UNIVERSITY OF RHODESIA

HENDERSON SEMINAR NO.46

SEMINAR: 27 APRIL 1979

THE MECHANICS OF LAND ALIENATION, 1890-c.1904

by

F.J. MASHASHA

This paper is devoted to an examination, by no means exhaustive, of the actual processes and procedures involved in the alienation of land - the translation into reality of abstract rights. Such an investigation into the mechanics of land alienation, it is hoped, will enable us to elicit what criteria, if any, were used in the alienation of land. This in turn should throw some light on the 'red soil - sandy or granite soil', argument.(1)

Briefly stated the 'red soils' argument and its proponents hold that the present division of land in Rhodesia whereby the rich red black and heavy productive soils - 'the blue star diorite' soils(2) - are owned by the whites while the poor granite sandy and unproductive soils are held by Africans, is the result not of pure chance but of careful selection and location of farms by the whites.(3) This paper seeks, by searching scrutiny of the relevant documents as regards the alienation of land in the early years (since those were the years in which most of the land was alienated), to test the validity of that argument. Crudely stated this paper seeks to answer the question: When a man went out to 'peg off' a farm did he know the type of soil he was pegging on? And, if he did, what was the source of his knowledge? In other words, were there any guidelines on what soils to and not to peg on?

I propose to examine the problem under the following broad divisions:- Titles to land and the terms of tenure and occupation; who could apply for, peg off and occupy land; and where to and where not to peg.

Before we embark on our investigation, however, it is as well to say something very briefly about why land was alienated in what almost every scholar or amateur who has written or said something on the land question in Rhodesia had stigmatised as a most reckless manner. It has become almost de rigueur the custom for scholars of early (white) Rhodesia history to censure the British South Africa Company itself, and particularly its representative and second Administrator in Rhodesia, 'the swashbuckling'(4) and bumptious Dr Leander Starr Jameson, for the reckless alienation of land to private individuals, companies and syndicates in the early years of the occupation of the country. In this regard Milton's blistering censure of his admittedly instinctively impulsive predecessor Dr Jameson that:

> Jameson has given nearly the whole country away to the Willoughby's Whites and others of that class so that there is absolutely no land left which is of any value at all for settlement of Immigrants by Government ... it is perfectly sickening to see the way in which the country has been run for the sake of hobnobbing with Lord this and the Honble that, - (5)

has been quoted with approval by scholars of Rhodesian history.(6)

This criticism of Jameson and his methods is, in my opinion, only valid

in so far as it relates to his alienation of huge tracts of land to unimproving and speculative companies, e.g. Sir John Willoughby's companies and others of that kind is concerned - although even in those cases there were reasons why Jameson gave them so much land.(7)

As regards the alienation of land to individual white settlers what alternative, we may well ask of his critics, did Jameson have? For the occupation of Mashonaland and Matabeleland to succeed, the Company had to entice whites to come into the country and once there to keep them there. The best means of doing this was the grant of land to intending settlers on cheap and easy terms. To have first carried out a carefully planned scientific survey of Mashonaland and (later) Matebeleland, as suggested by A.H.F. Duncan in May 1890, when he was still Surveyor General of British Bechuanaland (i.e. before he joined the B.S.A. Company's Administration),(8) before any land could be alienated, would have been tantamount to giving the kiss of death to the whole 'Rhodesian' settlement venture.

Both the Company and the early settlers were adventurers in a hurry. Economically, the B.S.A. Company had to show quick returns to justify, to its shareholders, its initial outlay in the occupation of Mashonaland and Matebeleland Politically, the Company had to justify the exercise of the permissive powers of jurisdiction and administration it had been granted by the British Government in the Royal Charter. These objectives could not have been achieved as quickly as desired, and as they were finally actually achieved, through a carefully planned and controlled system of land alienation. Land - the primary commodity of production - and its control and use had to be quickly wrested from the Shona and Ndebele as otherwise these peoples would never have appreciated their changed political status, i.e. their 'conquest'. The indigenous people's rights to the land, in these circumstances and in such cases, are usually hardly ever of any consequence. The ethos of all such proceedings and also of the whole era, particularly as regards the white conqueror's indifference to the conquered indigenous people's rights was perhaps best stated by Sir Godfrey Yeatman Lagden, of Basutoland fame and who was the Chairman of the now famous South African Native Affairs Commission of 1903-1905. Lagden wrote:

> The rights or wrong/s/ of the conquest /of the Bantu?/ is not a question - otherwise where is it to begin or end - Europe was conquered & conquered through the ages. It is hypocrycy /sic/ to say that Africa was conquered for the sake of civilizing & christianizing or improving the aboriginals. Conquest is always deliberate ... Most of those promoters who advance the flag do it for the purpose of cultivating business. Philanthropy stays at home and moderates the policy and the pioneers.(9)

The early settlers too both farmers and prospectos and miners were also men in a hurry. They had not enlisted as 'Pioneers' and marched up to Mashonaland and/or participated in the 1893/4 war against the Ndebele for charity. They had invaded Mashonaland and risked their lives in the war against the Ndebele for a well defined objective - to enrich themselves. Consequently when they demanded their 'pound of flesh' it had to be given them. They meant to make their fortunes - and the quicker this was done the better, for many 'Pioneers', according to one of them, Adrian Albert Darter, had written home 'news' of the fortunes they were going to make, especially to their mothers whom hopefully they would take with them to America's Chicago 1893 Exhibition.(10) 'Most of the Pioneers had made that a rendezvous ... Everybody was going to make

money quickly and everybody meant to meet everybody else at Chicago. It was the Mashona adieu ...'(11) 'Of course I am desperately sorry to miss Ida's wedding', wrote another Pioneer in a similar vein to his mother, 'but there is no help for it. When my future gold mines are in full swing they shall all have gold galore & lets hope it will turn out a veritable El Dorado-/but/ that the country is rich there is no doubt & we are going to make openings into it & are sure to succeed'.(12)

In the face of both the Company's and the settlers' determination to make a success of the 'Rhodesian' venture for both political and economic reasons, we should not be surprised at the massive scale of land alienation that occurred and the almost total disregard of African rights that it entailed. Rather should we be surprised that Africans got any land at all for the whites' feverish acquisitiveness was such that they wanted to own practically all the land - good land, mediocre land, poor and bad land - as long as it was land. These men were motivated by the same spirit of feverish acquisitiveness as that which drove the early settlers in America's 'wild west' of whom the novelist John Steinbeck has written perceptively that:

> When people first came to the West, particularly from the owned and fought-over farmlets of Europe, and saw so much land to be had for the signing of a paper and the building of a foundation, an itching land-greed seemed to come over them. They wanted more and more land - good land if possible, but land anyway. Perhaps they had filaments of memory of feudal Europe where great families became and remained great because they owned things. The early settlers took up land they didn't need and couldn't use; they took up worthless land just to own it. And all proportions changed. A man who might have been well-to-do on ten acres in Europe was rat-poor on two thousand in California.(13)

Land in Rhodesia could be held under any one of the following titles or a combination there of:- Pioneer, Police, Civilian, Victoria Agreement Rights (also known as Matabele Column land rights), and other rights given in Salisbury and in Cape Town or elsewhere (by the Company) under various understandings or conditions such as, for instance, beneficial occupation or expenditure on development. No land in Rhodesia could be purchased as absolute freehold; all land, except township plots or stands were held on quitrent tenure, and was further subject to an annual quitrent of four shillings per morgen (for all areas of approximately 200 acres) and seven shillings and sixpence stamps on each separate area of five hundred (500) morgen or over. All mineral rights were reserved to the British South Africa Company by law.(14)

The 'Pioneer right' title to land was the most favoured form of title. It had no conditions attached to it except the payment of quitrent.(15) In addition to this the Pioneers got free title deeds to their land.(16) The Police Farm Right entitled the holder to locate 3 000 acres of land in Mashonaland, and carried a quitrent of £3 per annum. The land, in this case, had to be selected within three years from the date of discharge (December 1891) from the force, and bona fide and beneficial occupation was required. For those members of the force not discharged the service for misconduct, land was liable at any time to forfeiture for non-occupation.(17) Civilian rights to land had only the occupation and payment of the 'perpetual quitrent'(18) written into them. The fourth class of rights to land were the special grants made in Mashonaland in 1891. These were practically identical to the 'Civilian rights'.

'Certificates of Rights' were issued for all these rights; these certificates were for rights to 'select' farms only. With regard to all these rights, 'the gift, its acceptance, and the fulfilment of its conditions, stated in each case or generally, form(ed) by themselves indefeasible title'.(19)

Finally, in addition to the above four classes of rights to land, there was added, after 1893, a fifth category. This class of land title, as already stated, was known as 'Matabeleland Rights' or Victoria Agreement Rights. These rights were acquired by military service in the 1893/94 Ndebele war and were registered at the end of 1893 as per 'letters of registration' signed by Dr Jameson, the Administrator of Mashonaland.(20) These 'Matabeleland Rights' formed titles in themselves like those of 1891 (in Mashonaland), provided however that the farm they gave a right to was duly pegged off and registered,(21) although by 1897 some still had not advanced beyond on to this stage. The next step in the implementation of Matabeleland war service farm rights was for the holder of such right(s) to obtain what was called the 'Land Grant (Matabeleland Right) Certificate'. This certificate bore a £4 stamp but stated neither the position nor conditions of such right - it was simply a right to select a farm.

Under all these various rights to land, authority was given to individuals to 'peg out farms' of 1 500 to 3 000 morgen and, as the Surveyor-General, J.H. Orpen later put it, 'what we may call "estates" of all sizes up to and beyond 300 000 morgen (600 000 acres) and some by buying up claims to smaller extents laid out blocks of very large extent. All these grantees scrambled together for good land and often pegged out farms over each other's land, and all strove against each other'.(22)

An essential aspect to all these rights - with the notable exception of the Pioneer title - was 'occupation' of the land claimed. But what was the accepted definition of 'occupation'? The Surveyor General's Office's and Lands Department's definition of occupation was simple and unequivocal. 'The accepted definition of "occupation",' wrote Frank Inskipp in reply to a query from Milton, the Administrator, 'is personal and continuous beneficial occupation. If the farm is not personally occupied [by the white owner] an European substitute must be left on it.'(23) Merely growing forage on it does not constitute proper occupation ...'(24) Neither was 'placing a Native boy in charge of some cattle beneficial occupation'.(25)

But some farmers (and other land holders) especially the Boers who in these matters 'generally had the reputation of being fairly wide awake'(26) did not like the Company's stipulations regarding beneficial occupation of land and issue of title. They, like the Enkeldoorn farmers, were particularly vocal on this issue and demanded that occupation 'should be defined by money value, i.e. a certain amount to be spent on farm, or else bona fide occupation for three years',(27) and that final title in absolute freehold be granted after six months' occupation.(28) The Company however was firm on this issue,(29) although it was defeated by the force of circumstances. But when the Company stood firm on this principle, failure to meet its requirements regarding 'beneficial occupation' of land, meant forfeiture of the right to land as one P.J. Pieters who went away without either leaving a substitute on his farm, or getting the permission of the B.S.A. Company to leave the country(30) found to his cost. When Pieters came back from his unauthorised 'leave of absence', he found that his farm had been re-pegged by one G. Herbst. On applying to the Company for the right to re-occupy his farm or to peg off a new one, Pieters

was bluntly refused both requests.(31) Such hard luck cases were, however, few; the Company usually preferring to display magnanimity(31) in all its dealings with the early settlers.

Once a person's right to land under one or a combination of the rights to land enumerated above (- with the exception of the Civilian rights which were made non-transferrable in the early 1890s-) had been established, the person concerned could proceed to peg off his farm or mining claim. But what type of person did the Company want as settlers? Although in the early days the Company administration never explicitly limited the alienation of land to one particular race or economic class, there is little doubt that it tended to favour men of Anglo-Saxon descent and background with modest capital to sink into their ventures. Provided they had the means to start farming, Afrikaners were most welcome. But 'Asiatics, Egyptians or natives', as one Company official later put it, needed not apply;(32) so too, strangely enough, Germans.(33)

Although a lot of land went to many individuals of little economic substance in the giddy days of Dr Jameson, yet there were signs by 1895 of unwillingness on the part of the Administration to grant land wholesale. Calls began to be made by officials for a thorough investigation of the whole land issue before any more certificates of occupation were issued, also for the thorough investigation of the backgrounds of applications - i.e. their economic standing, age, etc.(34) This was needed in order to stop land being given to men of little means as well as to check fraud for it appears that some sharp whites, especially the Boers, who of course were no fools where land was concerned, were putting in claims on behalf of their minor sons(35) or friends and relatives not even resident in the country.(36)

The administration, particularly its officials in the provinces, was averse to granting land to 'low class' Europeans. Low class whites were those whites who were extremely poor and who, perhaps as a consequence of their poverty, lived like 'natives' and married or led 'immoral' lives with native women.(37) Applications for land from this class of would be settlers, especially those from the low class Afrikaners known as 'bywoners', were treated with utter contempt by the Administration. The comments of C.M. Cary, the Civil Commissioner of Victoria, on one D.A. Swart's application for a farm for himself and his father in 1913 are representative of many. 'The father Gideon Swart, Cary wrote, 'is a lazy type of individual & from what I can gather the son is the same, viz. indolent uneducated & unprogressive. The elder Swart had a really nice farm in Swartfontein /Transvaal? Orange Free State?/ /but/ he loafed on it for 5 years & then sold it. This I am afraid is the manner of these people, which by process of generations has become chronic.'(38) Messrs E.J. Egan and Bushney's application met with similar cavalier treatment since the applications themselves were 'not of a particularly desirable class'.(39) 'Bushney,' wrote the Civil Commissioner, 'is a leading light amongst a low class of Dutchman in this neighbourhood. His wife is notoriously intemperate, and his children are being brought up without the slightest moral guidance. Egan is a better class of man but addicted to bouts of drinking. He is now on the "black list". These people can hardly therefore be called desirable settlers.'(40)

This hostility to 'undesirable whites' was not local to Victoria. W.H. Longden, the Civil Commissioner for Melsetter - an area with a large Afrikaner population - was totally against land being granted to such shiftless individuals as can be seen from his remarks on a petition signed by several residents of Melsetter district asking that a grant of land be made to one

Johannes G.F. Klopper, 'a hanger-on to the Steyn-Henry /Kroonstadt/ trek' of 1895:- 'I may remark', Longden wrote, 'that he is hopelessly lazy, and for a long time has been supported by charity, his children being sent round to beg, which they apparently preferred to work'.(41)

In this Longden and Cary and other officials were only echoing what seems to have been Company policy since the early days in dealing with applications for land from 'undesirables'. In 1897, for instance, the Surveyor General dismissed the applications (made in 1892) of H.C. van Niekerk, L.F.C. Weiner and one Gisner with the following terse comments: 'Too lazy to work ... A real bad lot'; '... is a common or garden swindler type of Dandelion'; 'Take no notice of him'.(42)

The people that Civil Commissioners and other Company officials desired to see taking up land were men of economic substance with a progressive outlook 'and (generally) of a class that most benefit the district'(43) and, of course, ultimately, the country.

Another class of tenant that some Company officials came to strongly disapprove of as grantees and tenants were the large Companies who, as Frank Inskipp of the Lands Department put it in 1898 'have no intention of over occupying their land, and who are allowed to peg land to the exclusion of bona fide farmers'.(44) Officials like him feared that unless a check was made of their land grabbing activities, these companies might pick out all the available good ground there was leaving none for the bona fide farmer when all they did with the good land was to keep it vacant, 'and wait for un-earned increment'.(45) For this reason these officials viewed applications for huge grants of land from companies with extreme disfavour, as the case of one Walter Howard shows. In 1899 Howard applied for a grant of ten farms in Matebeleland. Howard's proposal was that the B.S.A.Company grant him 10 farms of 3 000 morgen each on condition, however, that within two years from the date of grant he would spent a sum of £1 000 in stocking each of the ten farms with cattle. If, however, he failed to spend the suggested sum - £10 000, he proposed that the grant be pro rata - i.e. one farm for every £1 000 spent within the specified time.(46) The Deputy Administrator in Bulawayo, Lawley, recommended this application for favourable consideration by the Lands Department.(47) But the Acting Assistant Surveyor General, Henry Sawerthal, poured cold water on the scheme. 'The question,' Sawerthal minuted caustically, 'is where does Mr Howard propose to locate the area of ten 3 000 morgen farms? There is no ground near any centre & to spend £1 000 per farm in any outlying part will certainly be a questionable enterprise spread over the next two years as the proposal indicates. Unless Mr Howard intends working in a quite original way he should not be allowed to swell the already bulky list of subsidy /subsidiary?/ Companies some of which the B.S.A. Company has now trouble enough to induce them to conform to terms of grants.'(48)

Once a man had established his bona fides claim to land under any one or a combination thereof of the different classes of rights to land and was not an 'undesirable white', he took the next vital step in the implementation of his right(s). This consisted of writing officially to the Secretary of the B.S.A. Company or the local Civil Commissioner cum Resident Magistrate lodging his application for a farm and stating the right(s) under which such claim was being made. The Secretary of Civil Commissioner in reply - if all was in order - would then send an official reply, embodying the conditions of their tenure once they had located and pegged off their farm. The application letter and the official reply to it would then be handed over to the Company's Surveyor General in Salisbury for registration and record.[49] Meanwhile the big day for the land right holder had come - that is the day when the grantee actually went out to peg his farm.

Where then could, and did, men peg? The answer to this question is simple. The early settlers could and did peg anywhere they pleased except on the Gold Belt[50] and municipal commonages. There were no directives or any guidance from the Administration as to what soil was or was not to be pegged on. There were no topographical maps or diagrams to guide a man as to his choice of the type of soil on which to locate his farm. Consequently men literally pegged everywhere and on all types of soils ranging from diorite and ironstone (good red soils) to granite (poor sandy soil). The result of this is, of course, that most farms were on mixed soil types - felsite, granitic soils mixed with sand, grey, red or black soils, and slates in some cases.[51]

Although this picture of blind pegging holds good for the overwhelming majority of the white settlers and other land holders, there are a few cases in which men were guided by what can only be called extremely rough and ready topographical survey. One such individual was Henry Sawerthal, a Government land surveyor in the 1890s who was later attached to the Surveyor General's office. When he was asked in 1900 to state whether certain farms south of the Enterprise Gold Belt, i.e. the farms "Mashonganyika", "Witness", "Goromonzi" and others right up to Chishawasha, were on "Gold Belt" or not, Sawerthal replied that when he surveyed these farms during the 1892/93 rainy season and declared them to be on Gold Belt, he had been guided in his decision by 'a milky discoloration' he observed in the waters of the rivers Chinyika and Nora.[52] 'By this discoloration,' he continued, 'the presence of granite is popularly taken for granted and over that stretch of ground there are numbers of granite boulders and some hills.'[53] This observation, Sawerthal went on, was further complemented by the presence of a native smithy on the farm "Mashonganyika" - although he could not say exactly where the African smiths got their iron ore from. 'The smithy,' he speculated, 'might point to shale formation traversing the granite and this in conjunction with the presence of the Mahobohobo /mizhanje/ trees could be taken to indicate the existence of gold formation.'[54]

This sort of crude geological and topographical survey meant that no one knew exactly where the "Gold Belt" in any district began or ended.[55] The confusion that arose from this state of affairs where "Gold Belts" of doubtful value proliferated all over the country drew pungent comment from the incisive (Sir) Francis James Newton. 'These promiscuous Goldbelts,' he observed sourly, 'appear to be injurious to agriculture. Do they really exist?'[56] Nobody in the Administration bestirred themselves to answer Newton's query.

The lack of proper maps, diagrams, survey, or even lists of farms granted or already pegged,[57] or of open and unpegged land, resulted in confusion, overlapping and overpegging of farms.[58] This also led to serious disputes amongst the land peggers as land holder fought land holder by trying to outsmart the other in the assertion of their rights. Some of the things that

happened were bizarre; only a few examples will be given here.

The first example, which is by no means unique, illustrates what sometimes actually happened when people were out pegging off farms. This is the case of one James Wilkins, an employee of the Anglican Bishop of Mashonaland (himself a keen landgrabber[59]), and an ex-Pioneer named Venables - both of Umtali. According to the Civil Commissioner for Umtali, Venables pegged off a farm some time early in 1891, but lost the farm through the Civil Commissioner's decision 'after evidence had been taken'.[60] Venables was, however, given permission to look for another farm, and he indicated to the Civil Commissioner that he would peg one near Christmas Pass. Maglashan continues: 'It appears he and Wilkins were on the same ground the same day and pegged the disputed farm simultaneously. Wilkins however recorded the ground in our books one day before he actually pegged it...'[61] The Civil Commissioner decided the case in favour of Venables because of Wilkins' irregular proceeding.

The second example also illustrates the phenomenon known as "jumping"of farms. This was a process whereby, on seeing a "vacant" farm, a man out to peg a farm could "peg" such farm even though it was already pegged and registered under another man's name. The important thing in "jumping" a farm or farms was that the man doing so should satisfy himself and the authorities that the farm(s) in question had not been "beneficially occupied".[62] A good example of "jumping" a farm is the case of "Coldstream 14" Farm in the Umtali district. According to the Government Land Surveyor in that district, Rhys Seymour Fairbridge, this was 'a typical case of "jumping"'.[63] G.C. Glass (ex-Police) and Venables (Pioneer)[64] pegged the same farm on the same day. Venables, however, agreed to vacate the farm in favour of Glass but only on condition that Glass occupied the farm. 'Glass built a hut and then left.'[65] Whereupon Venables 'applied for the farm as being vacant'.[66] But then one Maritz, acting for Glass, agreed with Venables that if Glass 'did not personally claim the farm by the 15th October 1892 ... Venables was to retain same'.[67] At this point the Civil Commissioner intervened and told Venables and Maritz that their agreement was 'ultra vires'. But he at the same time instructed Venables to request the B.S.A. Company to formally call upon Glass to 'show cause why the farm Coldstream should not be officially declared abandoned'.[68] This Venables agreed to do - unfortunately, however, there is no record of what finally happened. It was cases like this which prompted the Administration to issue an "anti-jumping" notice in August 1892.[69]

The third and final example illustrates some of the sharp practice that occurred amongst the early settlers. The quarrel between the brothers Posselt - W. Posselt, T. Posselt, N. Posselt and Hermann Posselt - and Carl F. Cremer, is a good case in point. The Posselts, who were in the country before its occupation by the B.S.A. Company, and who claimed to have 'discovered the Zimbabwe Ruins in 1887',[70] claimed 'Pioneer Farm Rights' on the basis of a letter allegedly given to them by Rhodes, 'promising them Pioneer Farms as well as two or three of their "friends"'[71] who, however, were unnamed. Although not named in the 'original Rhodes letter', the Posselts' friends, it later transpired, were Carl Cremer and Carl Friedrich W. Nauhaus. A third "friend", one Richter, was dropped by the Posselts.[72] In October 1892 the Posselts and their friends had duly applied for and pegged their farms at Zimbabwe. Only three Pioneer rights including Cremers were, however, used in the pegging of the large estate "Erichstahl" which was 6,710 morgen in extent (about 13,000 acres).[73] Cremer's right was actually pegged for him by one of the Posselts (either William Felix or T. Posselt) who, however, do not seem to have ever shown or told him the exact location of his farm.[74] The Posselts moreover registered Cremer's farm not as a "Pioneer" but as a "civilian right" farm, which Cremer only discovered in 1898 when, after a long absence in unknown parts, he applied for a certificate of right in regard to

his farm.[75] There can be little doubt that the Posselts indulged in this sharp practice because they wanted all the land allegedly granted under Pioneer right - the most favoured form of title to land in Rhodesia - by Rhodes for themselves.[76]

The case as to what happened to Cremer's Pioneer right never went to Court because, fortunately for the Posselts and the Administration, fate intervened. During the 1899-1902 Anglo-Boer war Cremer left Victoria and joined the Boer forces, but he was taken prisoner by the British and shot as a rebel.[77]

The Posselts' conduct was not unlike that of the Moodies in Melsetter. Settlers in that district complained that 'anyone not in the Moody /sic/ family' were 'put off with anything the Moodys taking the best',[78] as a result of which several people left Melsetter 'in disgust'.[79] G.B. Dunbar Moodie's tactic was to prevent others from pegging off farms on good land by always claiming that he was reserving the land for his 'uncles and cousins'.[80]

One can also scarcely resist the speculation that some of the confusion that arose as a result of overlapping and overpegging of farms and mining claims was the result of many land grabbers doing all their pegging from the comparative comfort of their homes or town hotels on utterly unreliable maps and diagrams supplied by those who had actually gone out in the veld to peg off their land, that is that pegging was in such cases a matter of imaginative guess-work. This seems to have been the case, for example, in the Anglican Bishop of Mashonaland's "farms" at Murahwa's and Nyabadza's kraals in the Umtali district since neither the Civil Commissioner there nor the Bishop's own representative in Umtali, Douglas Pelley, could say for certain where either of the two kraals were.[81] The sketch plans furnished by the Bishop, said the Umtali land surveyor, were utterly useless since they relied 'simply on the name of a native Induna - changeable at pleasure - instead of stating a distance and direction from some known point'.[82]

Another significant result of the fact that the early land grabbers were free to, and in fact did, peg anywhere they pleased (provided it was off the Gold Belt and three miles from the centre of any municipal commonage) was that people pegged on native occupied land. In fact the fact that natives were settled on a particular piece of ground was taken as good evidence - which in fact it was - that the land in question was good land for both agricultural and grazing purposes. The land grabbers were also aided in this by the fact that in the early days the Surveyor General specifically instructed Government land surveyors that 'no native locations need be reserved, as such...'[83] Consequently, in the absence of any serious restrictions on their activities, the early land grabbers soon pegged off farms on land that was thickly populated by Africans.[84] And, as has already been stated above, the Africans' rights to the same land were of little or no consequence.

Pegging farms on land occupied by natives also had certain other advantages, both immediately and in prospect. A farm with a large native population provided the farmer with a good opportunity to practise "Kaffir-farming" - i.e. the system of ploughing "on-halves" and share-cropping, and also for levying a monetary rental from the Africans. This, of course, enabled the landowner to make some money from land which would otherwise not bring in any income as the early settlers lacked both the means and the energy to work their land with any hope of earning a decent living from it. By pegging a farm on land thickly inhabited by natives, the farmer or landowner

also provided himself with a ready-made local labour force[85] - although this was largely in prospect since there was no farming worth the name in the early years of the occupation. It is these factors which explain why most farmers like L. Meredith and one Bennett pegged their farms right in the middle of Mangwende's country - Nhowe - close to the villages of ngwende himself and his kinsmen Muchemwa, Derere and Gatsi.[85]

Once the initial hazards of actually locating and pegging off a farm[87] had been successfully overcome, the land grabber took his next important step. The exact procedure to be followed was laid down by the Company. The applicant, on lodging his application, had also to submit (i) a sketch showing the land applied for; (ii) proof that he was 'possessed of sufficient stock &c for bona fide farming, and if not, whether they have the means for obtaining it';[88] and (iii) three recommendations from the three most important civil officials in their district, namely, the Mining and the Native Commissioners and the Civil Commissioner and Resident Magistrate.[89] If these conditions were satisfactorily met, the farmer would then be issued with his "Certificate of Right" (or Permit of occupation) actually to take physical possession of his farm. The "Certificate of Right" would therefore only be issued on bona fide promise of beneficial and personal occupation, and farms pegged off and occupied on these certificates could be enregistered in the local Civil Commissioner's books. But this did not in any way 'impose upon the B.S.A.Co. the duties of sentry over the farm'.[90] It merely served 'as reference or evidence in controversies &c' that might arise 'owing to any overpegging or occupation of the ground, either before or after the enregistration of any farm'.[91] The duty of sentry over farms was the responsibility of the landowners themselves and the Administration, in some cases, had no sympathy at all with those who failed to beneficially and personally occupy their farms.[92]

Only when all the requirements stated above had been satisfactorily met, and the land beneficially occupied for six months, could the land-holder apply for the issue of "Provisional title" to his land.[93]

To get 'good title to their lands'[94] farmers had to further comply with yet another set of requirements. The procedure here was that the land to which final title deed was sought should first be inspected and reported on - as to the work done and improvements made - by an official of the Administration - either the local Civil or Native Commissioner or member of the B.S.A. Police, or most preferably, an officer from the Surveyor General's office. This had to be done before final title could be issued. But despite the fact that it was at the request of landholders themselves that inspection and/or survey of land were made, such inspections or surveys, and indeed land surveyors themselves, were unpopular. This was particularly so in those cases where landowners had overpegged and knew that inspection and survey of their property meant loss of the excess area as well as the payment of survey fees. In such cases the landowners resorted to tactics which ranged from simple refusal to pay survey fees[95] to instructing surveyors 'so to cut off any excess as to make it valueless to anyone else',[96] to disappearance from home for some other place 'on no very important business...'[97] hoping, of course, that the surveyor would go away and perhaps never return and the landholder could keep his land as he had pegged it.

On receipt, however, of a favourable inspection report, the Surveyor General issued the farmer or landowner with his Final Title. The farmer sent in the original grant, which was itself a kind of provisional title, for

cancellation, as the new Title Deed with a diagram of the land replaced the original grant. In those cases where notarial transfer of the original letters of grant had been effected, however, such notarial transfer document had to be submitted to the Surveyor General's office.[98] Moreover, receipts relating to quitrent for all the years dating from when the grant was made had also to be concurrently submitted with the original or document of notarial transfer of original grant. Any landowner who had evaded payment had to be made to pay up the balance due before he could get the Final Title Deed from the Administration. No excuses were allowed in this matter as the public had been notified that quitrent could be paid to any Civil Commissioner if it was convenient to the landowner to do so, if he happened to be away from his own Civil Commissioner at the time quitrents fell due, i.e. in the beginning of each year.[99]

But as much of the land in Rhodesia was held on 'very informal titles', not many people bothered to obtain Final Title. As the Surveyor General, Orpen, observed in 1897, once many landholders had had their properties surveyed and had complied with all the legal requirements as to 'publication of notice and calling for objection, like calling banns',[100] they considered that they had acquired 'perfect security or quite sufficient security against Government and individuals', and could 'wait as long as they please/d/ before they trouble/d/ about obtaining Final Title'.

It is this indifference to obtain Final Title Deed to land together with the Company's insistence upon the strict observance of all the requirements for the obtaining of such title - especially the stipulations as regards the inspection of land and report thereon, as well as the payment of survey fees - which explains why land registers were incomplete and unreliable, and why the land question in the first decade of the Occupation was so confused as well as confusing. Little did Civil Commissioners and other officials realize that this was basically the cause of the confusion over the land ownership and tenure against which they thundered. It simply was not worth the trouble to the landowner to obtain final title to his land - in fact, given the circumstances of the time, it was a needlessly costly business; hence the landowners' reluctance as well as indifference over the proper registration of their land with the authorities.

The confusion that arose from all this was widespread and the bane of good administration; hence civil officials' calls for the compilation of complete and thorough up-to-date registers of all farms and other land alienated in their districts with statements of the terms and conditions of each grant. Thus in 1892 the Civil Commissioner of Umtali called for a register of the farms in his district in order, as he put it, to put an end to 'the very great confusion ... in this district in regard to the pegging of Farms'.[101] Out of ninety-seven farms recorded in his office, the Commissioner continued, only thirty-seven had been surveyed, and yet applications were still pouring in.[102] Moreover, and what was even more disquieting for the future, in some instances people had registered and occupied farms and built on them, only to find later that their ground did not extend to where they had imagined it did.[103] Although of course all such persons took all the risks of occupying land prior to thorough accurate survey, yet it was perfectly obvious the Administration might, if this process was not checked, in future find itself having to pay heavy compensation for "improvements" made on land which on accurate survey turned out to be outside the boundaries of the landowner's original grant.

In 1895 the Civil Commissioner of Victoria also called for a comprehensive register of all the farms in his district. This was necessary, he said,

in order to enable the State to take in, in the form of quitrents, the 'hundreds of pounds a year' due to it as land revenue which, however, was not being collected simply because no proper quitrent registers were kept. The custom, said the Commissioner, was 'to receive a quitrent when it is offered but otherwise not to do anything about collecting quitrents that are due'.[104] This was so because Civil Commissioners lacked instructions 'about who to collect from & what amount to collect from each farm'.[105] Such registers of persons to whom certificates of right to peg and occupy farms had been granted became even more necessary after the 1896/97 uprisings, as the war had 'to some extent been an excuse for the non-fulfilment of the conditions /of occupation/',[106] and it was now deemed time that the farms were inspected and reported on so as to determine 'how far the conditions of grant have been complied with',[107] and whether the time in which 'to occupy and improve' should be extended or not, and generally to enable the Administration to decide on how to deal with the whole issue.[108] This was all the more urgent because, said the Civil Commissioner, Victoria, 'Many persons who had held these grants have left the/se/ territories and others have neglected their farms without any regard to the conditions of such grant/s/.'[109]

But although registers were made by some Civil Commissioners, the land position still continued to be chaotic as information on farms, pegged and surveyed or unsurveyed, as well as open land was still very incomplete.[110] Farms therefore still remained largely unoccupied; the Administration continued to suffer a loss of revenue, while the country generally suffered from agricultural stagnation, and officials continued to fulminate impotently against the lack of progress in farming.[111] Thus in the Victoria district there were, according to the Civil Commissioner in 1898, 'not more than three bona fide farmers ... and these are poverty sticken men who can accomplish but little'.[112] On the seventy-three surveyed farms in the district there were only three resident owners, but these were 'practically transport riders and traders rather than cultivators'.[113] In the Umtali district of 224 farms in 1895 only two were occupied, while in Hartley of 21 farms pegged between 1891 and 1896, only three appeared to have been worked.[114] Similar statistics exist for the other farming districts of Mashonaland. Matabeleland fared no better.[115] This, as has been pointed out by Palmer, was the beginning of absentee landlordism in Rhodesia. (116)

Both the Administration and the farmers were fully aware of the cause of the country's agricultural malady, namely the severe lack of capital[116] and agricultural equipment, which was accentuated by the natural disasters that befell the fledgling Colony in its infancy -- the rinderpest (pre-1896) and the East Coast Fever (1903-04) which decimated the cattle.[117] The torpid doldrums into which Rhodesian agriculture had sunk during the years before the agricultural upsurge of 1904 is perhaps best summed up by Edward James Lawlor, Acting Civil Commissioner, Victoria, in 1903, who wrote:

> Many of the farmers are, it is true, in very poor circumstances, and are unable through lack of means, to operate on a large scale, but I cannot help thinking that in some instances the small amount of progress made is largely attributable to want of energy. Farmers who owned cattle were attracted by the apparent advantages to be gained by Transport riding, & preferred earning money quickly in that manner to the slower but more certain method of working their Farms. Now that they have been obliged through loss of cattle /through East Coast Fever/ to return to their Farms and devote their energies to farming matters, I consider that they will be able - if industrious - to ride over the present depression without Government assistance.[118]

By this time, however, the fundamental re-think by the Company of its policies and priorities was almost complete. The result of this re-think was that farming ceased to take second place to (gold) mining and became a major state concern. This was the beginning of scientific and commercial capitalist agriculture in Rhodesia, and the alienation of land began to be very much more tightly controlled and to be made on sounder topographical knowledge. This was a significant break with the giddy years of Dr Jameson.

It is abundantly clear from the source material that the alienation of land in the early years of Company rule was a hazardous and haphazard business. There was no systematic location of farms or blocks of land on a particular soil type - indeed the opposite was the case, and farms were located indiscriminately on any soil type or mixture of soil types. Conscious avoidance of pegging on "the granite" is very much a post-1900 phenomenon. The present pattern of land ownership whereby practically all the good productive land is in white hands, while the Africans' land is basically sandy veldt, poor and unproductive, is largely the result of post-1900 policies, especially the formal delimitation of the Reserves in 1914/15 and in 1930, and the enforced eviction of Africans from white-owned land.

References

1. For a statement of this argument see R. Palmer - 'Red Soils in Rhodesia', African Social Research, 10, 1970, pp.747-58.
2. See H.V. Moyana - 'Land Apportionment in Rhodesia 1920-1930' (Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University, 1974), Chapter IV.
3. See for instance R. Palmer - Land and Racial Domination in Rhodesia (London, 1977), p.41; and Moyana - op.cit., passim.
4. R. Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, p.
5. National Archives of Rhodesia /hereinafter NAR/ - Hist.Mss M1 1/1/2 - W.H. Milton, Administrator of Rhodesia, to his wife, 25 September 1896.
6. See for instance L.H. Gann - A History of Southern Rhodesia Early Days to 1934 (London, 1965), p.146; J.S. Galbraith, Crown and Charter The Early Years of the British South Africa Company (London, 1974), p.277 et seq.; and R. Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, pp.35, 48.
7. -
8. L2/3/6, J.A. Stevens, Surveyor-General of Cape Colony, Cape Town, to J.M. Orpen, Surveyor-General of Rhodesia, 21 December 1900, enclosing, 'Memorandum re Survey of Land and Settlement in Mashonaland', by A.H.F. Duncan, Surveyor-General of British Bechuanaland, Vryburg, 28 May 1890.
9. Lagden Papers, Mss.Afr.S.210(2) - Question of Natives inS(outh) A(frica) n.d., but probably Oct 1901 (see Ibid - Mss. Afr. S211(5a) - Lagden to Milner, 19 October 1901.
10. Adrian A. Darter, The Pioneers of Mashonaland (Books of Rhodesia, Volume 17, Bulawayo, 1977), p.113.
11. Iden.
12. NAR- Hist.Mss DY1/1/1 - Lawson L.B. Dykes to his mother, 24 February 1890. See further Hist.Mss DY1/1/1/2- Dykes to his mother, 16 February 1891.
13. John Steinbeck - East of Eden (Pan Paperback Edition, London, 1970), pp.15-16.
14. See L2/4/14, Scretary, Department of Lands, Salisbury, Rhodesia, to Nicholas Lobb, Cornwall, United Kingdom, 2 Sept. 1901.
15. See L2/4/20, 'Memorandum on Public Travelling Rights', by J.M. Orpen, Surveyor-General, on a minute of Sir Thomas Scanlen, Attorney General of Rhodesia, submitted for report (doc. no.4948/21/1/97S), n.d.; also L2/4/25, Orpen, Surveyor-General, to Under Secretary (to the Administrator), 11 July 1898.
16. See National Archives of Rhodesia (NAR)- Hist.Mss DY1/1/1/2,Lawson L.B. Dykes to his mother, 16 Feb. 1891.
17. Although the position was fairly clear it appears, however, that a lot of the people concerned did not really understand the terms of the contract they had signed to serve as policemen and then claim their farm rights - see ease of Charles Morkel in A3/15/3/2 (folio 262) - C.H. Morkel to Acting Administrator, Salisbury, 12 March 1896.
18. See DV3/9/1 - Frank W. Inskipp, Lands Department, Salisbury to Lieutenant Colonel William Sitwell, Dublin, Ireland, 7 May 1904.
19. L2/4/20, Memorandum by Orpen, Surveyor-General, n.d.
20. Ibid. (p.19 of memorandum).
21. Iden.
22. Ibid, (p.15 of memorandum)
23. L2/4/29, Minute by F.W. Inskipp, 7 Jan.1898.
24. L2/4/29, Minute by F.W. Inskipp, 1 Dec. 1897.
25. DV1/7/1, A.H.F. Duncan, Surveyor-General, to Civil Commissioner, Victoria, 31 January 1895.
26. H.M. Hole, Old Rhodesian Days (London, 1928), p.78.
27. L2/3/1, Notes of a meeting between members of the Enkeldoorn Farmers' Association deputation and Sir Thomas Scanlen, Legal Adviser to the Government, J.M. Orpen, Surveyor-General, and Percy S. Inskipp, Enkeldoorn, June 1899.
28. Ibid.

7

29. Ibid.; and A3/15/5, correspondence between Milton, Administrator, Orpen, Surveyor-General, and the Acting Administrator in Bulawayo in Feb. 1898, and especially memorandum by Surveyor-General on beneficial occupation of land dated 28 October 1898; and ibid, (folios 55-97), J.M. Orpen, Surveyor-General to Managing Director, Willoughby's Consolidated, Bulawayo, (draft letter), n.d.
30. It was obligatory on the settlers, in the early days, to ask and obtain permission to leave the country from the B.S.A. Company authorities - see for instance DV1/7/1, W.R. Fielde, Acting Secretary to the Executive Council, to Magistrate and Civil Commissioner, Victoria, 16 Jan. 1896; and ibid, F.W. Inskipp to Civil Commissioner, Victoria, 9 July 1891.
31. See L2/3/1, Notes of a meeting between members of Enkeldoorn Farmers Association deputation and Sir Thomas Scanlen, J.M. Orpen, and P.S. Inskipp, June 1899.
32. See A3/15/1/1 (folio 226), D. Lindsay, Secretary, Commercial Branch of the B.S.A. Company, to Secy, Department of the Administrator, 23 May 1913.
33. L2/3/18, P. Inskipp to Director of Land Settlement, 3 May 1911, and ibid, Director of Land Settlement to London Board (of B.S.A.Co.), (draft) telegram, 28 April 1911.
34. See L2/4.5, J. Vintcent, Acting Administrator, to H. Sawerthal, (Surveyor-General?), December 1895.
35. See L2/4/15, M. Moodie, Charter, to Land Surveyor, 23 Jan. 1893 (re one Kotzee's application for a farm for his son) and minute by Sawerthal, n.d.; ibid, Percy S. Inskipp to L.J. Macfarlane, 31 Jan. 1895.
36. L2/4/5 - Thomas Ignatius Ferreira, Act. Field Kornet, Charter, to Surveyor-General, 26 Dec. 1895; and ibid, Ferreira to Duncan, 26 Feb. 1896.
37. See for instance DV2/1/2 (p.164), C.W. Cary, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Director of Land Settlement, Confidential, 13 Oct. 1913.
38. DV2/1/2 (p.61) - C.W. Cary, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Director of Land Settlement, Confidential, 18 September 1913. Very few of the British applicants, however, were turned down for laziness.
39. Ibid. Cary, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Director of Land Settlement, Confidential, 27 Oct. 1913.
40. Idem. See further, ibid, Cary, Victoria, to F.D. Wise, Director of Land Settlement, Confidential, 3 Sept 1913, and ibid, Cary to Director of Land Settlement, Confidential, 13 Oct. 1913. Although the Civil Commr paints Egan and Bushmey in very black colours, yet the two men seem to have done some considerable work on the farm they already owned. A report on their farm revealed that although the brick house and huts on the farm were in a shocking condition, they ran 147 head of cattle (including calves) on it, had planted a total of 84 fruit trees, and had put some 20-5 acres of land under cultivation although this was largely the work of a 'Dutch' family they allowed to squat on the farm and with whom they shared the crops in equal halves - see DV3/9/3, N.S. Mansergh to Acting District Superintendent, B.S.A. Police, Victoria, 17 Nov. 1913.
41. L2/4/12, W.H. Longden, Civil Commr, Melsetter, to Surveyor-General, 9 April 1898.
42. DV3/12/1, Civil Commissioner, Victoria, 'Register of Names of Applicants for farms' - Comments by Surveyor-General, 31 Jan., 28 May and 13 Dec. 1897.
43. L2/4/13, G. McTulloch, Government Representative, Enkeldoorn, to Surveyor-General, 28 Feb. 1898, and L2/4/12, Longden, Civil Commer, Melsetter, to Surveyor-General, 9 Apr. 1898.
44. L2/4/20, F.W. Inskipp to Under Secretary, 9 Sept. 1898.
45. Idem.
46. L2/4/8, A. Lawley, Deputy Administrator, Bulawayo, to Acting Administrator, Salisbury, 29 Jan. 1898.
47. Idem.
48. Ibid., minute by H. Sawerthal, Act.Ass. Surveyor-Gen., 11 Mar.1898.

49. See L2/4/23, F. Rutherfoord Harris, Secy, B.S.A.Co. to W. Newdigate, 10 Sept. 1891.
50. Although it was government policy that 'no ground on gold belt should be alienated for farming purposes' (q.v. L2/3/41 - E.W.S. Montagu, Secy for Mines, Minute, 11 Sept 1903), some farms, admittedly only a few, were granted on 'Gold belt' - see for instance, L2/3/61, Sawerthal to Surveyor-General, 6 Apr. 1894.
51. See generally L4/4/1-18, Land Inspection Reports.
52. L2/3/30, Memorandum by Sawerthal, 27 Mar. 1900.
53. Idem.
54. Idem.
55. See for instance L2/3/40, Minutes by H. Sawerthal and J. Griffin, Commr, of Mines, 29 Mar. 1899 (on Ibid, Mining Commr, Umtali, 'Report on Land Application of Mr Palmer', 22 Mar. 1899).
56. L2/3/41, Minutes by F.J. Newton, Treasuer, B.S.A.Company Administration, 23 Feb. 1904.
57. See for instance, L2/3/13, Longden, Civil Commer, Tuli, to Surveyor-General, 20 Dec. 1897.
58. See for intance L2/3/25, Minute by N.H.S. Lee, Examiner of Diagrams (on Espin & Fletcher, Govt Land Surveyors, Bulawayo, to Surveyor-General, 28 Sept. 1903), n.d.; also L2/3/26, C.E. Gilfillan, Government land surveyor, to Surveyor General, 11 September 1897.
59. R. Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, p.37.
60. L2/3/14, Neil Maglashan, Civil Representative, Umtali, to Surveyor-General, 22 December 1891.
61. Idem.
62. See L2/4/23, I.A. Spreckley, Salisbury, to Surveyor-General, 4 May 1892.
63. L2/3/23/1, R.S. Fairbridge to Surveyor General, 13 Nov. 1892.
64. Venables seems to have been singularly unfortunate in his pegging ventures!
65. L2/3/23/1, R.S. Fairbridge to Surveyor General, 13 Nov. 1892.
66. Idem.
67. Idem.
68. Idem.
69. L2/3/23/1, R.S. Fairbridge to Surveyor General, 15 August 1892.
70. DV2/2/2 (p.446/7), Civil Commissioner, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 20 Apr. 1895.
71. DV2/2/5 (p.231), Lieutenant-Colonel Oliver T. Duke, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 22 Mar. 1898.
72. Idem.
73. DV2/2/5 (p.103), Colonel Duke, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 25 Jan. 1898, and DV2/2/2 (p.446/7), Civil Commissioner, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 20 Apr. 1895.
74. DV2/2/12 (p.371), Gordon M. Huntly, Civil Commissioner, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 17 March 1905.
75. DV2/2/5 (p.231), Colonel Duke, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 22 Mar.1898.
76. DV1/7/1, Ernest E. Sharp, Surveyor General's Office, to Civil Commr, Victoria, 25 Mar. 1895.
77. DV2/2/12 (p.64), Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor-General, 17 Mar.1905.
78. L2/3/61, H.J. Pickett, Govt. Land Surveyor, Umtali, to Surveyor General, 7 Mar. 1894.
79. Idem.
80. L2/4/8, R.A. Hulley, Melsetter, to Administrator, 8 Sept. 1898; and further L2/4/22, Correspondence in 1897 re G.O. Rothman's right to a farm in Melsetter. The file DV1/12/3 on the Moodie Trek shows that Dunbar Moodie was a thorough scoundrel if not a criminal. See also R. Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, p.36.
81. L2/3/231, R.S. Fairbridge, Govt Land Surveyor, Umtali, to Surveyor Gen. 12/9/1892.

82. Idem.
83. L2/3/231, Fairbridge to Surveyor General, 29 August 1892.
84. See Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, Chapter 2; and Moyana, op.cit., passim.
85. Charles E. Gilfillan, a Government Land Surveyor in the Gwelo-Enkeldoorn area, openly admitted that the reason why he wanted to get control over the Africans who lived on the land around the Fairbridge-Mteo forest area which land he was applying for in order to experiment with tobacco and citrus culture, was that he wanted their labour. Gilfillan wrote: 'This is an attempt to solve my labour difficulty. There are natives living on this land & I want to get control of them. They are very destructive to the land & the BSA Company may as well get something in return & aid me at the same time' - q.v. L2/3/28, Gilfillan to Secretary, Department of Lands, 7 Aug. 1906. Gilfillan's request was refused by the Government on the grounds that although the Administration was prepared to alienate land to whites for bona fide purposes of farming or beneficial occupation it was unwilling to do so 'solely for the exploitation of natives living thereon' - q.v. ibid. & minutes by W.J. Atherstone, 4 & 17 Sept. 1906, and W.H. Milton, Administrator, 19 Sept. 1906. See also L2/4/14 - P.W. Kidwell, Secry, Lomagundi Farmers Assoc. to Director of Land Settlement, 24/7/1911.
86. See for instance L2/4/15, L. Meredith, Harrydale, Mangwende's, to Sawerthal, 20 March 1893. For reasons why missionaries, who were no mean land grabers, were encouraged to peg on African occupied land see, Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, pp.36-7.
87. Although this paper almost exclusively deals with the alienation of land for farming purposes, it should not be forgotten that large amounts of land were also being alienated to mining claim holders for prospecting and mining purposes, sometimes to men, esp. 'Pioneers', who already held the rights to peg off large farms. A mining claim was fifty yards long by 133 yards broad. Consequently a man, like the Pioneer Lawson L.B. Dykes, who owned thirty five claims could possess 'a strip of ground, not necessarily in one piece 1750 yards long by 133 yards broad', plus the land his farming right(s) entitled him to. See DY1/1/1/2, (Lawson L.B.) Dykes to his mother, 16 Feb. 1891. The amount of land alienated in this way was of course enormous.
88. DV1/7/1, F.W. Inskipp (for Surveyor General) to Civil Commr, Victoria, 19 Nov. 1895.
89. Ibid, F.W. Inskipp, to Civil Commr, Victoria, 23 Aug. 1895.
90. DV1/7/1, F.W. Inskipp (for Surveyor General) to Civil Commr, Victoria, 15 and 29 Jan. 1896.
91. Idem.
92. Ibid., Surveyor General to Civil Commr, Victoria, Telegram, 7 July 1898.
93. Idem, also L2/4/20, Memorandum by J.M. Orpen, Surveyor General, 21 Jan. 1897. These provisional titles were provisional in the sense that they were issued pending some future comprehensive survey.
94. DV1/7/1, H. Sawerthal, to Resident Magistrate, Victoria, 6 Sept. 1895.
95. See for instance L2/3/61, R.S. Fairbridge, Gwelo, to Duncan, 23 July 1894.
96. L2/3/26, Gilfillan to Surveyor General, 11 Sept. 1897.
97. L2/3/26, Gilfillan (Surveyor Camp, Central Estates, Charter) to Surveyor General, n.d. All these and other tactics made the life of a surveyor a most difficult one - see for instance, L2/3/26, Gilfillan (Ortons Drift, Sebakwe River, Enkeldoorn) to Surveyor General, 1 Sept. 1899; ibid, Gilfillan to Surveyor General, 11 Jan. 1899; and also L2/3/20, W.H. Greathead, Salisbury, to Surveyor General, 9 Mar. 1900.
98. See DV1/7/1, H. Sawerthal to Resident Magistrate, Victoria, 6 Sept. 1895.
99. Idem.
100. L2/4/20, Memorandum by Surveyor General, J.M. Orpen, 21 Jan. 1897.
101. L2/3/14, M.W. Mahan, Civil Commr, Umtali, to Secy B.S.A.Co., 18 July 1892.

102. Idem.
103. Idem.
104. DV2/2/2, F.W. Ferguson, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Accountant, Salisbury 29 July 1895.
105. Idem.
106. DV2/2/4 (p.288), Lieut-General Oliver T. Duke, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 27 Aug. 1897.
107. Idem.
108. Idem.
109. Idem.
110. See for instance DV2/2/5, Civil Commr, Victoria, to Surveyor General, 6 Jan. 1898; also L2/3/43, Driver, Actg N.C. Gwelo, to CNC Bulawayo, 8 July 1897.
111. See for instance DV2/2/5, (pp.381-407), Lieut.Golonel Duke, Civil Commr, Victoria, Annual Report 1897-98, 22 Apr. 1898.
112. Ibid.
113. Ibid.
114. Palmer, Land and Racial Domination, p.40.
115. See for instance L2/3/43, returns of the NCs for Belingwe, Insiza, Mangwe and Manzanyama.
116. See for instance Sir Thomas Scanlen's remark: 'I never yet met the man who was willing to advance money on farms in this country. For instance, there are thousands of pounds in Cape Town, but they wont look at it'. - L2;3;1, Meeting between Enkeldoorn Farmers Deputation and Sir Thomas Scanlen, J.M. Orpen, and P.S. Inskipp, June 1899.
117. See NAR, Hist.Mss S05/2, Charles W.R. Southey, 'Reminiscences of an Early Settler in Rhodesia' (1943).
118. DV2/2/10 (p.183/4), E.J. Lawlor, Acting Civil Commr, Victoria, to Secy for Agriculture, Confidential, 3 October 1903. East Coast Fever was thus an indirect blessing to the farming industry. See also M. Elaine Lee - Politics and Pressure Groups in S. Rhodesia, 1898-1923 (Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, 1974), p.28/9.