African Missionary Photography as Enslavement and Liberation

Day Associates Lecture
June 29, 2007
Yale University Divinity School, New Haven, CT
The Day Associates Lectures are sponsored by the Yale Divinity School Library
by T. Jack Thompson
Director, Centre for the Study of Christianity in the Non-Western World, University of Edinburgh

Introduction: Black and White Kings
In January 1880 one of the first magic lantern shows given by missionaries in the north of Malawi took place at Bandawe on the shores of what was then known as Lake Nyasa. Among the audience were several emissaries of the Ngoni people—often described by contemporary missionary commentators as ‘wild’, ‘bloodthirsty’ and ‘savage.’ The mission journal recorded the occasion as follows:

We showed them some pictures of battles, a regiment on the march, a photo of the Zulu king now caught, numerous forts on the Mediterranean and an entertainment with the magic lantern. We impressed upon them the necessity of taking some steps in the way of improvement.¹

The photograph of ‘the Zulu king now caught’ was, in all probability, one of several taken of King Cetshwayo, after his surrender to the British following the Battle of Ulundi (oNdini) in July 1879 at the end of the Anglo-Zulu war. It may well have been one of those taken on board ship as he was being transported to detention in Cape Town. Here both the image, and its subject had been captured. Following Lord Chelmsford’s unreasonable and deceitful ultimatum to Cetshwayo in December 1878, the British had invaded Zululand in the following month. On 22nd January 1879 the Zulu had won a startling victory over the British forces at Isandlwana, in which 90% of the British force had been killed. Later the same day, and into the following day, in a much smaller and less important engagement, a small British force of less than two hundred defenders had held off a large Zulu army at Rorke’s Drift, just a few miles away. Needless to say, it was the latter, rather than the former engagement which went down as both heroic and significant in popular British imagination.²
Eventually, over the next few months, British technology overcame Zulu tactics, and by the time of the Battle of Ulundi (oNdini) in July, Zulu resistance had largely been crushed. Cetshwayo was deported to Cape Town (though he was allowed to come to Britain and visit Queen Victoria in 1882). While he was permitted to return to Zululand in the following year, his power (and that of his people) was effectively broken, and he died, possibly poisoned, in February 1884.

What is perhaps surprising here, is that within a few months of the Zulu defeat in South Africa, Scottish missionaries in Malawi were already using a photograph of the captured Cetshwayo to impress upon the independent-minded Ngoni (who were themselves sometimes mistakenly called Zulu by Europeans of the period) the extent of British military power, and the folly of trying to resist it.

Twenty-five years after the Scots missionaries showed the image of ‘the Zulu king now caught’ to the Ngoni in Malawi, a very different image of Africa was captured in Congo and shown widely throughout the world. In 1905 Mark Twain published his satirical booklet *King Leopold’s Soliloquy*—an imaginary rumination by the Belgian king on the extremely negative publicity which his policies in the Congo Free State were producing in much of the world. In both the first American edition in 1905 and the first British edition eighteen months later, Twain’s publishers included several photographs of victims of the atrocities which Leopold’s rubber-extracting policies were producing for the people of the Congo. Pre-eminent among these was the photograph of *Nsala of Wala with his daughter’s hand and foot*, taken by the British missionary Alice Harris in May 1904. At that time a local man, Nsala, had come into the mission station at Baringa with a small package containing the severed extremities of his small daughter. The practice of cutting off hands in particular had become fairly common in the Congo of the early twentieth century. Technically this was done by the local militias to account for the number of cartridges used during their rubber collecting expeditions; but increasingly it came to be used as a means of terrorizing local people into producing more rubber. In Nsala’s case, both his wife and child had been killed and mutilated, and he had managed to rescue just one small hand and foot to show as evidence.
Alice Harris of the Congo Balolo Mission persuaded Nsala to allow her to photograph him with the gruesome evidence. Her husband John then sent the resultant print home to Dr. Harry Guinness with the comment, “The photograph is most telling, and as a slide will rouse any audience to an outburst of rage.”3 In the course of the next few years it did indeed arouse thousands to indignation, as the Harrises toured both Europe and America with a Congo Atrocities magic lantern slide show which included the Nsala shot. But it also appeared in printed form in many places, including Mark Twain’s pamphlet, several full length books on the Congo atrocities (such as E.D. Morel’s *King Leopold’s Rule in the Congo*) and in various other newspapers and periodicals.

In putting imaginary words into the mouth of a disgruntled King Leopold, Mark Twain commented:

> The *Kodak* has been a sore calamity to us. The most powerful enemy indeed. In the early years we had no trouble in getting the press to ‘expose’ the tales of mutilations as slanders, lies, inventions… Then all of a sudden came the crash. That is to say, the incorruptible *Kodak*—and all the harmony went to hell! The only witness that I have encountered in my long experience that I couldn’t bribe… Ten thousand pulpits and ten thousand presses are saying the good word for me all the time and placidly and convincingly denying the mutilations. Then that trivial little *Kodak*, that a child can carry in its pocket, gets up, uttering never a word, and knocks them dumb!4

Whether with regard to Leopold’s atrocities in the Congo, or on a much wider front, the development of more convenient and quick photographic techniques in the 1880s and 1890s led to a vast increase in the volume of missionary photography in Africa as the nineteenth century came to a close. Parallel developments in the ability to reproduce photographs in printed form meant that the missionary photograph became one of the most widespread media for the propagation of western Christian ideas about Africa in other parts of the world.

In these first two photographs we have two very different examples of the interaction of missionary photography and slavery (interpreted here in its widest sense). In the first a photograph of the actual captivity of the Zulu king was used to impress, if not to intimidate an African people with the extent of European power; in the second a photograph of atrocities against African people (based on a system amounting to virtual slavery) was used to alert a worldwide audience to the inhumane policies which were being carried out in King Leopold’s personal fiefdom in the Congo.

**Liberating or Enslaving Photography?**

We will return to these examples later, but they raise a much wider question: the issue of whether African missionary photography itself was a liberating or enslaving experience for its African subjects; and it is this question that I want to address in this lecture. It is, of course, a truism that many of the terminologies connected with the taking of photographs are, in...
themselves based on a vocabulary of violence or constraint. In our title we have already spoken of ‘capturing the image’. That such images were often ‘taken’ without permission (in itself another intrusive image) goes without saying. The term *paparazzi* (the colloquial meaning of which is apparently buzzing and annoying mosquitoes) may only have attained common usage in the English language in the last few decades, but the idea of pursuit in achieving photographic aims is far from being a new one. Nor is it entirely coincidental that the term *snapshot*, which accompanied the explosion of popular photography in the late nineteenth century, is itself connected with game hunting. At its worst, therefore, photography is an act of violence against the other: an invasion of personal space, and a stealing of identity. At its best, of course, it may be quite the opposite—liberating and affirming—allowing its subjects to express their identity and become known beyond their own immediate context. Sometimes it is not totally clear into which of the two categories a particular photograph may most accurately be placed.

![Migrant Mother](image)

Take, for example, one of the most famous American photographs of the twentieth century: ‘migrant mother’ by Dorothea Lange. In the 1930s Franklin D. Roosevelt set up the Farm Security Administration to try to provide subsidies for poor farmers hit by the depression. A photographic branch was established to try to provide striking visual evidence of the depths of poverty being suffered. Its most famous photographer was Dorothea Lange. One evening, after a hard day’s work photographing migrant workers in California, she was on her way home when she came across a pea-pickers’ camp at the side of the road. Tired and discouraged she drove on; but something persuaded her to turn back, and she took a series of photos of a mother and her children. The last of the six photographs she took there became one of the most reproduced images of the twentieth century, and an icon of the under-belly of American society. It aroused the conscience of a nation, and has remained a powerful image ever since. Yet what of its subject? Dorothea Lange later confessed “I did not ask her name or her history.” The woman’s name was, in fact, Florence Thompson, and in later life she complained, “I’m tired of symbolising human poverty when my living conditions have improved.” I refer to this photograph, though of course it is not African, because it clearly illustrates the ambivalence of the photographic image. Who owns it? What does it say? Why was it taken? How does it represent the other? All of these issues are clearly relevant to the thousands of photographs of Africa and Africans taken by western missionaries in the late nineteenth century.
Clearly the missionaries who took photographs in Africa did so with a purpose, though it would be naïve to assume that all missionary photographers, and every missionary photograph had the same purpose. Among the very earliest missionary photographers in Africa was William Ellis of the London Missionary Society who visited Madagascar three times in the 1850s. LMS missionaries had first entered Madagascar in 1818, but had been forced to leave in 1836, following the prohibition of Christianity by Queen Ranavalona, and the persecutions which led to the martyrdom of Rasalana in 1837—the first Christian to die for her faith on Madagascar. Following her death other Christians were executed: numbers are variously estimated between fifty and two hundred. By the late 1850s the prohibition on Christianity was still in place, though active persecution was sporadic. There seems to have been a thriving, if secret local church, with its own clergy; but this did not deter both the LMS and the Catholics from sounding out the possibilities of returning to the island when the time was more propitious.

Ellis had taken up photography at the age of fifty-nine, hoping that the new technology might impress the Malagasy court and facilitate the return of missionaries. Yet the delicate nature of the situation meant that he could not openly proclaim either his Christian status or his real purpose in visiting Madagascar. Both initially, and on his third visit in 1856, he spoke of being merely on ‘a visit of friendship’. For Ellis, and for his Jesuit rival Finaz who also used photography, the new technology was a way of impressing the royal court at Antananarivo, and gaining their confidence. Indeed, when the queen died, her son, King Radama, though not himself a Christian, introduced religious freedom, and when Ellis returned to Madagascar, this time as an openly Christian missionary, he became a confidant of the king whose portrait he took on several occasions. Here we see photography (as it was also in the case of the ‘Zulu king now caught’) being used as an example of superior European technology to attempt to influence non-European peoples.
On the other hand, it is quite clear that much missionary photography of the nineteenth century was aimed at a home audience. Here a predominant motivation was to show the transforming power of the Christian gospel, and one common way of doing this was to emphasize photographically the perceived backwardness of traditional peoples and culture. Much of this thinking was, of course, based on contemporary theories of racial hierarchy. I was amused just recently while reading a modern novel about Irish immigration to America after the potato famine of the 1840s to come across a lithograph from *Harper’s Weekly: Journal of Civilization*, illustrating one variant of this hierarchy which clearly compared both Africans and Irish very unfavourably with the ‘superior’ Anglo-Saxon type. In the era just before photographic reproduction in books and magazines became common, lithographs (such as the one from *Harper’s Weekly*) could be manipulated to exaggerate those aspects of African physiognomy considered indications of inferiority by Social Darwinists. Such racial exaggeration can clearly be seen in the illustration of many contemporary books on Africa. I take as just one example H.M. Stanley’s *How I Found Livingstone*.

In the two illustrations selected, Africans features are distorted to give an impression of imbecility, or irrational evil. (‘Mutiny on the Gombe River’ and ‘Look out!’) One might have expected that the development of the half-tone process in the 1880s, which made it possible to
reproduce photographs directly into books and magazines, would have brought an end to this caricaturing. In fact, however, techniques were commonly used to emphasize and exaggerate difference between the African and the European, and between the ‘heathen’ and the Christian. By far the most common of these was the transformation or ‘before and after’ photograph, by which the appearance, dress and even architecture of two photographs were juxtaposed to emphasize difference. Such techniques were not, of course, confined to Africa, but were widely used in both Britain and America to contrast, for example, orphans before and after being rescued by Dr. Barnardo’s Homes, or native Americans in their traditional and ‘civilised’ states.

![Fig. 8 Look Out](image)

There were, of course, missionaries who had a more neutral ethnographic interest in the peoples among whom they worked. Anna Rein-Wuhrmann, for example, who worked for the Basle mission in Cameroon just before the First World War, took a number of natural and sympathetic portraits of the Bamum people.  

David Livingstone, though he did not himself take photographs, had two photographers with him on his Zambezi expedition, and issued very specific orders to his brother Charles (the semi-official photographer of the expedition):

“"You will endeavour to secure characteristic specimens of the different tribes residing in, or visiting, Tete, for the purposes of Ethnology. Do not choose the ugliest but, (as among ourselves) the better class of natives who are believed to be characteristic of the race.""

And here we come across a great paradox in much European photography in Africa in the mid to late nineteenth century. Often the photographers, especially if they claimed in any sense to be scientists, were attempting to record what they thought were accurate and scientific images of what they saw; but, at the same time, the subjects they chose to represent, and the images through which they did so, were deeply influenced by prior ideas and presuppositions about the nature of Africa and its peoples. By and large, however, much missionary photography of local peoples in the late nineteenth century in Africa was aimed at contrasting the old and the new, the traditional and the modern, the pre-Christian and the Christian.

**Views of Lovedale and Livingstonia**

Such contrasts can be seen very clearly in a book of photographs produced by Dr. James Stewart of Lovedale in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. Lovedale was one of the leading missionary educational institutions of sub-Saharan Africa, opened by Scottish missionaries in 1841. In 1894, at the height of his principalship, James Stewart published a book entitled *Lovedale South Africa: Illustrated with Fifty Views from Photographs.* The book is dedicated to ‘The Right Honourable Sir George Grey, K.C.B. formerly Governor of Her Majesty’s Possessions in the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope under whose administration
and by whose aid the first steps were taken to teach the arts of civilised life to the native races of South Africa. This dedication is particularly significant, in that Grey had produced an educational plan in the 1850s aimed at introducing a more industrial based education in South Africa. The purpose of such a plan was to ‘civilise races emerging from barbarism’ and thus produce a ‘settled and industrious peasantry.’ While this was before Stewart took over as principal, and Lovedale was then putting more emphasis on classical education, the school nevertheless began introducing the kind of industrial training for which Grey was calling. Once Stewart took over as principal in 1870, this emphasis increased, with courses being offered in such skills as carpentry, bricklaying, wagon-making, and printing for male pupils, and more domestic skills such as sewing, dress-making, and laundry-work for the female pupils.

Stewart’s dedication of the book makes it clear that he saw the kind of education being offered at Lovedale, and the accompanying photographs highlighting what Lovedale was doing, as in line with the principles of Grey’s plan. Furthermore, the book was published in Scotland, and was designed largely for a British audience of mission supporters. Both of these points are made specifically by Stewart in his preface to the book, which begins:

Illustration seems to be a necessity of the present day. It saves time in reading, and conveys a certain clearness of impression. These views accordingly have been prepared for the information of the friends and supporters of the Lovedale Mission, as well as of others who may be interested in the progress of Christian missions generally.

Stewart then goes on to commend ‘Sir George Grey’s wise and humane native policy’ which he defines as being:

To combat superstition by promoting Christianity; to shake native faith in witchcraft, and those who practised it by skilled medical aid; to overcome ignorance by native schools; and to counteract indolence by industrial training in various trades, and by employment on works of public utility.

Here we can see many of the key elements of Lovedale’s educational policy under Stewart’s tutelage: to what extent, however, may these elements also be seen in the accompanying photographs themselves?

It needs to be said right away that though the interpretation of historical photographs as images is entirely legitimate (though itself sometimes open to the same criticism of ideological bias which is often aimed at the photographers themselves) the task becomes much easier when the photographs under discussion are accompanied by textual comment, as they are here. In such cases our concern is not so much what the intention of the photographer was, as what the intention of the author or publisher was in using the photograph for a particular purpose.

Fig.9  Lovedale, Main Approach
First, a general summary of the kind of photographs contained in Stewart’s book. The photographs are not neatly divided into different categories, and so the following categories are approximate (and sometimes overlapping). Of the fifty photographs about fifteen are studies of Lovedale buildings or the surrounding countryside; another fifteen are made up of various student groups, while about ten are of specific educational activities and the remainder are of various ‘native groups’ or traditional activities (including several on the *Abakweta* initiation ceremonies).

Even the most apparently straightforward shots can be given a particular focus by the accompanying text. A general, and fairly uninspiring, view of the ‘Main Approach’ to Lovedale, showing a wide road flanked by a wire fence with trees beyond, is accompanied by a short text which includes the statement, ‘roads in Africa only came with civilisation.’ Thus the ideological purpose of the use of the photograph is revealed: to reinforce the idea that before the coming of the missionaries the Xhosa were uncivilised, and that the mission brought civilisation with it. This contrast, either implicitly or explicitly, is present in many of the photographs. Even the seemingly neutral shot of the waterfall on the Tyumie river is used to support the development of the industrial departments, and to stress the hope that a turbine at the waterfall will provide electric power for the workshops of the industrial departments. Here is an excellent example of how photograph and commentary can be used together to put across a very specific message. The photograph is of a picturesque rural scene: the perfect basis, one might think, for an accompanying textual idyll. Instead the photograph is used, not simply as a visual prop for a yet to be built electric turbine, but beyond that, as an indirect appeal for the money to build it.

![Image of waterfall](image)

**Fig.10 Waterfall on the River Chumie**

In the same way, the photographs of many of the buildings at Lovedale (some of them very impressive, and still standing today, well over one hundred years after they were built) are used to emphasize the common European trope of ‘progress.’ Sometimes the contrast is between African and European, but on other occasions it merely highlights the architectural progress which the mission itself has made. Thus a photograph of the first permanent building at Lovedale, is immediately followed by one of the main educational building in the 1890s, with the comment, ‘In contrast to the previous view, it tells of change and progress—the old order changing and giving place to new.’
Several of the photographs of ‘native groups’ are very clearly used to provide a stark contrast for readers with consequent studies of Christian converts. The outstanding example of this is a pair of photographs showing groups of women and girls. The two photographs are titled ‘as they are at home in their own villages’ and ‘as they become under Christianity and civilisation’. (In both cases the omission of an appropriate noun to designate the subjects of the photos has led to the use of what may be described as the de-humanising ‘they’, so that the othering of the Africans in the photographs, whether deliberately or accidentally, here includes both those who have been influenced by Christianity and those who have not.) The first of the two photographs shows a group of mainly Xhosa women and children outside a traditional hut. The photo on the following page shows a large group of Lovedale female pupils, outside the Girls’ School. Even without text the photographs and their immediate captions are meant to create a distinct example of transformation. When the short paragraphs of text are added, this becomes even more obvious. The first photograph is described as being of ‘native women and girls in the uncivilised state’; the second comments that ‘the difference which education and Christianity produce on a native girl in expression, dress, and bearing is very marked.’

The same two photographs were used in James Wells’ later biography of Stewart. Here the contrast was increased by deliberately placing them one below the other on the same page with the captions, ‘The Natives as they are at Home’ and ‘The Natives when Civilised’. Visually, the photographs imply that civilisation is a matter of dress and of architecture. In these and other photos, the text then builds on these perceived differences. For example, a few pages further on from the photos discussed above, there occurs one captioned ‘Group of uncivilised Natives.’ The text begins, ‘The above shows a group of natives, chiefly women, as yet untouched by Christianity or education. It requires to be looked at in contrast with the next two or three groups.’ The following photographs are of various groups from the girls’ school, the biggest visual contrast being in the Europeanised dress of the Lovedale pupils. It is not, of course, that there are no contrasts to be made, nor to imply that western mission
education brought no benefits to African peoples. It is rather that the contrasts are oversimplified: weighted heavily in favour of the benefits of ‘civilisation’, uncritical of its disadvantages in areas such as the destruction of traditional social patterns, and assuming a willing acquiescence on the part of its African recipients.

Yet, at the same time, it is important that the modern reader-viewer does not fall into the same trap of oversimplification as the nineteenth century editor. Not all of the text is totally negative about the ‘red Kaffir’ as European commentators tended to call traditionalist Xhosa of the period. Take this passage from Stewart, commenting on a photograph entitled ‘A group at their own home’ and comprising eighteen or nineteen men, women and children sitting and standing in front of a traditional grass-thatched wattle and daub hut:

The group outside—unpromising and uncivilised as they may appear—are each and all probably better than they look. The Kaffirs, as a race, will stand comparison with the men of most other uncivilised races. In the old fighting days, they were described by war correspondents as magnificent savages. And a non-missionary writer of the present day describes them quite accurately and justly, as “generally fine, powerful, able-bodied men, reserved and self-possessed in manner, but courteous and polite and sensible of kindness and consideration.” All which, as traits of the Kaffirs, the writer of this page, after nearly thirty years’ contact with them, can verify, as being according to truth and reality.

25 Fig.13 Kaffir Customs—the Abakweta

It is when the meta-narrative is considered that the situation becomes clearer. This can be seen in the series of photographs of the Abakweta initiation ceremonies. Three of the photographs of the Abakweta (the initiates) themselves; the fourth is of a group of spectators. Two of the three initiate photographs are taken from some distance away (in the days before telephoto lens) and give the impression of having been snapped discreetly so as not to disturb the ceremony. The third is a somewhat closer study of a group of around twenty Abakweta in their elaborate ukutshila dancing outfits. The photographs themselves are not all that different to those which may be taken today by an anthropologist or documentary photographer. When we come to read the extended text which accompanies the four photographs, however, the meta-narrative becomes clear. Much of the text is largely descriptive, explaining what is going on in the photographs in a fairly neutral way. However, at several points in the commentary (which runs over four pages of comment on all the Abakweta photographs) there are clear indications of the missionary view that many aspects of the initiation ceremony are unacceptable from a western Christian perspective. The description begins, ‘There are many curious customs among the Kaffirs, as among all primitive races.’ Following a comment on the reluctance of some chiefs to allow photographs, either in general, or of the initiation ceremonies, the text continues, ‘most of their superstitions and many of their customs are opposed to the Gospel, and to the morality it teaches.’ The text concludes with the comment,
This custom stands in the way of missionary work, not because it is in any way evil in itself, but because of its associations. There are various other practices connected with this rite which cannot be described here. In the picture the *Abakweta* look, as some one remarked, like little fairies or ballet dancers, but they are not innocent little fairies for all that.\textsuperscript{27}

The meta-narrative here, is that, quaint and attractive as some of the Xhosa traditional customs may be, they have a dark underside which is incompatible with Christianity; and brave and impressive as the Xhosa may be in terms of ‘uncivilised races’ only a complete religious and cultural transformation will suffice if they are to join the civilised world. It needs to be said that there were variations of missionary opinion on these matters, even within a given mission. Nevertheless, the transformation model was clearly the predominant one in late nineteenth century Africa, and can clearly be seen in much of the material—both photographic and textual—in *Fifty Views from Photographs*.

Perhaps this is nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the question of dress. Of the fifty photographs in *Lovedale, South Africa*, more than half show pupils at the institution. It goes almost without saying that in all cases they are dressed in European style. In some cases—doing manual work, for example, they are dressed appropriately in older, working clothes—but in such contexts as class photographs both men and women tend to be dressed very stylishly, though clearly, as in any such social context, some are more expensively dressed than others.

![Fig.14 Kaffirs, Fingoes and Zulus](image)

From the missionary perspective, the concept of the ‘red Kaffir’—the traditionalist Xhosa dressed in a blanket—represented but one aspect of the need for transformation. In effect, there was a variety of traditional dress in South Africa, with sometimes intricate minor local variations—the shape of Zulu women’s headgear, for example, indicating the precise area from which they came. Unlike parts of West Africa, however, the possibility of combining traditional dress with western education, or conversion to Christianity, seems not to have been considered as an option by the missionaries. The extent to which western dress was imposed by missionaries in the Eastern Cape, rather than enthusiastically embraced by the Xhosa is not
easy to determine. Certainly, by the 1870s it seems not simply that western dress was accepted by the students and graduates of Lovedale, but that, with all its social gradations, it was used by the educated African elite as a marker of social advancement. One has only to look at a photograph of four volunteers from Lovedale, who went to Malawi in 1876 to work for the Livingstonia mission to realise that clothes were one marker of self-esteem among educated Africans.  

For the missionaries the question of clothes as social signifiers of African advancement was a complex one. As seen in several of the photographs in *Fifty Views* western clothes could be used by the missionaries to indicate the success of the task of ‘raising the natives’, particularly to visually contrast them with ‘red Kaffirs’; but such a signifier was circumscribed. It did not necessarily indicate that African converts were yet the equal of their missionary mentors. From a visual point of view this point could be made by the way in which various subjects were placed in group photographs. Thus, in a second group photograph of the party setting out
from Lovedale for Malawi in 1876, the four Xhosa volunteers, immaculate in their new stylish European clothes, are relegated to the background. Such positional differentiation is extremely common in Lovedale (and other mission) photographs of the period. Yet one has to realise that it occurred also (and indeed still occurs) in school or college photographs where teachers and professors tend to occupy central positions, surrounded by their pupils and students.

![Larger Group to Malawi](image)

Yet beyond that remains the overriding question as to whether such missionary photography as that included in Stewart’s book was a liberating or enslaving experience for its subjects. Undoubtedly the terms of the photographs were largely determined by the white photographers—whether missionary or professional. Yet a new rising educated African elite came to identify itself visually (and here I stress the word *visually*) in terms of the European norms of dress laid down by the missionaries as ‘normal.’ Let me give one small example of this from the Livingstonia mission in Malawi—which James Stewart had helped to establish. Here is a photograph taken in 1897 of a group of Ngoni teachers in northern Malawi.  

![Ngoni Teachers 1897](image)

The first Ngoni converts had been baptised only in 1890, so these teachers represented the vanguard of the advance of the new religion. Sartorially the photograph is a strange mixture of traditional and modern. Men’s pants did not become common among northern Malawians for another decade or so, and shoes were actively discouraged by the missionaries at this period. Yet fourteen of the fifteen teachers in the photograph are wearing western hats. Clearly the hat became, at an early stage of African-European interaction in this particular context, an accessory of choice and a statement of status. Another very similar mixture can be seen in the photograph of one of the young Ngoni chief Amon Jere who came under the influence of the
mission, shown here with his wife, Mary Chipeta. Both wear a mixture of the traditional and the modern. As with all clothes this was a statement of perceived identity. Yet very quickly (as had happened at Lovedale also) traditional dress began to give way to western in the context of the mission. In the case of the Ngoni, their strong cultural identity meant that they retained also their traditional dress for important cultural occasions—a situation which prevails even up until today.

![Amon Jere and Mary Chipeta](image)

In short, what seems to have happened in terms of visual identity is that the missionaries had certain cultural and sartorial standards which they tried to enforce. To a large extent African converts were forced to conform to these (the question of women’s exposed breasts would be a very obvious example). On the other hand, the new emerging educated elite interpreted and used these new rules to their own advantage to assert their own emerging definition of their new identity, not only to the missionaries, but to their fellow Africans as well.

Where the photographic subjects had no control, of course, was over the captions and text which accompanied missionary photography when it was published in Europe or North America, and it was here that the missionary agenda was most clearly asserted. Let us take here just two brief examples from Malawi, both of which appear in the missionary biography *Laws of Livingstonia*, by W.P. Livingstone, published in 1924.

The first shows two young women of the Ngoni people. The caption under the photograph says ‘Typical Ngoni Girls’. This is precisely what they are not. Both their dress, and their history indicate that they are important individuals, married into the royal Jere clan. They are Emily Nhlane and Mary Chipeta, their western first names indicating that they are early converts to Christianity. As a result of the caption in the book they have been deprived of their identity, stripped of their individuality and their social importance. They have become victims of what I call ‘the anonymous African syndrome.’ Yet the situation is not quite as simple as it seems, for if one is to examine the original photograph (now in the National Archives of Malawi) the names of both women are written below the photograph. When looking at the captions and text used with African missionary photographs then, we should not be too quick to assume that they are necessarily the responsibility of the missionaries who took the photographs. In some cases at least they are the result of editorial decisions made either by mission administrators at home, or by the book publishers themselves.
Our second example here concerns what, in the context of northern Malawian Christianity is a very important photograph. It was taken in May 1914 on the occasion of the ordination of the first three Presbyterian ministers of the Livingstonia mission (later to become part of the Church of Central Africa, Presbyterian). The three newly ordained ministers are shown with their missionary mentors. We might even want to comment on the fact that they are given pride of place (as indeed they should have been on the day of their ordination). When we come to the caption which accompanied the photograph in *Laws of Livingstonia*, however, this is what it says:

Rev. A.G. MacAlpine, Rev. Dr. Elmslie, Rev. Dr. Laws, Yesaya, Hezekiah, Jonathan. 

---

Fig. 20 *Typical Ngoni Girls*

Fig. 21 *Bandawe Ordination*
The whole point of this photograph is to celebrate the ordination of these three men; yet while the missionaries standing behind have been give their full titles, the newly ordained Africans are allowed neither their ecclesiastical status, nor their own African names. Such textual inequalities are all too common in the accompanying commentaries of published missionary photography in Africa.

The Camera and the Congo

While it is true that much missionary photography in Africa in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represented a form of captivity in which identity was constrained and constricted, we should not regard this as a universal pattern. Let us return the theme of the Congo Atrocity photography of almost exactly one hundred years ago. Here, as already indicated, we see quite a different use of missionary photography of Africa. In 1904, at just about the time that Alice Harris was taking her photograph of Nsala with his daughter’s hand and foot, Harry Guinness, son of Grattan Guinness the founder of the Congo Balolo Mission for which Alice and her husband John worked, was publishing a booklet which he entitled Congo Slavery. Some recent critics of missionary attitudes to Leopold’s policies in the Congo have highlighted the slowness of the missionary response to known atrocities, and there is certainly some truth in these accusations. Many missionaries, and certainly many mission administrators, were reluctant to speak out too openly against Leopold for fear of endangering their own work in the Congo—an almost universal, and still present dilemma of missionary work in other countries, whether under colonial control or indigenous government. Once people like Harry Guinness had decided they must speak, however, they did so with a vengeance. In Congo Slavery Guinness writes starkly, “Murder will out! And the groans of Africa, muffled so long, are at last destined to awake Europe from her apathetic slumber.” The thirty page pamphlet contains several photographs of mutilated Congolese, the beginnings of a flood which were to find their way into the British and American press within the next few years. These particular examples are almost certainly by Rev. W.D. Armstrong and were carried back to Britain in December 1903 by Roger Casement, the British Consul, returning after carrying out his enquiry into conditions in the Congo, which, when published in 1904, was to blow the lid off Leopold’s methods and lead to an international outcry.

Fig. 22 Maimed for Life
Yet neither Armstrong nor Alice Harris can claim to have been the first missionary photographer to have taken photographs of the atrocities and mutilations taking place in the Congo. That honour probably belongs to the African-American Presbyterian missionary William Henry Sheppard who had first gone to the Congo as a missionary in 1890. The southern Presbyterians had been reluctant to send out a black missionary without white supervision, so Sheppard and his wife Lucy travelled out to the Congo with a young white missionary, Samuel Lapsley, who, however, died in 1892. For a time, this left Sheppard as *de facto* head of the mission, but this was not a situation the administrators of the mission were happy with, and a series of white missionaries were sent out to ‘head’ the mission. Such was the racial prejudice of the time, that it was considered preferable to have an inexperienced white man in charge, rather than an experienced African-American missionary. In 1897 the latest in a series of white missionaries arrived at Luebo, the station Sheppard had opened among the Kete people in Kasai province. This was William Morrison, an upper class Virginian who, though he respected much of what Sheppard had achieved, soon made it clear that he was in charge of the station. Relations between them deteriorated, and Sheppard moved further north to open an independent station at Ibaanc, among the Kuba people.

Though Sheppard was well aware of injustice in the way the state was administered, he did not personally feel any pressing desire to take action on the matter. Morrison, on the other hand, felt a need to expose the injustices of which he quickly became aware. In 1899 news reached Morrison of a massacre in the Pianga region. He ordered Sheppard to go and investigate it. In an article he wrote afterwards Sheppard expressed his own reluctance to get involved—not least because the people responsible for the massacre, the Basongo (known at the time as Zapo-Zapps) were renowned for their fierceness and ruthlessness. Sheppard wrote, “These were orders. I had to go; there was nothing else to do.”

Sheppard must have had misgivings about his own safety; but he seems to have struck it lucky in one very major respect. When he encountered the Zappo-Zap chief Mulamba Nkusu, Sheppard seems to have been mistaken for a government official, so that he was shown the bodies of many of those killed. Sheppard reports that he asked the chief:

> Can you show me some of their hands?…He led me to a shed covered with a framework of sticks, under which a slow fire was burning, and there they were—the right hands of the victims of the slaughter. I counted them, eighty-one in all.

The report which Sheppard subsequently wrote for Morrison was published (without Sheppard’s permission or knowledge) in *The Missionary*, the periodical of the American
Presbyterians. It subsequently appeared in both the American and European press, and led to questions being asked in the British House of Commons. Indeed, Mark Twain was clearly aware of Sheppard’s report when he came to publish his *King Leopold’s Soliloquy* five years later, and twice included reference to Sheppard’s account of the massacre in his booklet, as well as mentioning him by name.\(^\text{40}\)

There is, however, one further interesting feature of Sheppard’s journey to investigate the Zappo-Zap massacre. He carried with him one of the very latest Kodak box cameras, and took several photographs to back up his textual evidence, including at least one which still survives of a young woman, with the caption, ‘Rescued by Sheppard from the cannibals’.\(^\text{41}\) If not the first, this was certainly one of the earliest of the atrocity photographs which, within a few years began to exert a huge influence on public opinion in Europe and America.

Sheppard himself was reluctant to get involved in a public campaign. When tackled by fellow missionary Lachlan Vass on the issue he replied, ‘Being a colored man, I would not be understood, criticizing a white government before white people’.\(^\text{42}\) Sheppard was more interested in the traditional Kuba way of life (which both attracted and repelled him). The classic photograph of the African-American missionary shows him standing on a lion skin holding a Kuba spear, and surrounded by four impressive looking Kuba warriors.\(^\text{43}\) In some respects, it would seem, Sheppard is attempting to identify with the Kuba; in others (he is dressed from head to foot in white, including the ubiquitous tropical helmet, and stands squarely in the centre of the photograph) he fulfils the typical missionary stereotype. The fact that he himself titled the photograph ‘the chief of Ibaanc’\(^\text{44}\) in a real sense points up this dual identity which Sheppard tried to create for himself.

While Sheppard’s photographs of the Zappo-Zap atrocities never became widely publicized in the way that those of Alice Harris did, they nevertheless remain part of the historical record of the missionary witness which was largely responsible for Leopold handing over control of the Congo to the Belgian government in 1908, just a year before he died.

![Fig. 24 The Chief of Ibaanc](image)

**Missionary Motivation**

And what of that missionary witness as a whole? Can it be said that it helped to ‘set the prisoners free’? Was it a liberating activity? Individually, of course, few, if any of the subjects...
of atrocity photographs would have been aware of the way in which they were being used in Europe and North America. The bigger question, therefore must be, did the missionary campaign (or rather, to be more accurate, the missionary contribution to the wider campaign for Congo reform) succeed in liberating people in the Congo? In 1911-12 Alice and John Harris (by now working for the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery and Aborigines’ Protection Society) returned to Africa. They reported ‘an immense improvement’ in the situation in the Congo. It would be naïve to suppose that missionary photography alone led to this improvement, or that all the iniquities of Leopold’s rule disappeared overnight; but equally, it would be churlish and short-sighted to argue that the hundreds of atrocity photographs taken by missionaries and used extensively in the Congo Reform movement had little or no effect. Taken together with the printed and spoken word such photographs had a huge emotional and intellectual effect on public opinion in Europe and North America, and helped to ensure real improvement in the lives of many people in the Congo.

But what are we to make overall of missionary photography in Africa? Was its effect liberating or enslaving? Let me again say that it would be unwise to draw any general conclusions across the whole field, which undoubtedly contains hundreds of thousands of images, even if we do not consider the more modern period after 1939. Nevertheless, in terms of the particular contexts and images which I have researched, I think it is possible to come to several fairly firm conclusions.

The first, I think is that many missionaries (and other photographers) in the nineteenth century, were rather naïve about the objectivity of photography. The camera may never lie, but the photographer is often, to use a phrase from recent British political life ‘economical with the truth.’

The second is that every photograph, like every textual source has its own perspective and bias. In the many hundreds of missionary photographs which I personally have examined I see two main (though clearly not exclusive) motivations. The first is to show the nature of traditional African life and culture—usually from a negative standpoint; the second is to emphasize the transforming possibilities of the Christian message. That there were contrasts to be made cannot be denied. That the contrasts were often exaggerated goes almost without saying.

A third, and connected point, is that when missionary photographs of Africa were used on what we may call the home front their clear intention was to promote support for the mission and its work. This led to the contrasts mentioned above being augmented by textual descriptions which tended to see the Africans portrayed as types, rather than as individuals. In
this sense, at least, one might argue that such use of photography and accompanying captions was constrictive and de-humanizing.

At the same time, however, we should not assume that Africans (whether converts or not) were merely the passive objects of the missionary camera. Though largely constrained by the demands and the ideas of the missionary photographer, Africans still found it possible to make themselves known, to begin to come to terms with the new world with which they had to deal—a world filled with new ideas, customs and technologies, of which the camera was merely one small part. (Particularly in large urban areas such as Lagos and Johannesburg one way in which this became possible was through the opening of African photographic studios from the 1890s onwards where cultural norms were more easily accommodated—though that is not the focus of this particular paper.) In this sense African subjects of missionary photography were able to use the medium as a liberating force to assert their own identity in a rapidly changing world.
Slave Traders and Captured Kings

It has not been my intention in this lecture to deal directly with the question of missionary photography of African slavery and the slave trade itself, though, of course, there would be plenty of scope for such a lecture, and the Congo atrocity photographs do deal with what was, in effect, a form of slavery. But let me at least, before finishing tell one brief story which draws together several of the strands with which we have been dealing, and confirms the complex interaction of so-called savagery and civilisation. In 1895 Sir Harry Johnston, British consul-general in what is now Malawi, gathered an army of around five hundred to attack the headquarters of Mlozi, one of the leading Swahili-Arab slave-traders on the Malawi-Tanzanian border. This army contained an exotic mixture of professional European soldiers, Indian Sikh troops, and African askari, as well as missionary volunteers and a variety of European big game hunters and adventurers. After being wounded, Mlozi fled. He was finally found and captured by Bandawe, an ex-mission employee of the Livingstonia mission from (as his name implies) the mission station at Bandawe, where he might well have been present sixteen years earlier when the missionaries showed the photograph of ‘the Zulu king now caught’ with which we began. Johnston describes Bandawe as ‘the invaluable Atonga Sergeant’, and goes on to say that he ‘learnt to play the harmonium quite well; and after one or other of our victories on Nyasa used to make for the nearest mission station with some of his men, and slinging his rifle at his back would sit down and play and sing hymns of triumph.’—no doubt ‘Onward Christian Soldiers’ among them!

Following his capture by Bandawe, Mlozi was given an immediate trial accused of various murders, and summarily hanged the same day. After his death, one of the British volunteers who had taken part in the war against him, cut off his head, and strung the body upside down from a tree. The head was removed in a tin box. It found its way back to Scotland, where it has recently been re-discovered (more than one hundred years after the event). The photograph of Mlozi, taken by Fred Moir, one of the founders of the African Lakes Corporation (closely associated with the Livingstonia mission) was widely published in Britain, but few sources, certainly not missionary ones, made any reference to the gruesome events which followed the death of Mlozi. Nor did they mention the fact that the African Lakes Corporation (set up originally as the Livingstonia Central Africa Trading Company to help supply the mission with goods, had traded with Mlozi, exchanging cloth for ivory.) Mlozi’s death, rather, was always presented as the triumph of civilisation over savagery, and of legitimate trade over the slave trade.
But let us finish with Cetshwayo, king of the Zulu, with whom we began. After several years in exile in Cape Town, Cetshwayo was allowed to travel to Britain to put his case for restoration directly to the British government. While there he met Queen Victoria. (Colonial accounts would speak, of course, of Cetshwayo being granted an audience with Queen Victoria, but it was, after all, a meeting of two monarchs). As it happens, Queen Victoria recorded her impressions of the meeting in her diary. This is some of what she had to say:

Cetewayo (sic) is a very fine man… He is tall, immensely broad and stout, with a good-humoured countenance, and an intelligent face. Unfortunately he appeared in a hideous black frock coat and trousers, but still wearing the ring around his head, denoting that he was a married man… [He] mentioned having seen my picture, and said he was glad to see me in person. And in this short account we have encapsulated much of the paradox of missionary photography in Africa. The followers of the great empress thought it their duty to ‘civilize the natives’ and among the elements which indicated that civilisation was the wearing of western clothes. But when Cetshwayo appeared before Victoria she was disappointed precisely because he was wearing western clothes, and did not appear in his traditional dress. He, for his part had seen her photograph—her isitunzi, her shadow, and was glad to meet the reality. As T.S. Eliot has it in the Hollow Men:

Between the idea and the reality
Between the motion and the act
Falls the Shadow

African missionary photography operated in the borderlands between idea and reality, between enslavement and liberation. Precisely where that border runs remains a matter for ongoing discussion.
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