

'... the trend of this thought in political action is well shown by recent events in Rhodesia. To sum up the story briefly, first, deliberate war was forced on the Matabele in 1893 by Dr Starr Jameson, who promised to each of the six hundred filibusters who rode against the natives, 6,000 acres of native land conditionally redeemable at £9,000. Secondly, in 1896, the Mashona, oppressed and subject to Forced Labour, heard of the collapse of the Jameson raid and rose against their oppressors. As a result both tribes lost their land, and 800,000 natives were allowed to live in their own country: (1) on those lands now taken by the whites by paying £1 per head to the owner and £1 to the Chartered Company; (2) on those lands which nobody had taken and nobody wanted, by paying £2 to the Company; and (3) on the lands set apart as Reserves, by paying £1 head tax. The first sort are known as Alienated Lands, approximately 20,000,000 acres; lands (2) and (3) as Unalienated, approximately 70,000,000 acres. In 1914 the expropriation of the whole of this Unalienated Land was effected by means of a deliberate plot combined with misrepresentations made to the High Commission of South Africa, now known and admitted to have been such, with the result that no single native of the Mashona, Matabele and kindred tribes was to own, either personally or through membership of his tribe, a foot of land, a spring of water, a sacred graveyard, a patch of garden, or even the plot on which his hut was built.

This expropriation of the rights of an entire people might well have gone wholly unchallenged but for the watchfulness of the Anti-Slavery and Aborigines Protection Society who brought it before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, April 16 to May 2, 1918. The Legislative Council of Rhodesia proceeded to add insult to injury. In 1914 they voted a sum to defray the costs of the impending action as "The cost of presenting the case of

the inhabitants and people of Rhodesia", so that they do not regard the 800,000 natives as either inhabitants or people of Rhodesia in comparison with a few thousand invading foreigners. But these costs were levied upon taxation of which nearly half is actually drawn from these natives, who were thus forced to pay for the case against themselves. The cost of the action for the natives was raised in England through the A. & A.P.S., but when the Society sent its secretary to South Africa to collect evidence, the Chartered Company declined to give the required powers. . . . '—*Blackfriars*, December 1920.

*In February 1921, a correspondent took issue with the author of this passage on behalf of the Rhodesia and British South Africa Company. In two memorable passages she explains the situation with regard to 'Forced Labour' and 'The people of Rhodesia':*

'Labour was needed by the Government, the mines, and by private persons in Matabeleland, and the Native Commissioners received instructions to comply as far as possible with these requirements. The Indunas were told that they would be expected to supply men, who would be fed and paid a fair wage. When they had been collected together, the "boys" were sent under the escort of native police to the Native Commissioner for the district to be registered, and were then drafted to the masters whose employ they wished to enter or to those who were seeking labour. In some instances the native police overstepped the bounds of their authority in procuring labour – in other words, using compulsion – but in every case where this was discovered the offenders were severely punished . . . The expression "inhabitants and people of Rhodesia" makes no distinction of race or colour. Natives in Rhodesia are entitled to the franchise on the same conditions as Europeans. The fact that the vast majority have not so far qualified themselves to exercise it is beside the point. . . .'