to Johannes, for whom the activity of "museum collecting" had proved fatal. There is no comment from Warren in the records, but he seems, from his earlier telegram at least, to have felt in some measure responsible for having sent Johannes into this situation.

DISCURSIVE REPRESENTATIONS OF WILD ANIMALS: TOWARDS A DISCOURSE OF REDEMPTION

The previous section focused on material representations of animals; that is, on images of science and nature created at the museum through the art of taxidermy, images with particular meanings for early twentieth-century metropolitan audiences. This section focuses more explicitly on language; on the discursive constructions and ideas about wild animals and nature contained in Dr. Warren's writings, both his general correspondence and numerous articles he wrote for newspapers and journals - what one might think of as the discursive production of nature. After 1910, the language Dr. Warren used in referring to the wild fauna of Zululand underwent a significant change, and this alteration reflects the emergence in his thinking of a discourse that, in comparison with the discourse of illustration, was more explicitly persuasive or rhetorical. I have termed this the discourse of redemption.

Of course, as writers on the social construction of nature have pointed out, it is never possible to represent nature impartially: even representations that depend for their efficacy on the note of detachment and empiricist objectivity they strike, commonly serve particular purposes and are created for definable reasons. As Noel Castree notes in relation to discursive representations of wild seals in the early twentieth-century campaign against commercial sealing, waged primarily in the United States:

... this discourse and these images, rather than innocently reflecting 'nature', actively constructed it in interested ways ... [in the seal case] it was precisely the claim to truthfulness which allowed the discourse of wildest nature to be so successful.⁹⁸

In the battery of images with which radical preservationists bombarded the United States government and the public, the seals were presented as majestic and pristine animals, part of the natural order and thus, as Castree puts it, "not be sullied by the grubby machinations of human commerce".⁹⁹ This argument placed "nature" and "civilization" in opposition, although not in a straightforward way: while a certain amount of commercial activity was, the protectionists allowed, unavoidable if civilization was to be extended, uncontrolled greed - the indiscriminate pursuit of wealth - was antithetical to civilized values (and sealing fell into this category). The success of the protectionist lobby in negotiating a five-year closed season on land sealing in 1911, Castree argues, has a lot

⁹⁷ NM 2/4, Minute Paper NGM 1/1911, "Hippo in Ingwavuma District, which is about to be Destroyed", Addison (District Native Commissioner) to Hershensohn, 6 January 1911.

⁹⁸ Noel Castree, "Nature, Economy and the Cultural Politics of Theory: the 'War Against the Seals' in the Bering Sea, 1870-1911", *Geoforum*, 28, 1 (1997), p.14.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.13.

to do with the impact of these images and ideas.¹⁰⁰

Dr. Warren was in contact with one of the central figures in the world of radical preservationism discussed by Castree in his paper, the controversial American William T. Hornaday. Castree notes that, in early twentieth-century, there were two competing philosophies of wildlife preservation: a conservationist view based on a “wise use” philosophy, similar to current ideas of sustainable development, and a rival vision of protectionism that was closer to contemporary “deep green” and animal rights arguments. Proponents of the latter, in particular Hornaday and Henry Elliott, led the anti-sealing campaign. Hornaday’s outspoken defence of the seals was, in Castree’s words, a “more radical form of environmental thought and politics than had been seen before in government circles”.¹⁰¹ Warren sympathised increasingly with this kind of approach, and adopted many of the same persuasive literary and discursive techniques. His correspondence with Hornaday began in 1913, and ten years later he was affirming his admiration for the man: “I have the greatest regard for Dr. Hornaday who is doing splendid work in advocating the preservation of the wild life of the world”.¹⁰²

As in the protectionist discourse surrounding the seal controversy, Warren’s writing on behalf of the Zululand game is imbued with a deep anti-commercialism. For Warren too, “nature” was opposed to “civilization”, and like the American protectionists he distinguished within the concept of civilization, more and less “civilized” varieties. Crass materialism Warren strongly condemned. As he wrote to Briejer, the Director of the Transvaal Museum with whom he had a cordial correspondence during the period of the First World War,

... more regard for the aesthetic side of life should be shown, and other measures than the extinction of fauna should be resorted to. The curse of the age is that everything must be sacrificed for material gain.¹⁰³

Briejer reported to Warren that he had heard Theiler, the Minister of Agriculture, expressing the opinion that, while he personally would like to have the country “teeming with game”, he (Theiler) was “afraid that sooner or later we shall have to destroy the game for ‘Agricultural purposes’”.¹⁰⁴ Warren begged Briejer to exercise his influence with Theiler and warn him of the dangers of rampant commercialism: “Please talk to him seriously and remind him that the world is not made for ‘sugar cane’ and ‘Agricultural purposes’ only, and that there are other sides to the question of the protection of a country’s fauna than the mere commercial one”.¹⁰⁵

On the international scene, Warren sympathised with and followed closely the campaign against the killing of plumage birds for the millinery trade. To Hornaday, who was involved with this, he wrote that, in his view, “the enormous destruction of plumage birds for the milliners should be ended at once by all civilized communities”.¹⁰⁶ In a letter to

¹⁰⁰ See also Kurk Dorsey, “Putting a Ceiling on Sealing: Conservation and Cooperation in the International Arena, 1909-1911”, *Environmental History Review*, 15 (3).

¹⁰¹ Castree, “The War Against the Seals”, p.12.

¹⁰² EWC, File “June 1922 to June 1923”, Warren to Stevenson-Hamilton, 25 July 1923.

¹⁰³ EWC, File “January 1916 to December 1916”, Warren to Briejer, 23 May 1916.

¹⁰⁴ EWC, File “November 1915 to August 1916”, H.G. Briejer (Director of Transvaal Museum) to Warren, 7 April 1916.

¹⁰⁵ EWC, File “January 1916 to December 1916”, Warren to Briejer, 10 April 1916.

¹⁰⁶ EWC, File “January 1913 to January 1914”, Warren to Hornaday, 12 April 1913. It seems odd that Warren referred to nagana as “East Coast Fever”. The latter is a totally different disease, tick-borne. The correspondence makes it quite clear that, by this time, Warren had already read

another correspondent, written at about the same time, Warren expressed his understanding that the idea of nature protection was gaining worldwide acceptance and that the millinery trade was a good place to begin the fight against commercial exploitation. He congratulated Buckland on his work in promoting the Plumage Bill, “which you have been so largely instrumental in bringing before the British Public”:

From what I can gather from “Nature” and other sources the idea of the protection of wild-life generally, and bird-life in particular, is spreading throughout the world. I sincerely hope that the Plumage Bill will pass into law, and prove a great blessing ... Undoubtedly the fur-trade is urgently in need of restrictive legislation, failing which in 50 years time very many of the most beautiful of the wild mammals will be extinct.¹⁰⁷

Warren’s anti-commercialism became even more pronounced in the 1920s, as he articulated an increasingly radical preservationism. He wrote in illuminating detail on the matter in 1927 in a private letter to Fitzsimons, the Director of the Port Elizabeth Museum. Responding to a proposal that live animals be captured in Zululand and sold to zoos and private institutions throughout the world, Warren expressed his sense of outrage at the idea that his own subject, zoology, and the wild creatures that zoologists studied, could be exploited for commercial gain. While Vaughan-Kirby, the Zululand game conservator (at that time near retirement), appears to have supported the project, Warren emphatically did not. Warren thought that perhaps Vaughan-Kirby did not understand that this was a “purely commercial” undertaking:

What a detestable word is “exploiting”! the spirit it implies is rapidly destroying all the most interesting things in the world. I am very strongly opposed to any action which will convert the scientific collecting of zoological specimens into a *commercial* undertaking. The fauna of Zululand is more than sufficiently harassed, and cannot it be spared from the attentions of omnivorous commerce ... The *export of the majority of wild birds is already prohibited* in the Union except under licence granted to specific zoological gardens and it will be necessary to extend such protection to mammals, for the fauna of the country must not be made a matter of commerce.

Warren by this time, then, was far more of a radical protectionist than a conservationist.

While the international context was important, the emergence of new modes of representation in Warren’s writings needs to be understood in the context of events in Zululand from about 1910. In the first few years of his tenure of office at the Natal Museum, Dr. Warren’s attention had been largely focused on developing the museum collections, particularly the mammal collection. Yet gradually the zoologist was forced to recognise that the animal populations from which his specimens were drawn, were in fact under serious threat in the wild. This threat arose directly out of the association of “big game” with “fly disease”, nagana or trypanosomiasis (I have called this the discourse of containment). In essence, Warren’s radical preservationism, while it was influenced and supported by the international wildlife protectionist movement, must be situated in the local situation. It developed as a response to the practices of “game control” that were increasingly employed in Zululand, as the provincial administration attempted to placate the various interest groups affected by the political ecology of nagana in the region: transport riders, Africans (via their representatives in the Native Affairs Department), as well as, most powerfully, newly introduced white settlers.¹⁰⁸

everything available on nagana. He may have avoided the word “nagana”, knowing that it would be unfamiliar to Hornaday?

¹⁰⁷ EWC, File “January 1914 to February 1915”, Warren to James Buckland, 18 March 1914.

¹⁰⁸ These measures included game drives, the designation of shooting areas, extended open hunting seasons, the removal of animals from the protected schedule under the new (1912) game law; and even the deproclamation of game reserves. While the established Hluhluwe and Umfolozi reserves were not affected directly until 1920, other game reserves (the Mdletshe, the Hlabisa) were abandoned early on.

These events - which were not of course limited to Zululand, but were also occurring in other southern African colonies where other administrations were battling with the intractable problem of trypanosomiasis in its various forms¹⁰⁹ - Warren saw as one aspect of the worldwide retreat of nature and wildlife in the face of commercial expansion. In an early letter to Hornaday, Warren gave his interpretation of the game drives being sanctioned by the various administrations in colonial Africa:

In Africa we are suffering very greatly in the same way. Here the cause of Protection is greatly handicapped by the excuse that the wild game favours tsetse flies which convey East Coast Fever to the cattle and Sleeping Sickness to Man. In the majority of cases the cry is simply an excuse for wanton butchery. There are a few here in Natal who are doing all that is possible to stem the destruction, but except in certain Game Reserves Wild life is becoming very scarce. The local Administration in Natal is on the whole sympathetic and it is sincerely hoped that the Zululand Reserves may continue to be carefully preserved.¹¹⁰

Already in 1913, then, Warren understood the importance of the game reserves: his belief that they were indispensable to the survival of Zululand's "characteristic fauna" dictated his involvement in the struggle during the 1920s to save them from abolition.

Warren's sense of excitement about the emergence of an international movement for the protection of wildlife, is clear in his earlier correspondence. For example, in 1910 Warren appears to have paid less attention to the rather cultured amateur naturalist society he had founded soon after his arrival in Natal (certainly, the society's minute book records no meetings after 1910). This was preaching to the converted, and in light of the challenge facing the continued existence of "wild nature" in Natal, Warren considered that more powerful allies were needed, particularly among the sport hunting fraternity. It was essential, he felt, that "all who have some regard for the beautiful fauna of South Africa should fight against the utter disregard of all natural things exhibited by so many in this country".¹¹¹ The new society he formed, the Natal and Zululand Game Protection Society, had a wider appeal than the Natal Naturalists' Society, and Warren informed prospective members - men who were carefully chosen for their likely political influence - that they could be part of an international movement:

Similar Game Protection Societies are being formed in all parts of the world, especially in America, and they undoubtedly are having a most beneficial influence in saving some of the finest species of animals from extinction. To mention one example, the Bison Society has been the means of ensuring the continuance of this noble animal.¹¹²

This enthusiasm declined, however, in the later period of Warren's career, and by 1930 he had come to the conclusion that the civilized and civilizing process of nature protection was all but impossible to achieve in what he referred to as "land of murder like Africa".¹¹³ It is worth emphasising the point that - unlike most white sport hunters - Warren did not consider other inhabitants of the country any more "civilized" in this respect than the indigenous population. His correspondence is full of comments like the complaint in 1915, with respect to game destruction in Zululand, that "It has been a difficult, heart-rending and thankless matter to keep off the slaughtering barbarous

¹⁰⁹ See Luise White, "Tsetse Visions: Narratives of Blood and Bugs in Colonial Northern Rhodesia, 1931-9", *Journal of African History* 36 (1995).

¹¹⁰ EWC, File "January 1913 to January 1914", Warren to Hornaday, 12 April 1913.

¹¹¹ EWC, File "June 1918 to January 1919", Warren to Montgomery, 29 July 1918.

¹¹² NM 2/5, "Preservation of Game", Unnumbered Minute Paper, "Game Preservation", Warren to Potential Members of Game Protection Association, 23 December 1910, revised 26 December 1910.

¹¹³ EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Warren to C.W. Hobley, Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire, c/o Zoological Society of London, 10 April 1930.

whites, the half-castes and the natives".¹¹⁴ Nearly ten years later Warren gave a more considered statement:

What is required is a changed outlook on the part of the people in their attitude towards wild creatures and nature in general. With very many in this country, the sight of a living antelope appears to create simply a desire to murder it and the notion of preserving the fauna for the sake of its interest and beauty is so foreign to their mental makeup that at times it is difficult even for them to understand what is meant by protection.¹¹⁵

Another aspect of Warren's increasingly radical position with respect to wild animal protection was his growing unease about sport hunting. As already noted, Warren relied on sport hunters to acquire his museum specimens, although he tried to identify and work only with sport hunters who he considered responsible and trustworthy. This put him in a difficult position. When, for a short time, the museum had its own collector, this man, Fred Toppin, gave Warren trouble. Toppin applied for the job of Zululand Game Conservator when it was advertised in 1911, putting Warren down as a reference and offering him a rather obvious bribe: "as you will be aware I know Zululand like a book and am sure if I get the appointment I should be of good service to the Museum".¹¹⁶ Toppin might have been surprised at the reference Warren wrote him. When asked in the future for information about Toppin and his work, Warren said that had not been able to rely on him.¹¹⁷

Warren's relationships with sport hunters - and with their game protection societies - became increasingly difficult as he moved to a more radical anti-hunting position in the 1920s. Letters such as the following ingenuous example from Thijs Uijs at Wakkerstroom continued to arrive at the museum:

I intend going to Zululand this year, with the intention, to shoot big game. But I do not intend going merely for the sake of killing, and gain, as most people does [sic] at present. The killing part I know alright but how to skin - absolutely not to get the best results, and not spoil my trophies. Would you be kind enough to give me a few, or all the hints necessary. And could I do any thing for your museum?¹¹⁸

This is this kind of letter to which Warren was referring in 1927 when he spoke of the many hunters who had approached him over the years - "'sportsmen' ... grovelling for permits to shoot for the Museum, promising anything, so that another noble head may fall under their foul gun".¹¹⁹

In the end, Warren retained links with a few sport hunters whom he considered to be responsible, but insisted on a clear expression of his personal opinion, which was anti-hunting and opposed to blood sports:

I know many who are fond of hunting and at the same time are keen on the general protection of the fauna and infinitely more so than the general public; but, as far as I am personally concerned, I cannot understand what pleasure there can be in killing wild animals, especially if they are gentle and charming like the antelopes and wild sheep. The philosophy of sport when a sentient timid

¹¹⁴ EWC, File "February 1915 to January 1916", Warren to Minchin, Vice President, Zoological Society, London, 30 October 1915.

¹¹⁵ EWC, File "October 1924 to January 1925", Warren to Hon Secretary, British Central Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature, 22 October 1924.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ EWC, File "June 1922 to June 1923", Warren to Fuller, 7 November 1922. A second letter in 1924 said that "Legal proceedings were being instituted against him for poaching and selling skins at the time of his death". (EWC, File "January 1924 to September 1924", Warren to Fuller, 27 February 1924).

¹¹⁸ EWC, File "November 1915 to August 1916", Thijs Uijs to Warren, 17 May 1916.

¹¹⁹ EWC, Warren to Kingston-Russell, Editor of *The Natal Mercury*, 19 September 1927.

animal is the target I do not attempt to decipher.¹²⁰

There was a strong moral aspect to Warren's anti-hunting sentiment: in his view, "free licence to kill is always debasing".¹²¹ Certain hunters did "take a real interest in the wild animals", and such people were undoubtedly less destructive than "the commercial people, land exploiters and the natives".¹²² Yet "hunters of fine calibre who detest slaughter" were not common, and it was a difficult relationship for Warren to maintain.¹²³

It was far easier to work with wildlife artists such as Strath Caldecott, a man with whom he formed a close working partnership in the later 1920s. Artists, like photographers, could also provide a way of "capturing" nature without killing it; and it is clear that Warren's insistence on the idea that taxidermy was an art, is linked to the fact that he lived in an era when other technologies for the accurate reproduction of natural specimens had not yet been developed. Warren's most explicit statement about this complicated relationship was the following, in 1927:

The alliance between the naturalist and the artist with the sportsman is due to the fact that the aims of both are similar; namely to protect the animals from extermination.¹²⁴

However, Warren's experience with game protection associations was disillusioning. When asked about his relationship with them in 1925, he said, rather wearily,

... I have had no direct communication with Game Protection Societies. I suppose there is some such Society in the Cape and I know there used to be one in the Transvaal. Of course, my attitude is not the protection of game *for the purpose of shooting it*, but the protection of game in order that the once magnificent fauna of this country may not be entirely blotted out. In any case, if the Game Protection Societies can help, perhaps you might be able to enlist their active support.¹²⁵

On one occasion, Warren stated explicitly that every time he had attempted to work with sport hunters - for example, in setting up the Natal and Zululand Game Protection Association - this work had achieved nothing, but had been a "farce", simply wasting his time.¹²⁶ The continued dominance of the sport-hunting discourse, even by the late 1920s, eventually made Warren despair about the possibility of reform, particularly in Africa. This was the context for his comment about the "land of murder":

Personally I detest every form of blood sport and I cannot understand what pleasure there can be in killing beautiful and interesting animals. In a land of murder like Africa it is useless to emphasize this aspect since the majority of the members of the various organisations for the protection of wild life are sportsmen.¹²⁷

If game protection societies were a "farce", what was Warren's view of the existing game reserves? Early on in his thinking about the Zululand reserves, Warren

¹²⁰ EWC, File "February 1928 to June 1928", Warren to Major Loder, The Marine Hotel, Durban, 13 March 1928.

¹²¹ *Ibid.* Warren drew, for example, a distinction between the "uncontrolled blood-lust resulting from free shooting and the licensed shooting of a few animals". (EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Article by Warren, "A Carnival of Blood").

¹²² EWC, File "February 1928 to June 1928", Warren to Major Loder, The Marine Hotel, Durban, 13 March 1928.

¹²³ EWC, Warren to Kingston-Russell, Editor of *The Natal Mercury*, 19 September 1927.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁵ EWC, File "February 1935 to July 1925", Warren to Stevenson-Hamilton, 20 March 1925.

¹²⁶ "I have tried on two separate occasions to start a Game Protection Society in Natal and they have been a farce and have simply taken my time without any good being done". (EWC, File "February 1928 to June 1928, Warren to J.H. Wilson, Wild Life Protection Society of South Africa, 14 February 1928).

¹²⁷ EWC, File "January 1930 to May 1930", Warren to C.W. Hobley, Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire, c/o Zoological Society of London, 10 April 1930.

expressed the opinion that, although it was crucial that they be retained, the game reserves were both spatially and philosophically inadequate. This was partly due to their close links to the discourses of sport hunting and associated game-keeping practices, as well as their origins within the discourse of containment - the main purpose of which was "game control" and the protection of the interests of people living outside the reserves.

Warren's objections were indirectly expressed in his vision for a proposed "national park" to be formed in the Drakensberg in 1916.¹²⁸ Warren insisted that the designation "park" or "sanctuary" rather than "game reserve" be used for this so-called "national" park. (The park, later called the Royal Natal National Park after the visit of the British royal family in 1947, was always in fact run by the province). As Warren stated:

My feeling is ... that the National Park should represent a piece of wild Natal in the Drakensberg Region. It must not be simply a Game Reserve where all so-called 'vermin' is shot on sight.¹²⁹

Two years later, Warren wrote to Vaughan-Kirby, asking for the latter's opinion as to the kinds of animals that could be introduced into this sanctuary:

It is small unfortunately, consisting of only some 15 000 acres but it includes some very fine scenery ... There are some precipices etc forming a natural boundary around the greater part and new fencing of only a few miles in length would be necessary. There are probably a few Klipspringers and Duikers already there, and doubtless Eland would flourish; but would Koodoo, Sable, Roan, Bushbuck, Hartebeeste, etc survive if introduced?¹³⁰

This was clearly an attempt to physically construct, almost from scratch, a "wild space" of nature.

By 1924, Warren expressed more explicitly his understanding of the philosophical and practical inadequacies of the Zululand game reserves. Drawing on comparative examples, Warren noted that other countries, in particular Switzerland and America, had set aside larger and more effective "natural sanctuaries for wild-life".¹³¹ One of the difficulties with the Zululand reserves, seen in this comparative perspective, was that due to their specific history and origins in the discourse of containment, they were small in area, discontinuous, and surrounded by settlements (white and African). It was difficult in such spaces to create the atmosphere of a nature sanctuary.

... The creation of natural sanctuaries for wild-life by Switzerland, America and other countries testifies to the fact that it is beginning to be realized that the relationship of man to living Nature should not be ruled solely from the commercial and utilitarian aspect. If the wonderful fauna of Africa is to be saved from extermination it will shortly become imperatively necessary to establish Natural Sanctuaries of adequate area.¹³²

Philosophically, the game reserves were inadequate because of the continued link with game-keeping. (For instance, carnivores were still killed in the reserves by Vaughan-Kirby, and by his successor in the 1930s, Captain Potter). Warren's sense that the Zululand game reserves were not really spaces of wild nature, reflecting the kind of moral geography he was advocating, comes across clearly in his statement, in the same letter, about the ideal sanctuary in Zululand:

¹²⁸ The Giant's Castle Game Reserve was already in existence, but this too was a "game reserve" run on gamekeeping lines.

¹²⁹ EWC, File "January 1917 to June 1918", Warren to Col. J.S. Wylie, 29 December 1916.

Warren wanted a similar space to be created on the Zululand coast. He thought St. Lucia would be a good location: as he noted in 1916, "I have been informed that St Lucia Lake district is exceedingly fine and wild with thousands of flamingoes and other water-fowl ... It would be highly desirable if another area could be similarly set aside to represent the Coastal bush". (*Ibid.*)

¹³⁰ EWC, File "June 1918 to January 1919", Warren to Vaughan-Kirby, 20 June 1918.

¹³¹ EWC, File "January 1924 to September 1924", Draft of article by Warren, dated 23 April 1924.

¹³² EWC, File "January 1924 to September 1924", Draft of article by Warren, dated 23 April 1924.

These sanctuaries should not be simply Game Reserves, which are primarily instituted in the interests of sport, but they should be formed for ministering to the intellectual and aesthetic needs of posterity.¹³³

If Warren increasingly felt that game reserves had to be real sanctuaries for wild nature, the corollary to this view is his growing sense of the threatened position of the wild animals that had to be protected within the reserves. Increasingly, Warren referred to the game animals of Zululand not only as “interesting”, or as part of the “characteristic fauna” of the country, but also as threatened and defenceless. In 1915, in response to game drives in Zululand, Warren moved away from his earlier detached, scientific tone, to condemn this “wild outburst of blood lust”, and insist that “some voice on the side of the wild animals should be raised at once”.¹³⁴ Speaking explicitly in the interests of wild nature, he begged supporters to “come to the rescue of our sadly harassed and fast diminishing wild-life ... the beautiful antelope fauna of Zululand and of Africa generally is in the most imminent peril of destruction ... the beautiful and defenceless creatures are being murdered wholesale”.¹³⁵ This was a new departure for Warren. His correspondence thereafter increasingly presented wild animals as in need of salvation, or redemption: he often spoke of the “sadly persecuted wild animals of Zululand.”¹³⁶ To Vaughan-Kirby, the Zululand Game Conservator, he said:

I have so often expressed my conviction that you have done, and are doing, everything possible for the wild animals under your charge that I hope you will not think it wearisome if I again express my admiration for your whole-hearted and valiant defence of our sadly persecuted fauna.¹³⁷

To another correspondent, he wrote: “I know that you detest this continuous persecution and cruelty meted out to our beautiful and defenceless wild-life.”¹³⁸

For Warren, the works of nature were “sacred”, albeit not in a conventional religious sense (as noted earlier, he was a committed evolutionist). The “characteristic” fauna of South Africa was not only “interesting”, “beautiful”, and so on, but also sacred, an implication carried by the word “sanctuary”, as well as by many of Warren’s other comments - for example his statement, in regard to the American company “Big Game Tours”, that “the African fauna will not stand any further desecration.”¹³⁹ The problem for Warren was how to induce a proper respect and reverence for animals as “sacred works of Nature”.¹⁴⁰ He was pessimistic about the ability of ordinary schooling to achieve this end:

The destructive agencies in a country such as South Africa are so varied and extensive that any expectation that general education and school-teaching will lead to a better regard for the magnificent and sacred works of Nature is doomed to disappointment.¹⁴¹

¹³³ EWC, File “January 1924 to September 1924”, Draft of article by Warren, dated 23 April 1924. This statement provides a hint of a new vision of public access, a discourse of re-creation, that emerged in Zululand only in the 1930s, after Warren had retired.

¹³⁴ EWC, File “February 1915 to January 1916”, Warren to Vaughan-Kirby, 22 July 1915.

¹³⁵ EWC, File “February 1915 to January 1916”, Warren to Prof. Minchin, Zoological Society, London, 30 October 1915. To another correspondent, Warren wrote: “On behalf of the beautiful wild life of Zululand I ask you to write a strong letter of protest to the Provincial Secretary, Pietermaritzburg ...” (EWC, File “June 1918 to January 1919), Warren to Ralph Holliday, 14 August 1918).

¹³⁶ EWC, File “January 1916 to December 1916”, Warren to Briejer, 29 March 1916.

¹³⁷ EWC, File “October 1924 to January 1925”, Warren to Vaughan-Kirby, 27 November 1924.

¹³⁸ EWC, File “June 1922 to June 1923”, Warren to Miss Wilson, Kimberley Museum, 3 September 1923.

¹³⁹ EWC, File “November 1926 to June 1927”, Warren to Stevenson-Hamilton, 14 February 1927.

¹⁴⁰ EWC, File “March 1926 to November 1926”, Warren to Editor, *Cape Times*, 17 March 1926.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*

Warren expressed his pessimism on this subject often, for example stating that “mere general education with regard to the whites (or blacks for that matter) will not mend matters. The present settlers in Zululand are people who have had ample educational opportunities in this age of super-education, but their attitude towards the works of Nature is still that of a barbarian”.¹⁴²

A series of picture postcards distributed by the Natal Museum in the early 1920s was intended to contribute to this process of public education. The postcards, on which were printed photographs of the “natural groups” on display at the museum, aimed to take these taxidermic images of wild nature outside of the museum walls and, through photography, to make them more widely available. As Warren expressed it, “it is hoped that [the picture postcards] will serve in some way as propaganda for the protection of African fauna”.¹⁴³ The sets of cards, together with accompanying leaflets, were distributed to all the members of the Natal Provincial Council, to the Zululand magistrates, and to all members of the national government, including the Senate and Members of the House of Assembly. In 1924, Warren told Vaughan-Kirby that “our stock of cards is low at the moment but when a fresh supply arrives from London they will be sent to all the Government Schools of the Union”.¹⁴⁴

The emotive representations of defenceless, suffering animals used by Warren in the period of the First World War, clearly influenced by the writings of radical American protectionists like Hornaday and intended to stimulate public outrage, did give way in part to a more measured discourse, this time focused around heritage. However, this was still a discourse of redemption: Warren was simply adopting a different persuasive strategy to try to save Zululand’s wildlife. Warren’s task in the 1920s, as he saw it, was to place the threat to the wild fauna of the country in context, in particular by creating a more inclusive idea of national heritage than currently existed. The aim was to develop an expanded notion of heritage and national pride, extending to South Africa’s indigenous wildlife, which would begin to be recognized as being unique and irreplaceable. The first reference in Warren’s correspondence to the wild animals as part of “heritage” was occurs in April 1918.¹⁴⁵ The following year, Warren wrote to General Smuts as follows:

In many respects the African fauna is one of the most wonderful in the world, and it should be a cause of national pride, but at the present time on one pretext or another it is being rapidly and ruthlessly destroyed in many areas, and once destroyed it can never be restored ... It is slowly being realised throughout the world that the indigenous fauna of a country is a heritage that should be passed on, unimpaired as far as possible, to the next generation, and is not something that the present generation has the right to destroy for the sake of temporary convenience.¹⁴⁶

The strategies associated with heritage discourse, central to Warren’s campaign in the 1920s to achieve the nationalization of the Zululand game reserve along similar lines to

¹⁴² EWC, File “August 1925 to February 1926”, Warren to G.F. Herber Smith, Hon Sec, British Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature, British Museum, 16 February 1926.

¹⁴³ EWC, File “January 1924 to September 1924”, Warren to Messrs Maskew Miller Publishers, Cape Town, 15 August 1924.

¹⁴⁴ EWC, File “October 1924 to January 1925”, Warren to Vaughan-Kirby, 27 November 1924.

¹⁴⁵ Warren wrote: “The wonderful animal life of Zululand must be jealously preserved by the Province as a heritage for posterity as far as is consistent with human welfare”. (EWC, File “January 1917 to June 1918”, Warren to the Game Laws Draft Amendment Ordinance Committee, 17 April 1918).

¹⁴⁶ EWC, File “January 1919 to September 1919”, Warren to Honourable J. Smuts, Executive Council, Pretoria, 21 July 1919.

that of the Kruger National Park (1926), cannot be considered in detail here. Suffice merely to note, in closing, that this shift involved a more detached or objective portrayal of animals, similar perhaps to the earlier presentations of animals as “interesting” or “characteristic” specimens, implicit in metaphors linked to notions of heritage. Warren’s affecting “cruelly persecuted”, “defenceless” animals became, in the 1920s, “charming monuments of Nature”; “living monuments” which, he argued, deserved to be included in state legislation that had the function of protecting historical sites and other aspects of “culture”.¹⁴⁷ The idea of living animals as national monuments created an oddly static image, which may have been one reason why it was not successful in South Africa.¹⁴⁸ In Britain, the “countryside” and its wildlife had been conceptualised as an integral part of the “national heritage” from the beginnings of the heritage movement in the nineteenth century - but this was far from being the case in Natal.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁷ A bill “To make Provision for the Preservation of Natural and Historical Monuments of the Union and of Objects of Aesthetic, Historical or Scientific Value or Interest” was passed in 1923, but it disappointed Warren. “Although there are certain clauses included in the Bill, which mention the protection of natural objects, the wording and general tenor of the Bill would seem to refer primarily to historical monuments (of which, by the way, there are extremely few).” (EWC, File “October 1924 to January 1925”, Warren to Hon. Sec Central Correlating Committee for the Protection of Nature, British Museum, 22 October 1924).

¹⁴⁸ Another reason is surely the conflicted nature of all South African identities in a segregationist era and in the wake of the still-festering South African war.

¹⁴⁹ See Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory. Volume 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (London, Verso, 1996 edition), in particular Part III, “Heritage”, and within this “Semantics” and “Genealogies”, pp.208-237.