

**Images of ‘Wild Africa’:
Nature tourism and the (re) creation of
Hluhluwe game reserve, 1930-1945**

Shirley Brooks

**School of Life and Environmental Sciences (Geography Division)
Memorial Tower Building
University of Natal, Durban
4041
South Africa
e-mail: brookss2@nu.ac.za**

Abstract

This paper explores the relationship between new discursive constructions of South African nature and the material imperatives that influenced game reserve management in Zululand in the 1930s and 1940s. It also investigates the social consequences of these developments. The paper traces the emergence of marketable constructions of ‘wild nature’ linked to the development of tourism and their expression in the increasing exclusion of Africans from game reserves. This process was tentative and its outcome far from inevitable. Yet while the question of an African presence in game reserves remained open in the early 1930s, in the longer term it was clear that black people could not be part of Zululand’s new, purified ‘space of nature’ - or, more correctly, they would participate only as employees and not as residents or tourists. The management of the Hluhluwe game reserve as a tourist destination ultimately entailed the more systematic exercise of spatial controls over its landscape, contributing to the dispossession and exclusion of local Zulu people. The paper argues that enhanced social controls and a new brutal geography of forced removal is implicated in the (re)creation of Hluhluwe as a romantic space in which tourists could experience wild nature and an ‘unspoilt’ African landscape.

Introduction

Over the last decade, innovative work in geography and political ecology has problematised the idea of ‘nature’, and has begun to explore its spatial implications for human beings and animals in various parts of the world.¹ Following Raymond Williams’ insight that ‘the idea of nature contains, though often unnoticed, an extraordinary amount of human history’, historical geographers are reconstructing the story of nature conservation in particular contexts.² Scholars in the complementary field of ‘animal geographies’ are exploring human discourses about animals and their spatial effects.³ This body of work has opened up several new lines of enquiry that have influenced the approach taken in this paper.

First, it allows a reading of modern landscapes that draws attention to the policing of discursive *and* physical boundaries between nature and culture. New approaches integrate materialist understandings of the production of nature with post-structuralist sensitivities to linguistic constructions. In relation to conservation in the USA, for example, Proctor and Pincetl ask: what are the social practices and linguistic constructs that maintain and police nature’s ‘bounded distinctions of purity’? How is nature’s ‘purity’ actually ensured in particular contexts? They argue that bounded natural spaces can be seen as the result of changing human practices that reflect both ‘material and ideological features of nature’ – an insight that I explore here in relation to the historical geography of Hluhluwe reserve, in Zululand, South Africa.⁴

Secondly, new critical work has drawn attention to the fact that ‘natural’ spaces have histories. This often goes unnoticed because of the taken-for-granted notion of ‘nature’ (as a category opposed to culture), which tends to appear timeless, pristine and outside the human world. As Kate Soper has pointed out, there is a peculiarly static, reverent quality to the modern attitude to nature.⁵ One of the defining features of this attitude is its reliance on a nostalgic reshaping of history, making it particularly difficult to historicize or ‘de-naturalise’ apparently ‘natural’ spaces.⁶ This paper thus aims to

historicize Hluhluwe and to illuminate the role of tourism in (re)creating a colonial game reserve as a modern recreational space.

Thirdly, research on the creation of natural landscapes in colonial contexts has drawn attention to the price paid by subalterns. Roderick Neumann notes that, ‘the control over nature, either for aesthetic consumption or for production, must be recognized as an integral part of the geography and history of empire’.⁷ If visions of landscapes as ‘natural’ or pristine, serve social purposes that require closer examination, such questioning is especially pressing in postcolonial contexts, where the project of decolonising taken-for-granted representations - in the sphere of nature as in many others - has just begun.⁸

During the 1930s, the Hluhluwe game reserve - one of four potential candidates – became the focus of attempts to market a ‘wild’ and unspoilt Zululand to visitors. This paper explores why Hluhluwe was chosen for this end, and the effects of tourist development. The social history I consider does not describe a straightforward process of colonial subjugation to which Africans responded simply in terms of either ‘collaboration’ or ‘resistance’. African responses were more complex than this. At the start of the 1930s, relations between the Zululand game reserve authorities and neighbouring communities were relatively good. The paper shows how the possibility of African settlement within this space of nature was closed down thereafter.

Game reserves in Zululand and the Transvaal in the 1920s

Game reserves were established in the British colonies and Boer republics of South Africa in the last decade of the nineteenth century. In Zululand, four protected areas for game were declared, of which Hluhluwe and Umfolozi - formed in 1895 – were the oldest in colonial Africa.⁹ But it was only in the second and third decades of the twentieth century that game reserves began to be thought of as places of national importance or as places of public resort. Internationally, leisure practices and attitudes to

wildlife were changing. Trophy sport hunting was gradually giving way to a more passive form of wildlife leisure tourism, performed with camera rather than the gun, and concentrated within the increasingly controlled environments of game reserves and parks - places now thought of as spaces of 'nature' (as opposed to culture, human history, or contestation).¹⁰

There is something quite specific about constructions of *African* nature and wildlife. Neumann has shown how ideas about Africa as a wild and primitive Eden influenced the shape and social histories of parks in East Africa.¹¹ In the colonial context, it was possible for imperial powers to set aside huge tracts of 'unspoilt' land as game reserves or national parks, without heeding the views of local people. In South Africa, increasing industrialization prefigured a new romantic ideology of African nature among white urban South Africans. From the late 1920s, game reserves took on new cultural functions and were reinvented as nostalgic spaces for alienated urbanites to visit in their leisure time. David Bunn suggests that in a context of industrial transformation and its accompanying social pressures, white urban workers needed to identify a 'zone of "primitive" space and time' to which they could escape on holiday.¹² The popularisation of game reserves such as the Kruger Park was also made possible by the spread of new modes of transportation such as the railway and later the motor car.¹³

Conservationists began to argue that the security of wild spaces and animals was best ensured by making them national assets and encouraging people to visit them. Legislation establishing South African national parks was introduced in the 1920s and the Kruger National Park, declared in 1926, was the first such experiment.¹⁴ The park's first warden, Col. Stevenson-Hamilton, came round to the idea of the parks as tourist destinations reluctantly and advised a Natal colleague to adopt similar policies.¹⁵ Supporters of wildlife conservation in Natal hoped that one or more of the Zululand reserves might be declared a national park on the Kruger model. But the circumstances in Zululand were less propitious than those in the Transvaal.

While Zululand had valuable ‘big game’ animals - including rare white rhinoceros in Umfolozi - it also had settler farmers engaged in commercial agriculture, and it had the tsetse fly. These blood-sucking flies transmitted the disease *nagana*, one of the African trypanomiases, to domestic cattle. Wild animals acted as hosts to the fly, but were themselves immune to the disease – a fact that was suspected (and affirmed in indigenous knowledge systems) before imperial scientists confirmed it.¹⁶ For this reason, the provincial authorities were forced to deproclaim Umfolozi game reserve in the early 1920s and throughout the 1930s and 1940s the place was the centre of an ambitious anti-*nagana* campaign coordinated by the national Department of Agriculture. Although its legal status was withdrawn, de facto Umfolozi remained a reserve where periodic game culling and fly trapping exercises were undertaken for *nagana* control and the white rhinos retained special protection.

In such circumstances, it was not possible simply to map new representations of nature onto the space of the Zululand game reserves. The presence of *nagana* in Zululand meant that preserving game for tourists was at odds with the material interests of farmers. Recreating reserves as spaces that served new ideological functions as places of restoration, and conveying images of wild African nature to tourists, was especially difficult here. Although Hluhluwe ultimately became a tourist destination, it did not become a national park. At first, this was opposed by the national and provincial guardians of agricultural interests. Later, when the park was established as a source of provincial tourism revenue, it was too valuable to be meekly ‘given’ to the National Parks Board.

New representations of the Zululand Reserves and the selection of Hluhluwe

The first promotional material for the Zululand reserves as tourist destinations was developed in the 1930s. It took the form of a booklet entitled *Natal's Nature Sanctuaries in Zululand*, which had official backing from the Natal Provincial Administration.¹⁷ A central stylistic feature of the booklet is the portrayal of the reserves as pastoral spaces of nature removed from the stresses and strains of urban life. Nature is peaceful (rather than

exciting or dangerous), the perfect ‘antidote to the soul-destroying effects of this mechanical age’.¹⁸ David Bunn argues that the successful marketing of Kruger Park was partly the result of its new cultural role, as the park solved for Transvaalers the problem of finding a zone of uncomplicated, primitive space, ‘which could be twinned with the modernizing space of Johannesburg’.¹⁹ *Natal’s Nature Sanctuaries* twins the ‘primitive’ space of the Zululand game reserves with the ‘modern’ space of the city of Durban in precisely this way:

The roads are quite good and one can travel by motor at a reasonably rapid pace. In the course of a few hours the visitor may pass from the crowded streets of Durban to the banks of the Umfolosi, with white rhinoceroses lazily feeding in their ancestral home, or to Hluhluwe to view a rosy sunset on the mountains, to see the valley sides covered with grass of vivid green and to hear the music of running water and the hooting of the owl, while a beautiful inyala behind a bough watches you with soft and tender eyes.²⁰

The geography of Hluhluwe - well watered and, in the higher sections, free from malaria and *nagana* - proved especially amenable to re-presentation for tourism. Its panoramic scenery and lack of development were attractive: ‘there are no roads ... saving the one to the conservator’s house, and it is much better so; the artificiality of roads would strike a discordant note and mar the pristine beauty of the country as designed by the hand of nature’.²¹ The writer includes a lyrical description of the view driving to the conservator’s ‘quaint’ house on the ridge. As he drives up the steep dirt road, ‘the sun is setting behind the mountain range to the west, and here indeed is a scene of striking beauty: far down in the valleys the dense bush darkens and the listening streams dull down to molten lead ...’²²

Descriptions of Umfolozi on the other hand, focus less on the landscape than on the rare and ‘prehistoric’ white rhinos found there. They totally overlook the large anti-*nagana* workforce in the reserve:

The animals have such an archaic aspect that the bend of the track which brought the family into view would seem to have transported us suddenly into a scene of

some past geological period. Modern man and all his works fade into the background of our minds ... in imagination we pass down the great avenues of time and picture the strange and wonderful creatures that the life impulse of the cosmos has produced on this globe during the past eons of evolutionary activity.²³

The two reserves were also publicized by the travel writer Carel Birkby. His 1937 book *Zulu Journey*, has a rather different emphasis from the official publications, but also aimed to draw tourists.²⁴ In the book, Birkby himself is the intrepid hero and adventurer. Together with his servant-companion Joshua Titus, the two men explore a romantic and distant region inhabited by untamed people and wild animals. In Birkby's tale, representations of the game reserves are inseparable from the mystique of the powerful Zulu nation. For example, one of Birkby's encounters is with Induna Mali, whom he presents as a kind of Prester John figure: 'Of all the game guards the most famous is Mali ... He is a silent, skilful tracker, a deadly shot and the terror of poachers. With his khaki uniform, his blue leggings and motor-tyre sandals, his Baden-Powell hat and his beard, Mali is a picturesque figure'.²⁵ The book is clearly designed for a white overseas audience who could be expected to identify with Birkby's adventures. Readers are told they can escape in imagination from 'a sick civilization in London or New York ... Travel through Zululand with Carel Birkby in this work and forget your fogs and skyscrapers as you encounter as strange a set of living characters as ever Rider Haggard invented'.²⁶ The 'Haggardesque' set of characters the reader encounters includes the Zululand Game Conservator – 'Monkey-rope Potter'. Potter is portrayed as 'guardian of the rare white rhino', living romantically alone in his animal kingdom at Hluhluwe.²⁷

Potter's inhabiting presence in the reserve is an important, if coincidental, factor that contributed to the emergence of Hluhluwe as the centre of tourism in Zululand. His presence shows that *nagana* shaped the historical geography of the Hluhluwe reserve in unexpected ways. To explore how this came about, it is necessary to look in more detail at the *nagana* control programme.

In 1929, the Natal Administration was desperate to control *nagana* and placed a government entomologist and tsetse expert – R.H.T.P. Harris - in charge of the Hluhluwe and Umfolozi reserves.²⁸ Harris was determined to exclude sport hunters from the area as part of his policy to rid the area of the fly. This first stage of his *nagana* control programme was ‘game reduction’, that is, shooting most of the wild animals in the reserves. Captain Harold (H.B.) Potter was one of the two white ‘rangers’ appointed under Harris to oversee the shooting, which was done by local Africans. As the high ground of the reserve was free of malaria, he chose it as a suitable place for a permanent dwelling, and erected a simple house there. Potter reported directly to Harris and effectively replaced the Zululand Conservators who had lost the previous decade’s battle for control of the game reserves. Thus in 1930, the future of the Zululand reserves appeared to be bloody battles against disease-carrying wildlife - rather than wildlife conservation or tourist development.

After eighteen months of entomological control, however, the Natal Administration decided that Zululand’s reserves should be placed under the control of someone who had the interests of the region’s wildlife at heart. Thus the post of Zululand Conservator was revived.²⁹ The man appointed to the job was none other than Captain Potter. This is not as paradoxical as it might appear. Potter enjoyed sport hunting. Unlike Harris, his primary interest was not *nagana* control but in living the outdoor life and working with animals. He had bred gun dogs in England and was steeped in game-keeping tradition. He precisely fitted the mould of the old-fashioned game warden.³⁰ As Conservator, Potter decided to stay in the Hluhluwe reserve for purely pragmatic reasons related to proximity to his work.³¹ But as we have seen, this was important for tourist development. The fact that Potter and his family were in permanent residence in the reserve meant that they could act as hosts to this ‘unspoilt’ natural world. From the start of his period of tenure as Game Conservator, Potter welcomed casual visitors to the reserve and acted as personal host and guide. He saw hospitality as part of his duties.

This was not the only reason why Hluhluwe became the prime focus for tourism. As we have seen, all the Zululand reserves were threatened by agricultural interests due to the

tsetse fly. Any future tourist development around wildlife depended on its compatibility with farming. When the Game Reserves Commission reported in 1935 on the future of the Zululand reserves, they concluded that the prospects for tourism development in Zululand were relatively good.³² Yet they foresaw the possibility of having to reduce the number of game reserves to ensure the development of settler agriculture. If only one reserve could remain, it would have to be carefully chosen. In the context of *nagana* controls, it was important that the chosen sanctuary should allow controlled movement of game, and its containment within the reserved area. This meant the chosen reserve had to have adequate grazing and water all year round; it had to be physically possible to patrol its margins to drive back straying animals; and the reserve had to be capable of supporting most species of Zululand fauna while being 'attractive to visitors from a scenic point of view'.³³ In the opinion of the commissioners, Hluhluwe – though it lacked white rhinos - met most of these requirements.

Visitors were in any case voting with their feet. Records show that visitor numbers at Hluhluwe were steadily rising. In his Annual Report for 1932, Potter recorded over 300 visitors, including central government officials and the Natal Administrator.³⁴ He hoped that the Administration would 'consider the possibility of providing Rest Camps for visitors in order that the attractions of the Reserve may become known to those who are interested in Game Preservation'.³⁵ The completion of overnight accommodation for twenty visitors in 1934 allowed tourism to expand and by 1937 the visitors book in Hluhluwe camp had more than 1000 signatures.³⁶ Tourists responded favourably to Hluhluwe because it was, in the words of a visiting Dutch scientist, 'as nature made it, and has not been spoilt by the hand of man'.³⁷ Other visitors compared the reserve favourably with Kruger because it was possible to walk around. In Kruger, 'having to remain in cars makes it seem more like a zoo'.³⁸

Captain Potter's management style was, however, of some concern to purists, and there were disputes over which species a 'space of nature' ought to contain. In addition to gun dogs, Potter was enthusiastic about breeding pheasants. He bought these birds himself and released them into the Hluhluwe reserve, hoping that they would improve sport

hunting in the region.³⁹ Potter also had no objection to introducing non-indigenous animals, such as various varieties of deer. In 1938, a professional zoologist Frank Bush protested against the proposed introduction of an exotic species, the Java deer. The dispute highlights the rift between the views of Potter's generation and the new idea of a game reserve as a consciously 'natural' space.⁴⁰ Potter's pheasants had, of course, already disrupted the 'biological features of the Zululand reserves'.⁴¹ Although Bush's view turned out to be prescient in the longer term, the pheasants at Hluhluwe were one of the early attractions for zoologically uneducated tourists.

To what extent did the reinvention of the Hluhluwe reserve as a tourist destination signal a greater determination to exclude Africans from its space? It is clear that the new interest in game reserves as spaces for tourist development was intimately connected with expansionist and consolidatory plans first articulated in the 1930s. If Hluhluwe was to be Zululand's prime tourist development, it would have to be big enough to be viable. Such consolidation meant incorporating the substantial area of crown land lying between Hluhluwe and Umfolozi reserves, known as the 'Corridor' and inhabited by Africans.⁴² The problem with this expansion – as the 1935 Reserves Commission noted – was that such enlargement was not necessarily compatible with disease management. For this reason, the Department of Lands had previously opposed the scheme.⁴³ The Durban Publicity Association and the Wild Life Protection Society were predictably in favour of expansion; the Zululand Farmers Union against it. The commissioners ultimately came down in favour of adding the Corridor to the reserve.⁴⁴

No mention was made of what would happen to the Africans living in the Corridor lands. Although individual game conservators often saw it as their duty to remove African homesteads from within reserves, it was not clear at this time that rural African people should be totally excluded from game reserve space. As we have seen, travel writers like Birkby valued African rural life as evidence of a disappearing 'primitive' world and presented Africans as exotic parts of the scenery. In 1934, the Director of the Natal Museum and an activist for the creation of a national park in Zululand, Dr. Ernest Warren, remarked that 'visitors from overseas to Southern Africa want to see three

things: (1) native life (2) game and (3) Victoria Falls'.⁴⁵ As he pointed out, Zululand possessed two of these three attractions - natives and game - why could these not be presented together?

The 1934 publicity booklet, *Natal's Nature Sanctuaries in Zululand*, expressed a hope that African residents should be allowed to remain in the Corridor area after it had been added to the Hluhluwe game reserve, on Captain Potter's authority:

There would appear to be no difficulty in allowing the native families resident in the area to remain, as the Game Conservator informs me that the natives are of a good type, and most of the native game guards are recruited from them. Possibly the authorities might seriously consider the advisability of exempting natives resident in the [game] reserves from taxation, as an incentive to assist in the protection of the animals.⁴⁶

What was envisaged could perhaps be thought of as an early version of today's cultural tourism. Such ideas would, however, change in the subsequent decade.

Inclusions, exclusions and new social controls

The period of the Second World War can be viewed as an era of transition from the personal control of a relatively sympathetic Conservator, to a more militaristic style of management and vigorous measures to exclude local people as new regulatory bodies were set up to control the game reserves. The shift towards a policy of exclusion should not be interpreted in a simplistic way as an undifferentiated story of colonial subjugation. A more complex social history emerges from interviews conducted with elderly men living in the tribal authority areas adjacent to the contemporary Hluhluwe-Umfolozzi park.⁴⁷ The interviews reveal a range of shifting responses to the actions of conservation authorities and to particular individual officials. For instance, Captain Potter is remembered in a largely positive light. Potter is exempted from resentment about new social controls involving fencing and forced removals. These stories complement the

archival record, adding an indispensable subaltern perspective to this account of the creation and maintenance of a colonial space of nature.

A fascinating feature of the social history of Hluhluwe and the other Zululand game reserves is the complicated relationships that evolved between white and black men within this space. Despite being unable to rise above the status of 'game guard' (the more important status of 'game ranger' being reserved for whites), Zulu men were indispensable to their white ranger bosses as teachers and guides to the wilderness. Zulu game guards had been a feature of the Zululand reserves since the 1890s. Before 1910, they enjoyed a certain prestige and autonomy, which ended when a permanent white Conservator was appointed over them in 1911. Under Captain Potter in the early 1930s, however, certain guards were again given more responsibility, mainly because the white conservation staff was so small. For example, for long periods African guards were in sole control at the Mkuzi reserve. And Potter's head game guard or 'induna', Mali Mdletshe, was responsible for the team protecting the rhinos at the Umfolozi reserve.

The memories of game guards who worked under Potter, centre on the responsibility with which they were entrusted, their uniforms and use of rifles. The rifle issued to game guards was both symbol and instrument of authority. Several former game guards recalled Potter's appreciation of their shooting skills as a qualification for employment. For example, Mr. Myeni was recruited after having illegally shot a rhino that had been destroying local people's crops. This was a serious offence. But instead of prosecuting him, Captain Potter offered him a job. Mr. Myeni vividly conveyed his sudden transformation into a game guard:

Mthwasi [Captain Potter] searched up and down for me. Mthwasi, after seeing the animal, concluded that I am good at shooting. He sent his *amasotsha* [soldiers, the game guards] to fetch me from home ... He took me to his office. There he told me, '...I am going to give you a job. I want you to work here' ...He took out two jerseys, two [pairs of] shorts, two shirts, two coats, a hat, a badge for the hat, a belt with an iron clasp, a whistle, and a card [license] for a rifle. He

gave me all these things and they took me to another room where I took off all my clothes and I put on the uniform ... He put on the belt and the jersey. He gave me the card and my cap ... He took me outside and he took a photo...He also gave me a rifle and he told me: 'This rifle belongs to you.'⁴⁸

Mr. Myeni remembered Potter positively because he treated the guards not merely as subordinates but as men, allowing visits from their wives while they were on duty.⁴⁹

All the retired game guards remember having to find animals to show visitors - they were also increasingly expected to serve as guides to tourists. Mr. Fakude remembers visitors' insatiable appetite for new animals.⁵⁰ From the point of view of the guards, their job not only gave them status, but also allowed them to stay at home and thus avoid migrant labour. As Mr. Mdluli commented, 'we were happy, because the game reserve itself was like our eGoli [Johannesburg].'⁵¹

It was not only as game guards that local men could find employment in the reserves. Jobs were also provided by the anti-*nagana* campaigns, which employed large numbers in the 1930s and 1940s, and there was a degree of overlap between the two workforces. The latter was involved first in game culling, then in fly trapping for which more men were recruited. In 1932, about one hundred men were working in and around the game reserves, in addition to eighteen or so African game guards under Potter.⁵² In such a context, reinventing the reserves as 'untouched' spaces of nature was not straightforward. In May 1936, when tsetse fly trapping was extended into the Hluhluwe reserve, Potter seriously considered closing off the reserve to visitors.⁵³ Visitors had to be shepherded, with Potter or a game guard personally escorting each party and keeping the tourists away, as far as possible, from tsetse fly operations. Motor cars had to be disinfected before they left the reserves.

Africans valued this source of work, the status it gave them, and also remember the period of their employment as a time of abundant meat. They portray the teams of men working in the reserves as relatively free of social hierarchy, and rations had to be provided for all of them.⁵⁴ Potter's popularity was certainly due in part to the fact that

he was responsible for shooting and dispensing game meat to the workers.⁵⁵ As Mr. Mdletshe, a campaign worker recalled:

During the time of Captain Potter, he used to slaughter *inkonkoni* [wildebeeste] for us. We all went there together with our children ... We used to slaughter the wildebeest inside the game reserve, and we all took the meat back home.... This was his rule. He instructed the game guards that they mustn't kill a female wildebeest, but they must kill a male one. Every one of us who went there came back with something. No-one came out empty-handed.⁵⁶

In Potter's time then, the game reserves were suppliers of jobs and meat to local African employees. However, local people also remember the same period as the time when fences were first erected, keeping them out and the wildlife inside the reserve, and indicative of moves toward the dispossession of their land.

By 1939, Potter's authority over the reserves was beginning to be undermined. Until this time, the game reserves were administered by the Natal Provincial Administration - nominally by the Administrator of Natal, but in practice by the Natal Provincial Secretary, to whom the Zululand Game Conservator reported. Under this arrangement, the Conservator had substantial personal autonomy and authority. The personal relationships Potter built up with neighbouring people were important and effective in resolving problems on the ground. But by the late 1930s, Natal politicians had become interested in the Zululand reserves, and especially Hluhluwe, for their tourist potential. The nearby St. Lucia estuary, which offered boating and fishing facilities, was also becoming popular. Now that the white public had to be catered for in these recreational spaces, the Game Reserves and Parks Advisory Committee lobbied for a more effective and powerful body.⁵⁷ The resulting statutory body, the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board, came into existence in June 1939.⁵⁸

From this point, relationships between the conservation authorities and local people in Zululand steadily deteriorated. The good relations that Potter had built up with neighbouring communities were compromised by the actions of this new, expansionist

Board. Thus the distancing effect of bureaucratization was felt on the ground in Zululand as changes in management undermined personal relationships in and around the game reserves: the further development of the Hluhluwe reserve's tourism potential increasingly meant that Africans were excluded from its space.

While local people were largely unaware of these bureaucratic changes, they do remember that their troubles with the Hluhluwe reserve began 'when Hitler's war started'.⁵⁹ Archival records show that three months after its creation, with war imminent in Europe, the board invited central government officials from the Department of Lands and the South African Native Trust (SANT) to the Hluhluwe reserve to talk about the future of the Corridor. They hoped to extract a promise that the Corridor 'be earmarked for a future extension of the Reserve as recommended by the [1935] Game Reserves Commission', rather than claimed by the SANT for African settlement.⁶⁰ The meeting was inconclusive, but the Board decided that in order to secure the Corridor, it would be strategic to fence the Hluhluwe reserve and demonstrate that wildlife and the potential for infection was contained.

Potter had already requested that the reserve be fenced: his first proposal for thirty-five miles of fencing was turned down.⁶¹ The new board, however, supported Potter, and after the meeting at Hluhluwe, Potter's request for fencing was reconsidered. In October 1939, the Natal Provincial Council voted one thousand pounds for fencing the reserve.⁶² The introduction of fencing was thus directly linked to the proposed consolidation of game reserve space through the addition of the Corridor lands. For local people a new era - one of alienation from the game reserves - began with the fencing issue:

The animals were there and people didn't have any problem with them. In the past, that fence was not there and there was no problem between the game and the people. Since the fence was put up, animals like lions, come out of the game reserve and they eat our stock. The *izimpisi* [hyenas] also come out and they eat our goats. But if we talk to them [the authorities], they don't listen to us.⁶³

Fencing is an important signifier of change in rural South Africa and a revealing point of tension between ruler and ruled. Isobel Hofmeyr's study of a rural community in the Northern Province reveals the changes fencing brought to the lives of local people and explores the strengths and weaknesses of oral memory as a form of knowledge used to argue with white officials in defence of rural space.⁶⁴ In the case of Hluhluwe, there was little opportunity for contestation and no engagement over the technology of the map. People were upset that the fence was being put up without consultation, and that it did not follow the reserve's original boundary as they understood it.⁶⁵ Their complaints were addressed through official channels to the Chief Native Commissioner for Natal, Harry Lugg. Lugg raised the matter with the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board and was reassured that the board was 'prepared to take the risk of any alteration should it be found subsequently that the boundaries laid down have not been correctly followed.'⁶⁶ Lugg then called a meeting with the people, indicated 'the positions of the beacons on the map', and informed the Chief that 'the boundaries as indicated thereon were correct and must be observed.'⁶⁷ He reported to the board chairman that 'The decision was accepted with a good grace and I have every reason to believe that nothing further will be heard about it.'⁶⁸

But a great deal was heard about it through the interviews I conducted in 1997. Fencing is a significant grievance in itself, but in this case is also linked to the forced removal of people from an expanding 'natural' space. The construction of fences to supplement or replace the boundary stakes and other markers denoting game reserves' borders, generated intense local conflicts over access to and ownership of land. Increasingly, the fences functioned to keep people out, as well as to keep animals in - they were not only about game control, but also about social control, and as such were bitterly resented. The decreasing permeability of Hluhluwe's boundary, brought about by fencing and various other restrictions on people's access to reserve land, is an important feature of the historical geography of the reserve from 1939.

As already explained, fencing was a precursor to forced removals. Negotiations over the 'clearing' of the Corridor lands took place from 1939 over a period of five years. The

archival record reveals a story of secret deals between central and provincial government departments in this matter. While it is difficult to assign ultimate responsibility to a single government department – several were involved - the attitude of the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board was consistent throughout and the board played an active role in pushing for removals. Members of the board wanted control of the Corridor lands, which would more than triple the size of the Hluhluwe reserve and allow the province direct control over a substantial number of white rhinos.⁶⁹ By early 1941, the Department of Lands was prepared to allow the provincial administration to control the Corridor pending a formal decision on the area's future.⁷⁰ The only problem was what to do about the people living there. The board (not the Conservator) favoured removing the homesteads.

In February 1941, the NPA's legal advisor, in an attempt to find out the legal standing of African people resident on crown lands, requested a further meeting with the Lands Department representative.⁷¹ In the course of this meeting, it was made clear to the NPA that any arrangements should be kept secret: it would not be politic to 'firm the position at this stage to an extent beyond what may be legally proper ... or to publicize overmuch what is being done.'⁷² There was to be no proclamation in the *Provincial Gazette*. At this meeting, too, the precedent was established that 'new arrivals' in the Corridor would be evicted by the Department of Lands on the province's request. Having agreed to these somewhat murky terms, control of the Corridor was unofficially given to the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board in April 1941. Because this affected African people, the Chief Native Commissioner was quietly informed of the fact.⁷³ It seems likely that the atmosphere of secrecy and associated actions was facilitated by war conditions.

While actual forced removals only took place in 1944, there was increasing pressure on residents to leave the area, and the involvement of the Department of Agriculture from the early 1940s was crucial here. Tsetse fly trapping in the game reserves had not solved the *nagana* problem, and attention was turning to the 'excess' domestic stock in surrounding native areas. A new tax was levied for the possession of livestock. Mr. Mfeka remembered that the Corridor lands were dubbed '*entela kabili*' [double taxes]

because of these livestock taxes.⁷⁴ Notwithstanding the taxes, many chose to pay until being forced to leave. In 1942, the situation became even more difficult when the Department of Agriculture requested that the Lands Department ensure 'all stock-bovines ... and small stock be removed' from the Corridor area.⁷⁵ It was thus no longer just a question of paying a tax; residents had to farm out their stock to relatives in other areas or sell them. Mr. Ngcobo remembered this as trickery:

We were at Masundwini. They told us that we ... must remain where we are now, and they said if we like, we can start cultivating the land. But [we must] sell goats, cattle, donkeys, cats and dogs. They said we must sell all these animals because they attract the *impukane* [flies] ... So they convinced us, because they told us that it is better if we move from that area rather than selling our stock.⁷⁶

The theme of trickery is prominent in accounts of the forced removal. Local people particularly resent having been 'tricked' into leaving their land in the Corridor on the pretext of *nagana* control. Oral evidence confirms that Native Affairs and other officials presented the removal as part of the anti-*nagana* campaign and as a temporary measure. As the tone of the following quotes suggests, this remains an explosive issue:

With the *nakane* issue, the whites were very clever. Because they told us that they want to help us, because they want to kill the fly which was also giving us problems because it was also killing our stock. So we were also happy to move, because we didn't want to see our stock dying. We saw our stock dying, so we could not resist because they were helping us by killing *unakane*, which was a problem to us. We became aware very late that they were cheating us.⁷⁷

People insist that they were told they could return to their lands. The promised waiting period - six years - is repeated all around the game reserve:

That area [the *khadado* - Corridor] is the land of the people. It is where all these people were removed. They were told that they will come back to that area after six years... They said they were killing the flies... Then the whites started building the game reserve. The blacks got nothing for their land. Their land was taken from them.⁷⁸

The final removals occurred by force in 1944, in the wake of many threats. Documents from 1943 make it clear that a firm decision had been reached that removals must take place by June 1944 at the latest.⁷⁹ Corridor residents attending a meeting in November 1943 were informed by the local magistrate and Native Commissioner that they could stay until June 1944, but that stock had to be removed immediately.⁸⁰ This meeting was attended by Chiefs Mtubatuba and Mtekelezi, together with their advisors (indunas) and eighty of their people. Induna Ntombela is recorded as pleading for leniency:

We do not dispute what the Government says: the Government has spoken about this for a long time. As people who have been living here for many years we thought the Government would sympathise with us and divide a small portion for us near the boundaries [of the Corridor crown lands]. We and our fathers and Grandfathers were brought up here and we know no other areas'.⁸¹

This, however, had no effect.

There were, then, a number of different government bodies involved in the removals at both provincial and national levels, including the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board (backed by the Executive Committee of the Natal parliament), the Native Affairs Department, the Department of Lands, and the Department of Agriculture, which ran the tsetse fly control programme. Eviction notices were distributed and the actual removal took place in May 1944. By this time, the situation had grown more complex, as the national government made a bizarre decision to earmark one section of the cleared Corridor land for 'coloured' occupation.⁸² Still, the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board fought for and was given a verbal undertaking that aside from the proposed 'coloured' reserve, the land would be placed under its control as a white rhino sanctuary.⁸³

The removals from the Corridor affected hundreds of households, and are still bitterly resented. A land claim is currently in process. It is striking that popular memory exempts Conservator Potter from involvement in both fencing and associated forced removals. Potter's daughter agrees. In her memory, 'he never wanted that Corridor. He was never happy about it. Because he felt that they were his friends, and people he knew

and the game guards' relatives.'⁸⁴ She remembers the removals as 'very traumatic ... a lot of bad feeling ... I can remember as a child going to some of the game guards' weddings and they lived in the Corridor.'⁸⁵ In fact, Potter did press for fencing and he did want the Corridor. But the spirit of the man is correctly remembered: he was sickened by the removals and would have preferred the Corridor's inclusion without them.

The removals deeply scarred relations between local communities and park authorities. Many game guards were affected by the removals, which were inevitably experienced as a betrayal by the provincial service. The best known Zulu game guard, Magqubu Ntombela, (who was 'mentor' to the international conservationist Ian Player) lived in Ongeni and worked first for the NPA and then the Natal Parks Board after 1947. But he never forgot this injustice.⁸⁶ Men like Magqubu Ntombela could belong within this 'wild' space as long as they were in uniform, and acted as a tourists' guide to the wilderness. But they could not continue to live there.

Fencing, removals and restricted mobility should be seen together, as a set of social and spatial controls. After the removals, rights of transit across the Corridor were made illegal, severing the links between people North and South of the Hluhluwe game reserve, such as those of Mpukonyone and Mpembeni.⁸⁷ In Mpembeni, people remembered:

Yes, we walked on foot to meet the people of Mpukonyoni. Yes, we even came back late at night from Mpukonyoni. Even when we were hunting, we used to meet with the people of Mpukonyoni. At that time, the [Corridor] game reserve was not there. As I told you, there is a difference between Umfolozi and Hluhluwe game reserve. They are separated. There were people's homesteads all over that place. You are going to see those homesteads if you look carefully. We walked on foot. But that now is no longer allowed. It is prohibited.⁸⁸

The game reserve, with its fences and patrolling game guards, became a formidable and inconvenient obstacle for residents of the tribal areas surrounding it. After 1940, it became increasingly difficult for local people to enter the reserve and poaching offences

were pursued more vigorously. Once the anti-*nagana* operations ended, tourists were unlikely to encounter in the game reserve any Africans other than game guards – who of course featured in tourism discourse as an integral part of the space.

These restrictions provoked later instances of resistance when Africans directly challenged the idea of a 'pure' space of nature from which African cattle, homesteads as well as people on foot were excluded. One such action, sometime in the 1950s, is illustrative. The action was deliberately provocative: the organizer hoped to be charged, and looked forward to raising in court the issues of fences, removals, and other forms of exclusion. As Mr Mkhize recalled:

Seven men drove seven cattle to the game reserve. They woke up early that morning and they went with seven cattle to the game reserve ... They were driving these cattle on the road and they saw their [Natal Parks Board] vehicle coming. They came to them and asked them, 'What are you doing here?' They answered, 'We are driving our cattle back. We just found them here inside the game reserve'. 'Oh, you have seven cattle and you are also seven in number'. They said, 'We are going to arrest you'.⁸⁹

Disappointingly for the organizer, the magistrate saw no reason to introduce issues of land rights into the case and the men were simply charged with trespass. However, the chosen idiom of resistance had been precise. The presence of local people walking through the reserves, or the presence of their cattle, disrupted the picture of a pristine Africa, and such people and domestic animals had to be excluded in order to maintain this image. The creation of a 'pure' space of nature in this context, now involved the explicit separation of 'nature' (in the game reserves) from African 'culture', in the surrounding tribal areas or native reserves.

It is important, finally, to note that local people do not dispute the existence of the original 1895 game reserves, though there is some dispute as to where their boundaries are located. Rather, old people focus on the 'illegitimate' game reserve created after the Corridor removals, and the trickery this involved:

No, no, no. We were not affected by the old game reserves. Everybody was happy with them... When the British came here first, they showed us the place of the game and they said we mustn't disturb them ... They told us that Umfolozi is the place of the animals.... We were happy about that. But we were very unhappy because they took our land [in the Corridor] and made it a game reserve. We were not happy because they moved us ... They took all our land, and that was painful. We are still unhappy. Even now, if I'm going to Mtubatuba, I feel sad if I pass there in the bus, looking at our land. I feel my eyes full of tears if I go past that area.⁹⁰

Conclusion

This paper traced the historical geography of a 'natural' space in a colonial context. It focused on the period of the 1930s and 1940s when the discourses and practices of nature tourism took hold in Natal and reshaped the space of Hluhluwe reserve - despite the difficulties caused by the political ecology of tsetse fly and disease. In the 1930s, 'primitive' spaces in South African were gaining new importance as a tourist spectacle: old game reserves were ideal for this purpose. In Hluhluwe's case, the emerging discourse of recreation was facilitated in the 1930s by Conservator Potter's residence in the reserve and his ability to offer a personalized experience of nature to (white) visitors.

By the end of the 1930s, this fresh perception of the game reserve as a valuable space for tourist development resulted in new structures of administration and the inauguration of new spatial controls. Increasingly, visitors to this exclusive space of nature (ironically now thought of as a 'public' space), expected to encounter a landscape featuring wild animals and 'unspoilt Africa'. Ambiguities and more positive possibilities were not lacking, but ultimately the management of the game reserve as a 'space of nature' entailed the systematic exercise of spatial controls over its landscape, contributing to the dispossession and exclusion of local people. Except in clearly defined subaltern roles such as that of 'game guard', Africans became increasingly invisible.

Local African people had a nuanced and shifting relationship with this ‘naturalizing’ space. They remembered cordial relations with the early reserve authorities, the opportunities for work, the plentiful supply of meat, and the status derived from employment as a game guard. But relationships around the expanding Hluhluwe game reserve deteriorated as a result of grievances focussed on fencing, restricted mobility, and above all forced removals. The evictions occurred during the Second World War, when war conditions heightened secrecy over the expansion of the game reserve and population removals. The paper thus documented the conditions under which nature’s ‘bounded distinctions of purity’ were recreated over time at Hluhluwe. It traced the shifting impact on local people and their material and emotional reactions to changing circumstances precipitated by the development of a tourism industry.⁹¹

¹ See Charles Zerner (Ed), *People, Plants, and Justice: The Politics of Nature Conservation* (New York 2000).

² Raymond Williams, Ideas of nature, in Raymond Williams, *Problems in Materialism and Culture* (London 1980) 67.

³ See Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel, Guest editorial: bringing the animals back in, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **13**, 6 (1995), and the papers in the issue; Chris Philo and Chris Wilbert (Eds), *Animal Spaces, Beastly Places: New Geographies of Human-Animal Relations* (Routledge 2000) and Jennifer Wolch and Jody Emel (Eds), *Animal Geographies: Place, Politics, and Identity in the Nature-Culture Borderlands*. (Verso 1998).

⁴ James Proctor and Stephanie Pincetl, Nature and the reproduction of endangered space: the spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest and southern California, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **14** (1996) 686.

⁵ Kate Soper, *What is Nature? Culture, Politics and the Non-Human* (Oxford 1995).

⁶ The expression was coined by Neil Smith.

⁷ Roderick Neumann, Dukes, earls, and ersatz Edens: aristocratic nature preservationists in colonial Africa, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* **14** (1996) 95.

⁸ See Bruce Willems-Braun, Buried epistemologies: the politics of nature in (post)colonial British Columbia, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* **87**, 1 (1997).

⁹ See Shirley Brooks, *Changing nature: a critical historical geography of the Umfolozi and Hluhluwe game reserves, Zululand, 1887 to 1945* (Ph.D thesis, Queen’s University, Canada, 2001). The Mkuzi reserve was added in 1912 and Ndumu in 1923.

¹⁰ See John MacKenzie, *The Empire of Nature: Hunting, Conservation and British Imperialism*. (Manchester 1988).

¹¹ Roderick Neumann, Ways of seeing Africa: colonial recasting of African society and landscape in Serengeti National Park, *Ecumene* 2, 2 (1995) and *Imposing Wilderness: Struggles over Livelihood and Nature Preservation in Africa* (Berkeley, 1998).

¹² David Bunn, Comparative barbarism: game reserves, sugar plantations, and the modernization of South African landscape, in Kate Darian-Smith, Liz Gunner and Sarah Nuttall (Eds) *Text, Theory, Space: Land, Literature and History in South Africa and Australia*. (London 1996) 39.

¹³ South African Railways, soon promoting tours of the Kruger Park, was itself shaping and transforming landscape visions (see Jeremy Foster, this issue).

¹⁴ See Jane Carruthers, *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History*. (Pietermaritzburg, 1995) and 'Dissecting the myth: Paul Kruger and the Kruger National Park, *Journal of Southern African Studies* 20, 2 (1994).

¹⁵ Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg, Ernest Warren Correspondence (EWC), File 'May 1930 to February 1931', Col. James Stevenson-Hamilton to Dr. Ernest Warren, 10 October 1930. Dr. Warren was the first director of the Natal Museum in Pietermaritzburg.

¹⁶ The Zululand game reserves had been founded as part of an official attempt to separate wild animals from domestic cattle, by concentrating the former in uninhabited areas like the Umfolozi valley. See Brooks, *Changing nature*. On tsetse fly and nagana, see Luise White, Tsetse visions: narratives of blood and bugs in colonial Northern Rhodesia, 1931-9, *Journal of African History* 36 (1995).

¹⁷ *Natal's Nature Sanctuaries in Zululand* (Pietermaritzburg, 1934), by E.K. du Plessis. Library, KwaZulu-Natal Nature Conservation Services headquarters, Queen Elizabeth Park, Pietermaritzburg, Box titled 'Reprints 1939'.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁹ Bunn, Comparative barbarism, 39.

²⁰ *Natal's Nature Sanctuaries*, 1-2. Note the importance of private transportation.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 3.

²² *Ibid.*, 2.

²³ *Ibid.*, 13.

²⁴ Carel Birkby, *Zulu Journey* (London 1937).

²⁵ Birkby, *Zulu Journey*, 142.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 9. Potter's Zulu name, Mthwasi, has two possible meanings - monkey-rope or tough, thorny vine, and 'the tall one'. Potter did not live in the reserve alone, but with his wife, son and daughter, and game reserve staff.

²⁸ Harris was an expert on the life cycle of the tsetse fly.

²⁹ When Harris' secondment ended in 1931, responsibility for Umfolozi was ceded by the province to the national Department of Agriculture to continue anti-*nagana* work. Harris continued to direct tsetse control operations, based at Umfolozi. Potter remained in charge of Hluhluwe and Zululand's other reserves, Ndumu and Mkuzi.

³⁰ Interview, Mrs Stafford, Durban, 20 April 1998. I would like to thank Captain Potter's daughter Mrs Stafford and his grandson Mr. Derek Potter, for their cooperation.

³¹ Potter Letter Book 1A, 6 September 1929 to 30 March 1931. Potter to Foxon, 16 February 1931. The Potter papers were viewed courtesy of Mr. Derek Potter.

³² Province of Natal, *Report of the Game Reserves Commission, 1935*, p.20. The Commission was appointed in terms of Notice No. 299, *The Natal Provincial Gazette*, 1 August 1935.

³³ *Ibid.*, 20.

³⁴ Pietermaritzburg Archives Repository, Natal Provincial Secretary (NPS) Files, Box 499, 1/11/3516, Zululand game reserves: reports, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1932, 8.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ NPS Box 257, 6/1747, Hluhluwe game reserve: rest huts; NPS Box 252, 1595, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1937; Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1938.

³⁷ Visiting scientists praise Zululand game reserve, *Sunday Tribune*, 29 October 1938.

³⁸ "Scientists enjoy visit - Hluhluwe Game Reserve - pleasant part of tour, *Natal Mercury*, 29 October 1938.

³⁹ NPS Box 499, 1/11/3516, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1932.

⁴⁰ NPS Box 257, 8/1747, Hluhluwe Game Reserve: introduction of species, Bush to Provincial Secretary, 11 June 1938.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Crown lands were unalienated state lands set aside for settlement, administered by the Department of Lands. Substantial native reserve lands bordered on the Hluhluwe and Umfolozi game reserves and were incorporated into KwaZulu homeland in 1972.

⁴³ NPS Box 499, 1/11/3516, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1932, 5; NPS Box 499, 8/3516, Game reserves: commission, Address given by the Provincial Secretary of Natal to the Durban Rotary Club ... on the Policy of the Administration in respect of Game Preservation in Zululand, February 1934.

⁴⁴ *Report of the Game Reserves Commission.*

⁴⁵ EWC, File December 1933 to July 1934, Warren to the Editor, *Rhodesian Weekly Review* 5 March 1934.

⁴⁶ *Natal's Nature Sanctuaries in Zululand*, 17.

⁴⁷ More than forty elderly men were interviewed (in Zulu) between January - March 1997 in six tribal authority areas. Bheki Nxumalo acted as interpreter and shaped the interviews in significant ways. The translations are a product of our joint transcription work.

⁴⁸ Interview, Mr. Myeni, Mdletshe tribal authority, 8 February 1997.

⁴⁹ Similar views were expressed by Mr. Fakude, Mdletshe tribal authority, 6 February 1997.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Interview, Mr. Mdluli, Mdletshe tribal authority, 5 February 1997.

⁵² NPS Box 499, 1/11/3516, Zululand game reserves: reports, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1932.

⁵³ The fly traps had to be monitored daily. Sixty Africans and two white staff were appointed to do this.

⁵⁴ The permanent game guards wore badges stamped with the letters 'G.G', while 'Mr. Harris' natives' wore badges stamped 'T.G.G. [Tsetse Game Guard]', NPS, Box 242,

15/1385 Game guards equipment, Provincial Secretary to Provincial Accountant, 23 May 1929.

⁵⁵ NPS Box 252, 1595, Game conservator: annual reports, Game Conservator's Annual Report for year ended 31 December 1938.

⁵⁶ Interview, Mr. Mdletshe, Mdletshe tribal authority, 6 February 1997.

⁵⁷ NPS, Box 499, Zululand game reserves: reports, Memorandum prepared by the Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Advisory Board on the present position in regard to the Hluhluwe, Umfolozi and Mkuzi Game Reserves and St. Lucia, with suggestions as to future policy, January 1939, 1.

⁵⁸ See *Natal Provincial Gazette*, Ordinance No.6, 1939 (Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Ordinance).

⁵⁹ Interview, Mr. Manyoni, Abasempembeni tribal authority, 12 January 1997.

⁶⁰ NPS, Box 257, 13/1747, Hluhluwe Game Reserve: Fencing, Zululand Game Reserves and Parks Board to Provincial Secretary, 27 September 1939. The SANT had been established under the 1936 Natives Trust and Land Act to control 'reserve' or tribal lands.

⁶¹ NPS, Box 257, 13/1747, Hluhluwe game reserve: fencing, Potter to Executive Committee, 14 August 1939.

⁶² NPS, Box 257, 13/1747, Hluhluwe Game Reserve: Fencing, Copy of Executive Council Resolution, 4 October 1939.

⁶³ Interview, Mr. Gumede, Mpukonyoni tribal authority, 15 January 1997.

⁶⁴ Isobel Hofmeyr, *We Spend Our Years as a Tale that is Told': Oral Historical Narrative in a South African Chieftdom* (New York, 1993) chapter three. Many of the same themes emerge in the context of the Hluhluwe game reserve. People possess a precise vocabulary of contested spatiality, referring to different kinds of fences, markers, trig beacons, and so on. Indeed, the Zulu word for game reserve, *isiqiwu*, means 'boundary marker'.

⁶⁵ Notice No. 164, *Natal Provincial Gazette*, 28 May 1930 extended the boundaries set out in Section 24 of the 1929 Game Regulations. On previous alterations see Provincial Notice No. 86, *Natal Provincial Gazette*, 23 May 1912.

⁶⁶ NPS, Box 257, 13/1747, Hluhluwe Game Reserve: Fencing, Chief Native Commissioner to Provincial Secretary, 6 September 1940.

⁶⁷ NPS, Box 257, 13/1747, Hluhluwe Game Reserve: Fencing, Chief Native Commissioner to Provincial Secretary, 9 November 1940.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Captain Potter had tried unsuccessfully to tempt the white rhinos into Hluhluwe by leaving a trail of molasses for them to eat.

⁷⁰ NPS, Box 252, 1/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: control of 'Corridor' tsetse fly. Provincial Representative, Department of Lands, to Provincial Secretary, 31 January 1941.

⁷¹ NPS, Box 252, 1/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: control of 'Corridor' tsetse fly, Legal Adviser to the Provincial Secretary, 7 February 1941.

⁷² NPS, Box 252, 1/13/9187, Tsetse Fly Campaign: control of 'Corridor' tsetse fly", Provincial Secretary's Memorandum to the Executive Committee, 24 February 1941.

-
- ⁷³ NPS, Box 252, 1/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: control of ‘Corridor’ tsetse fly, Copy of Executive Council Resolution, 22 April 1941.
- ⁷⁴ Interview, Mr. Mfeka, Mpukonyoni tribal authority, 15 January 1997.
- ⁷⁵ NPS, Box 252, 2/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: removal of native kraals from ‘the Corridor’, Secretary for Agriculture and Forestry to Secretary for Native Affairs, March 1943.
- ⁷⁶ Interview, Mr. Ngcobo, Abakwa tribal authority, 16 January 1997.
- ⁷⁷ Interview, Mr. Manqele, Abakwa tribal authority, 22 January 1997.
- ⁷⁸ Interview, Mr. Ngcobo, Abakwa tribal authority, 16 January 1997; Mr Mfeka, Mpukonyoni tribal authority, 15 January 1997; Mr. Ngcobo, Abakwa tribal authority, 16 January 1997.
- ⁷⁹ NPS, Box 252, 2/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: removal of native kraals from ‘the corridor’, Secretary for Agriculture and Forestry to Secretary for Native Affairs, March 1943.
- ⁸⁰ NPS, Box 252, 2/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: removal of native kraals from ‘the corridor’, Minutes of Meeting at Masundwini, 30 November 1943.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*
- ⁸² *Nagana* was suddenly no longer a problem! Not surprisingly, this never came to anything.
- ⁸³ NPS, Box 252, 2/13/9187, Tsetse fly campaign: removal of native kraals from ‘the corridor’, Provincial Representative, Department of Lands, to Provincial Secretary, 16 May 1944. The existence of this verbal agreement was later disputed and the Natal Parks Board did not gain formal control over the Corridor until 1989.
- ⁸⁴ Interview, Mrs. Stafford, Durban, 20 April 1998.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁸⁶ Interview, Ian Player, Karkloof, 10 October 1989; Ian Player, *Zululand Wilderness, Shadow and Soul* (Cape Town, 1997). Magqubu Ntombela died in 1993. On Player’s career, see Malcolm Draper, *Zen and the art of garden province maintenance: the soft intimacy of hard men in the wilderness of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, 1952-1997*, *Journal of Southern African Studies* **24**, 4 (1998).
- ⁸⁷ Mpukonyoni, Mpembeni and Ongeni were all places in the Corridor crown lands.
- ⁸⁸ Interview, Mr. Manyoni, Abasempembeni tribal authority, 12 January 1997.
- ⁸⁹ Interview, Mr. Mkhize, Ximba tribal authority, 27 March 1997.
- ⁹⁰ Interview, Mr. Manqele, Abakwa tribal authority, 22 January 1997.
- ⁹¹ Proctor and Pincetl, *Nature and the reproduction of endangered space*, 686.