
Book Section:
Cleall, E. orcid.org/0000-0002-9745-6711 (2023) John Mackenzie's 'true vision of the future': imagining peace in nineteenth-century Southern Africa. In: Troughton, G., (ed.) Pacifying Missions: Christianity, Violence, and Empire in the Nineteenth Century. Studies in Christian Mission, 58 . Brill , Leiden/Boston , pp. 130-154. ISBN 9789004536791

https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004536791_007

John Mackenzie's 'true vision of the future': Imagining Peace in Nineteenth-Century Southern Africa

Esme Cleall

Abstract

This chapter seeks to interrogate the meanings of peace, together with violence and war as its relational counterparts, in missionary thinking by focussing on the life and writings of Rev John Mackenzie (1835-1899). Mackenzie was an important London Missionary Society missionary to southern Africa and influential player in the late nineteenth-century missionary world. He was also a prominent speaker, writer and thinker in southern African politics, and although he found his political influence frustratingly limited, his many books and speeches circulated widely and played an important role in constructing ideas about southern Africa—both in late nineteenth-century Britain and in the colonies themselves. In this chapter I argue that as such, Mackenzie provides important insights into missionary thinking about the concept of peace during this period. Mackenzie's significance partly reflects his sheer productivity, the broad dissemination of his writing, and the diversity of audiences he reached, which led to unusually wide engagement with his ideas. Though not a typical missionary in many respects, his thinking nevertheless drew upon a wider missionary heritage, and in turn shaped trajectories within contemporary missions. Given his stature and influence, Mackenzie's repeated ruminations on peace therefore enable an exploration of the significance of peace in wider currents of missionary thought.

Draft

Writing in 1887 in a violently turbulent period of southern African history, the London Missionary Society (LMS) missionary, Rev. John Mackenzie, imagined an 'Austral Africa' characterised by peace:

> Like every true vision of the future, mine ends in peace, and not in war. Assuredly, as England has abolished duelling, and still retains her honour and her self-respect, so

> will the savage arbitrament of war be discredited and disused the world over, when the thoughts of the victorious Galilean shall have become the code of the world. The contests of men will consist in the noble emulations of literature, art, commerce, and industry; in all of which Austral Africa will have its share. I see these things with the eye of the soul; they will surely come to pass. I pray to be permitted to see some of them with the bodily eye also.[1]

Such a vision, so at odds with the political climate in southern Africa in which he was writing, was not just a passing fantasy in Mackenzie's writing. It was rather the fruit of considered reflection. a way of imagining southern Africa (or as he called it, Austral Africa) over which his son claimed he spent many years 'brooding, dreaming, praying [and] working'.[1] It was also a theme that appeared repeatedly within his public speeches and published works. Mackenzie's vision anticipated a trajectory of teleological progress from violent conflict to diplomacy and enduring peace. This movement would be grounded in Christianity, in the exemplary models of Christ's manhood and the highest ideals of Victorian society. It would reach its full realisation in Britain itself, and extend across the southern African sub-continent. In this stadial worldview, 'savage' nations, apparently stuck in a more violent present, would follow European nations down this path of progress. This was no idle vision of peace, but evidently one for which Mackenzie longed, prayed for and in which he profoundly believed. It was also profoundly informed by the experience of war and violence that characterised Mackenzie's time in southern Africa.

Taking this vision as a starting point, this chapter seeks to interrogate the meanings of peace, together with violence and war as its relational counterparts, in John Mackenzie's thinking. Mackenzie was a prolific writer, and influential in the late nineteenth-century missionary world. He was also a prominent speaker, writer and thinker in southern African politics, and although he found his political influence frustratingly limited, his many books and speeches circulated widely and played an important role in constructing ideas about

[1] John Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, *Losing It or Ruling It, Being Incidences and Experiences in Bechuanaland, Cape Colony and England,* vol. 1 (London: Sampson Low, Marsten, Searle and Rivington, 1887), 503,

southern Africa—both in late nineteenth-century Britain and in the colonies themselves.[2] As such, Mackenzie provides important insights into missionary thinking about the concept of peace during this period both in terms of his own contribution and in terms of ideas diffused amongst his readership. Mackenzie's significance partly reflects his sheer productivity, the broad dissemination of his writing, and the diversity of audiences he reached, which led to unusually wide engagement with his ideas. Though not a typical missionary in many respects, his thinking nevertheless drew upon a wider missionary heritage, and in turn shaped trajectories within contemporary missions. Given his stature and influence, Mackenzie's repeated ruminations on peace therefore enable an exploration of the significance of peace in wider currents of missionary thought.

Imperialist loyalties and advocacy were distinctive features of Mackenzie's ideology and career, and included an expressed faith in the peace-making power of the British empire. This conviction was articulated as a version of what has been dubbed the 'pax Britannica' myth of a British empire that was not only characterised by peace but also facilitated it. Despite an increasing wealth of research detailing the enslavement, violence, and destruction perpetuated by colonial regimes, including the British empire, this myth has proved to be remarkably resilient in British cultural history, persisting even into the twenty-first century.[3]

---

[2] *Austral Africa: Loosing It or Ruling It*, 2 vols; *Austral Africa: Extension of British Influence in Trans-colonial Territories. Proceedings at a Meeting of the London Chamber of Commerce, Assembled on the 14th May, 1888* (London: P. S. King and Son, 1888); *Bechuanaland and Our Progress Northward: A Lecture* (Cape Town: Murray and St. Leger, Printers, 1884); *Day-Dawn in Dark Places: A Story of Wanderings and Work in Bechuanaland* (London: Cassell and Company, 1883); *Ten Years North of the Orange River* (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871); *The London Missionary Society in South Africa: Retrospective Sketch* (London: London Missionary Society, 1888).

[3] For a sample of this literature that both supports and critiques the 'Pax Britannica' thesis, see: Barry Gough, *Pax Britannica: Britain and the World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); James Morris, *Pax Britannica: The Climax of an Empire* (London: Faber and Faber, 1979); Ali Parchami, *Hegemonic Peace and Empire: Pax Romana, Britannica and Americana* (London and New York: Routledge, 2009).

Analysis of Mackenzie's ideas about peace enables an examination of missionary entanglement in the process by which a violent colonial enterprise was recast as a harbinger of peace.

My analysis of Mackenzie's vision of peace is developed in three parts. The first introduces Mackenzie and situates him within his political landscape. The second examines how peace functions in Mackenzie's writing, focusing especially on the work peace does in justifying Mackenzie's vision for a southern Africa ruled by Britain. The final section explores the racialisation of peace and its corollaries in Mackenzie's thinking. My central argument is that Mackenzie uses 'peace' as a euphemism for British rule. In addition, I suggest that the association between Mackenzie and 'humanitarianism' by his son and subsequent biographers, is a powerful one that has eclipsed and shaped the way in which his imperial contribution is understood. In

John Mackenzie and His Political Landscape

Born in 1835 in Knockando in the Scottish Highlands, John Mackenzie was the sixth child of a farming father and a deaf mother. He experienced a profound religious conversion as a young man, following which he kept a highly introspective diary which demonstrated his intense engagement with Christian spirituality. After hearing Alexander Williamson (later a missionary to China) preach in June 1854, he determined to become a missionary. His original application to the LMS at the age of nineteen was rejected on account of his youth, his brief connection with a Christian Church, and limited education, but a later application was accepted and he joined the LMS at the age of 20 upon which he studied theology at the Congregational Seminary in Bedford. In 1858 he was ordained, married Ellen (née Douglas) from Portobello, and travelled to southern Africa.

The southern African mission was a diverse and long-running LMS concern reaching from the Cape Colony well into the southern African interior. It was a mission that was considerably shaped by a few individuals including Robert Moffat, David Livingstone and later John Mackenzie himself. Even by the second half of the nineteenth century, when other missions such as the LMS in India, had seen the 'feminisation' of the mission field, the southern African mission remained predominantly male, possibly because it was seen as a 'dangerous' and politically turbulent area.[4] Accompanied by much violence, formal British rule had also extended sporadically over the large swathes of African territory owned and inhabited by a wide variety of Indigenous groups, some of which were already in conflict with each other. There were also, of course, the Afrikaner settlers, rivalling the British as a colonising power and engaged in their own fraught relationships with African polities. LMS activity occurred both within and beyond the formal colonial frontier.

Originally Mackenzie was posted on the notoriously disastrous MaKololo Expedition (1859–60) but, thanks to Ellen's confinement and the birth of their first son, which separated them from the rest of the group, they escaped probable death from the tsetse flies that killed all but three of the expeditionary party. In the following years, Mackenzie worked and travelled extensively in Bechuanaland, particularly amongst the Ngwato, experiences recounted in his popular memoirs *Ten Years North of the Orange River* and *Day-Dawn in Dark Places*. This was a time of considerable conflict in this area, not least with the neighbouring Ndebele who were often portrayed as an aggressor tribe in missionary writing. As such, Mackenzie experienced war at first hand, negotiating with perpetrators, sheltering

[4] Esme Cleall, *Missionary Discourses of Difference: Negotiating Otherness in the British Empire, 1840–1900* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012). For more on the 'feminisation' of missions, see Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

from violence, fleeing missionary stations and conveying strategic information.[5] At 5 ft 11 inches and of large frame his imposing figure made an impression. He was known amongst the Tswana as 'Mohibuni' ('Red person' or 'Red man') partly on account of his red beard and sunburned face, and partly because of the symbolic meaning of the colour red in the Tswana worldview which was associated with ambiguous power.[6] In the mid-1870s, Mackenzie became increasingly caught up in imperial and colonial politics, particularly concerning the relationship between Bechuanaland and Griqualand West.

Bechuanaland and Griqualand West were large territories which, when Mackenzie first became acquainted with them in the early 1860s, fell outside the boundaries of formal imperial rule. This was soon to change. The discovery of diamond fields in Griqualand West and the conviction by all that they would yield further riches, placed them at the centre of a power struggle between the two British South African Colonies (Cape Colony and Natal), the Boer Republics (Orange State and Transvaal), individual gold-diggers, fortune-seekers and buccaneers, and between different Indigenous groups particularly the Rrolong, the Ngwatetse and the Tlhaping. The Portuguese, who it transpired had an earlier claim on the territory, were also involved. Unpicking the events surrounding the annexations, retractions and re-annexations of these different territories is complicated, not least because at every conjecture each party took away a radically different interpretation of any agreement reached. Behind all of these developments lurked the ever-threatening promise of violence.[7]

Mackenzie dreamt of resolving these problems, and those greater yet that followed. Initially, he endeavoured to do so through missionary work, preaching a doctrine he

---

[5] See Mackenzie, *Ten Years North of the Orange River*.

[6] Paul Stuart Landau, *The Realm of the Word: Language, Gender and Christianity in a Southern African Kingdom* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1995), 13.

[7] Some histories of some of these events include: J. Mutero Chirenje, *A History of Northern Botswana 1850–1910* (London: Associated University Press, 1977); Sampson Jerry, *History of Botswana Early History, Government, Economy, People* (Adidjan: Sonit Education Academy, 2006).

characterised as one of 'peace' and 'civilisation'. Increasingly, however, Mackenzie sought political solutions. He saw missionary work and imperial politics as complementary and interwoven paths to peace in southern Africa, and hoped they could be knitted together both theoretically and in his own career. Such a position was, however, unpopular with his employers, who were committed to a policy of 'political impartiality' (which often implied tacit acceptance of imperial manoeuvres). In 1878, when Sir Bartle Frere offered him the position of Commissioner of Bechuanaland, the LMS refused Mackenzie's request to allow him to work part-time as a missionary and part-time as a colonial officer, as he had proposed, claiming that 'the sanction of the directors of the Missionary Society was not given to such a corporal union of Church and State'.[8] At this point, Mackenzie bowed to LMS pressure and refused the position, but he remained committed to the Bechuana cause and endeavoured to get his imperial ideas adopted elsewhere.

Mackenzie's 'political vision' was remarkably consistent throughout his career. He was a strong believer both in European expansion, which he saw as inevitable, and imperial governance, which he was convinced was necessary to manage relations between Europeans and Indigenous peoples. Mackenzie thought that areas outside formal British control should be monitored by British Residents who would be directly responsible to the Imperial Government rather than to the Colonial Government in the Cape.[9] He argued that Indigenous areas should be governed through a system of 'Territorial Government' (a model that had recently been applied by the Colonial Office to a system they had wanted to establish in Basutoland); these areas would be 'administered on traditional lines by the tribal hierarchy', but overseen by the High Commissioner.[10] He believed that whilst under Territorial

[8] LMS (1879) quoted in Anthony Sillery, *John Mackenzie of Bechuanaland 1835–1899: A Study in Humanitarian Imperialism* (Balkema, Cape Town, 1871), 57.

[9] Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 52–53.

[10] Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 53.

Government, Indigenous people would have an opportunity to be 'civilised', whilst the Imperial Government would be able to prevent abuses of Europeans upon Indigenous peoples by monitoring the situation and intervening when necessary. He argued that this system should be paid for through taxing Indigenous people. This is the basis of a scheme that Mackenzie advocated at various points and (only slightly) modified to different situations ranging from Griqualand West, Matabeleland, the Transvaal and Bechuanaland.[11]

As time went on Mackenzie became increasingly embroiled in imperial politics. He spent his 1882 furlough in Britain campaigning rigorously for the annexation of Bechuanaland – lobbying parliament, business interests and missionary supporters alike, exerting most notable influence amongst Nonconformists and humanitarians). In 1884, he left the LMS in favour of a Deputy Commissionership in Bechuanaland, and joined the Warren Expedition that sought to assert British sovereignty in the region under the threat of military force. Mackenzie's office as Commissioner was short and eventful. He resigned in August 1884 after only six months, and despite some success with the declaration of Botswana as a British Protectorate his commissionership was widely recognised to have been a failure.[12] The task before him was huge, whilst his instructions were vague and his brief diffuse. According to his albeit sympathetic biographers, his remit was 'absurd' given the resources he was allocated and the artificial distinctions drawn in official thinking between polities, land and resources which were impossible to implement on the ground.[13] The question as to

[11] For articulations of this scheme see for example: John Mackenzie, *The High Commissionership as Connected with the Progress and Prosperity of South Africa – Further Correspondence Respecting the Affairs of the Transvaal and Sent to Parliament June 1886* (West Minister: Parliamentary Agency, 1886); Mackenzie, *Bechuanaland and our Progress Northwards*; Mackenzie, *Austral Africa: Extension of British Influence in Trans-Colonial Territories*. See also Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 51.

[12] Andrew Ross, 'John MacKenzie,' *Dictionary of African Christian Biography*, https://dacb.org/stories/southafrica/mackenzie-john2/ (accessed 27 Aug 2019).

[13] Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 87.

who owned the land now seemed apparently unresolvable as pseudo-legal agreements designated the same land to multiple parties, whose claims were mutually incompatible. The Cape refused Mackenzie the police force he believed necessary to exert control in Stellaland and Goshen and both the British and Cape Governments grew increasingly anxious about intervening, having no intention to fight for the territories on grounds of cost. In July, the 'freebooters' raided Mafeking, killing thirteen people, and a few days later attacked the town again. Mackenzie was recalled to Cape Town and replaced with Cecil Rhodes.

From 1890, Mackenzie returned to missionary work and to the Missionary Institution at Hankey, back under the employment of the LMS. He threw himself into his work and became leader of the Congregational Union. Although suffering increasingly bad health, he worked in Hankey with his wife and two of his daughters who taught at the local school. He continued to correspond widely about southern African affairs, which descended into further violence. Rhodes's South Africa Company absorbed an increasing amount of territory, which incorporated Bechuanaland in the mid-1890s. The Jameson Raid, a failed armed coup against the Cape government, made the situation still more precarious. The late 1890s saw famine, rebellion and war in both Bechuanaland and Matabeleland. Mackenzie died in 1899 eight months before the outbreak of the (Second) South Africa ('Boer') War, a development which would have horrified him.[14]

Mackenzie's political career has made him one of the most controversial figures in the complicated historiography of missionaries' relationship with empire. This historiography has argued from one perspective that missionaries were intimately if unofficially connected with empire as agents of cultural imperialism; from another perspective that there is no 'plausible connection' between missionary activity and imperial policy; and from a third perspective that the relationship between missionaries and imperialism was variegated and ambivalent,

[14] Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie*, 544.

with different missionaries at times challenging and at other times endorsing, if not ideologically bolstering, the colonial state.[15] In some ways Mackenzie was an exceptional figure who straddled the positions of coloniser and missionary more unambiguously than most. Yet in other ways, as Anthony Dachs argues, Mackenzie was less idiosyncratic than his biographers depict him to be, deeply embedded as he was in a longstanding pattern of behaviour and understanding of the world premised on fifty years of LMS relations with the Tswana.[16] Those sympathetic to Mackenzie have emphasised Mackenzie's links with 'humanitarianism'. For example, Anthony Sillery's biography *John Mackenzie of Bechuanaland* is subtitled *A Study in Humanitarian Imperialism* and argues throughout that Mackenzie stood for a 'humanitarian policy' in southern Africa.[17] Part of the evidence for this includes Mackenzie's own opinion that 'the Bechuana question is a humanitarian one', by which he meant 'justice' in the 'welfare' of the Tswana people of which he saw himself as

[15] For one proponent of the view that missionaries and imperialism were firmly connected see Arun Shourie, *Missionaries in India: Continuities, Changes and Dilemmas* (New Delhi: ASA Publications, 1994). For notable contributions to the debate see for example: Norman Etherington, ed., *Missions and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Andrew Porter, *Religion Versus Empire: British Protestant Missionaries and Overseas Expansion, c. 1700–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); Ian Copland, 'Christianity as an Arm of Empire: The Ambiguous Case of India Under the Company, c. 1813–1858,' *Historical Journal* 49 (4) (2006), 1025-54; Jeffrey Cox, 'Were Victorian Nonconformists the Worst Imperialists of them All?,' *Victorian Studies*, 46 (2) (2004), 243–255; John Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, *Of Revelation and Revolution*: *Christianity, Colonialism, and Consciousness in South Africa* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Catherine Hall, *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002); Alan Lester, *Imperial Networks: Creating Identities in Nineteenth-century South Africa and Britain* (London: Routledge, 2001; Amanda Barry, Joanna Cruikshank, Andrew Brown-May and Patricia Grimshaw, *Evangelists of Empire: Missionaries in Colonial History* (Melbourne: University of Melbourne, 2008). The quotation is from Brian Stanley, *The Bible and the Flag: Protestant Missions and British Imperialism in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Leicester: Apollo, 1990), 58–59.

[16] Anthony Dachs, 'Missionary Imperialism—The Case of Bechuanaland,' *Journal of African History*, 13 (4) (1972), 647.

[17] Sillery, *John Mackenzie*.

the main advocate.[18] Sillery does not argue that humanitarian policy was not also a form of 'imperialism', but his emphasis is certainly on a benevolent rather than an exploitative policy. Åke Holmberg also sees Mackenzie as the 'bearer of a humanitarian tradition in South Africa' that he traces back to the famous LMS missionary John Philip, who arrived in the Cape in 1818 and famously fed information into the Select Committee for the Protection of Aborigines.[19] Whereas Sillery cast humanitarianism as a benevolent form of imperialism, Holmberg defined Mackenzie's 'humanitarianism' in decisive opposition to the 'colonialism' represented by other forces in southern Africa – not least Cecil Rhodes, the Cape politician, mining magnate and enthusiastic exponent of British expansion.

Notwithstanding the personal opposition between Mackenzie and Rhodes, Kenneth Hall has argued that the evidence Sillery and Holmberg provide is 'inadequate' in establishing that Mackenzie's view of Tswana society was significantly different to that of his contemporaries.[20] In fact, Hall argues, they actually shared important premises about African behaviour, British 'supremacy' and the 'need' for British rule. 'Not only did Mackenzie subscribe to the assumptions of his counterparts, the proposals he submitted for governing Bechuanaland had the same ends in view'.[21] Fidelis Nkomazana and Senzokuhle Doreen Setume make a similar point, arguing that 'regardless of the claims that the missionaries [in Bechuanaland] considered themselves anti-colonial… it is evident that they were part of the colonial structure'[22] Anthony Dachs, meanwhile, sees Mackenzie's role in

[18] John Mackenzie (November 1883) quoted in Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 77.

[19] Åke Holmberg, *African Tribes and European Agencies: Colonialism and Humanitarianism in British South and East Africa 1879–1895* (Goteborg: Scandinavian University Books, 1966), p. 12.

[20] Kenneth O. Hall, 'Humanitarianism and Racial Subordination: John Mackenzie and the Transformation of Tswana Society,' *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 8 (1) (1975), 97–110, esp. 98.

[21] *Ibid.*, 99.

[22] Fidelis Nkomazana and Senzokuhle Doreen Setume, 'Missionary Colonial Mentality and the Expansion of Christianity in Bechuanaland Protectorate, 1800 to 1900', *Journal for the Study of Religion*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (2016), pp. 29-55.

the British annexation of Bechulanaland as a 'classic instance of missionary imperialism' with missionaries using the power of the colonial state to further their agenda of proselytisation and, as such, rendering imperial expansion and missionary practice inextricable.[23] 'The missionaries', Dachs argues, 'were as much agents of alien political expansion as traders, consuls and concession-hunters. By their settlement they threatened independence; by their methods they eroded custom, integrity and authority; by their connexions they invited the imperial replacement of resistant African rule.'[24] Dachs also emphasises the extent to which missionary practice had to be adapted to the beliefs and structures of Tswana society; it was their resistance to Christianisation, he suggests, that convinced Mackenzie and fellow missionaries that British intervention was necessary.[25] Brian Stanley has more recently rejected this argument, contending that Mackenzie was 'too idealistic' to be motivated by instrumentalist uses of imperialism, and that his machinations in Bechuanaland 'owed less to evangelistic strategy than it did to humanitarian concern'.[26]

I interpret Mackenzie as having been heavily invested in the expansion of colonial rule, and committed to a colonising project that intersected in substantive ways with wider commercial and political colonising projects. In this sense, my argument is closer to that of Hall and Dachs than it is to Sillery, Holmberg and Stanley. In particular, I am influenced by Hall's theory of the shared values that underpinned Mackenzie and Rhodes's assumptions about African capacity and the supposed supremacy of British rule. Interrogating the role that 'peace' played in Mackenzie's thinking and praxis shifts the focus from debates about the extent of Mackenzie's supposed humanitarianism or imperialism in productive ways. It

[23] Stanley, *Bible and the Flag*, 117.

[24] Dachs, 'Missionary Imperialism,' 658.

[25] Dachs, 'Missionary Imperialism,' 658.

[26] Stanley, *Bible and the Flag*, 118.

reveals that claims of peace provided a powerful means through which imperial expansion was justified and Indigenous peoples subordinated.

Practices and Discourses of Peace

'Peace', used as an adjective, an aspiration and an ideology, reoccurs throughout Mackenzie's extensive writings. The term occurs 26 times in *Day-Dawn in Dark Places*, 38 times in *Ten Years North of the Orange River*, and 363 times in the two volumes of *Austral Africa*. Cognate terms and the concept, without reference to the word itself, are also evident throughout these works. Taken together, this provides some indication of the extent to which peace was an ongoing preoccupation for Mackenzie. Mackenzie's idealistic rhetoric had a particular shape; his use of peace discourse bolstered his ideological positioning, but must be seen as imbued with substantive meaning.

In his statement at his ordination in 1858, Mackenzie, like many other new missionaries, was committed to a doctrine that contrasted the violence of 'heathendom' with the peace of Christianity. Christianisation and civilisation were closely linked in his thinking as he believed that 'in order to complete the work of elevating the people, we must teach them the arts of civilised life'. To do so, he argued 'if we exhort them to lay aside the sword for the ploughshare and the spear for the pruning-hook, we must be prepared to teach them to use them with the same dexterity which they exhibited in wielding the other. If they are no longer to start upon the marauding expedition, if they are not to rely on the precarious results of the chase, then we must teach them to till their own land, sow and reap their own crops, build their own barns as well as tend their own flocks.'[27] The vision of a 'civilised', agrarian society here is striking.

[27] Mackenzie, Statement at his Ordination, Edinburgh 19 April 1858, reproduced in *Papers of John Mackenzie*, edited by Anthony J. Dachs (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1975), 72.

Mackenzie used the concept of peace in his writing to forge a community of like-minded thinkers who would support his actions in southern Africa. In referring to 'friends of peace', and 'all lovers of peaceful progress' he evoked a constituency of humanitarian and missionary thinkers to be placed alongside other groups such as 'the multitudes who are interested in commerce'.[28] Similarly he wrote of the 'good of the empire, and the peace of the world' as universal aspirations, or elsewhere as 'nobler trophies' that could be shared by all.[29] The desirability of peace is taken for granted in his writing despite the engagement of many of the consistencies with whom he worked in active conquest. Furthermore, Mackenzie presented peace as a personal goal as well as a general missionary concern. 'My scheme contemplated the peaceful opening up of the whole country', he wrote.[30] 'My object in this country is to produce peace, harmony and good will'.[31] He also wrote of his 'services in the cause of the peace of Bechuanaland and of South Africa.'[32]

Part of the discursive power of the word 'peace' in Mackenzie's writings was achieved through its frequent couplings with other positive concepts in Victorian thinking: 'peace and industry', 'peace and prosperity', 'peace and progress', 'peace and stability', 'peace and justice' and 'peace and security'.[33] The most frequently used coupling is 'peace and order' which appears repeatedly in his writing, and has the effect of equating peace with British rule.[34] Implicit in this framing is also the portrayal of Indigenous peoples without European colonisation as chaotic, a frequent claim in much imperial writing. Mackenzie's

[28] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 175.

[29] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, pp. 1-2,

[30] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 202.

[31] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 309.

[32] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 169.

[33] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, preface, 217; 245, 259, 293 and 443.

[34] For references to 'peace and order' see for example Mackenzie, *Austral Africa,* vol. 1, 234, 283, 236, 380 (twice), 392, 403, 443 and 481.

desire for the 'peace and unity of the races under Her Majesty', similarly ties peacefulness with the promise of British rule.[35]

In terms of lived experience and missionary practice, it is also important to make an obvious point: peace and war operate as important descriptors of a turbulent and often violent political landscape to which Mackenzie was a witness. His time in southern Africa saw numerous conflicts between Indigenous polities and the violent extension of both British rule and Dutch settlement; and he saw this fighting at close quarters. The point is worth making because witnessing war and peace directly, as opposed to in the abstract, is highly formative. I have written elsewhere about the profound effect that experiences of violence and displacement had on the missionary psyche and in particular on the performance of missionary masculinity.[36] Mackenzie was certainly affected by these processes. Whilst desperately presenting themselves as occupying positions of autonomy underpinned by faith, missionaries such as Mackenzie often ended up depending on peoples and situations out of their control. If war was an archetypal arena for the performance of masculinity, and if missionary men did not fight, discursive work had to be put into their responses to conflict that would cast missionary behaviour positively, in terms of active participation, and to mitigate their bodily vulnerability.[37] But the concept of peace was by no means limited in Mackenzie's thinking, to these political realities.

Whilst Mackenzie did not write extensively about the theological underpinning of his worldview, he did return to Biblical teachings to inform his responses to colonial politics. During 1878, when Mackenzie was stationed amongst the Tlhaping in South Bechuanaland, a

[35] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 449.

[36] Esme Cleall, 'Missionaries, Masculinities and War: The London Missionary Society in Southern Africa, c. 1860–1899,' *South African Historical Journal*, 61 (2) (2009), 232–253. See also Cleall, *Missionary Discourses*, chapters 5 and 6.

[37] Cleall, 'Missionaries, Masculinities and War.'

rumour began to circulate of a 'colour war': 'no white man must be spared'.[38] When rumours appeared to be confirmed by the killing of the three Europeans at Daniel's Kuil, Europeans throughout South Bechuanaland panicked and started to congregate. By his own account, Mackenzie did much to calm things down, persuading the European traders not to 'take a stand' by themselves but instead offering them accommodation in the not-yet-finished Institution he was having built. In recounting this situation in *Austral Africa*, Mackenzie recounts an interesting conversation with two Quaker visitors, Mr Isaac Sharp and Mr Langley Kitching, about the meanings of war and peace. When Sharp praised Mackenzie for attempting to advert violence, Mackenzie replied 'that we must do all in our power towards this end, and leave the rest in God's hands'.[39] But despite describing himself as 'almost a Quaker' on account of having life-long cherished their views, Mackenzie was by no means a pacifist.[40] He wrote of some forms of violence as necessary in order to prevent further bloodshed, and during his conversation with Mr Sharp, which developed into a discussion of the use of physical force, Mackenzie returned to the Bible to justify war in some contexts. Jesus' teachings against resistance were quoted, yet he returned to Mosaic Law, legitimising violence in gendered terms; that is, by affirming that men should have the right to protect women:

> the [Mosaic] law was universal, that the strong male defended the weaker female and their offspring. This law of nature surely extended to man, and was not abolished by Christianity. It was, therefore, right in the highest sense for Christian husbands and fathers to defend those whom God had given them, and if need be to die in their defence.[41]

As was common in colonial discourse, race and gender were easily read off each other, and the Biblical teachings, overtly about gender, were readily applied to a racial hierarchy

[38] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 82.

[39] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 85.

[40] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 85.

[41] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 85.

wherein the British should protect the 'weaker races'. It was important for Mackenzie to reconcile this Hebraic teaching with the life of Jesus, and he saw in Jesus' 'own example before the highest Jewish Court' as 'explanatory of what He really meant. We were to be forgiving and charitable and long-suffering; but we had His own example, that there was also an occasion when we should stand up for our rights.'[42]

Going back to the Hebrew Bible's use of 'shalom', peace was an active concept in Mackenzie's thinking, indicating 'wholeness' and a positive assertation of an earthly and also a spiritual landscape that was imbued justice, order and harmony – not merely the absence of conflict. As a missionary, Mackenzie described himself as a 'man of peace', performing 'peaceful labours'.[43] He believed 'the one gospel of peace and good-will' had particular resonances in southern Africa precisely because it was characterised by warfare and violence.[44] In *Ten Years North of the Orange River*, which recorded the earlier part of Mackenzie's missionary career, and written before he became involved in critiquing imperial policy (of which *Austral Africa* is a commentary), peace is used literally to denote an absence of warfare, and also to refer to his identity as a missionary. When asked by the Ngwato chief Sekgome whether he would help in his war against the Ndebele he replied in the negative, reminding Sekgome that 'I was a promulgator of peace and good-will amongst all men'.[45] This basis for refusal, whilst drawing on language common in missionary discourse, might be seen as somewhat disingenuous in the case of missionary relations with the Tswana, which had historically involved trading firearms that were then used in Indigenous conflicts.[46] It was, however, a powerful discourse to maintain. As we know from Mackenzie's trajectory,

[42] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 85.

[43] Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 433; 404.

[44] Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 134.

[45] Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 270–271.

[46] Dachs, 'Missionary Imperialism,' 648. See also Ørnulf Gulbrandsen, 'Missionaries and Northern Tswana Rulers: Who Used Whom?,' *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 23 (1) (1993), 50.

this kind of language could be used not only to exonerate missionaries from implications of violence but could also be used to construct a narrative of empire and imperial expansion that might also be described as one of peace. It is to this vision that I will now turn.

Austral Africa: Mackenzie's Vision of Peace and Imperialism

Throughout the violence and upheavals witnessed throughout his lifetime, Mackenzie clung to a vision for southern Africa that involved the extension of imperial governance across the subcontinent – from Cape Town to the Zambesi and from Ocean to Ocean. In his writings, he imbued 'Austral Africa' with an almost mythical status. He spoke of a '"fresh departure," which would form a sequel to recent disturbances and wars, in various parts of Southern Africa.'[47] He optimistically sketched an imperial future for southern Africa characterised by a peaceful 'mingling of the races', an expansion of British power, a southern Africa where 'black' and 'white' could co-exist – a comingling he believed was the 'will of God'.[48] Mackenzie believed that without British imperial intervention, cooperation between races could not be achieved:

> I desire that English rule should be gradually, and with due caution, extended over the native tribes; and that it should be done in such a manner that England should regard her work in this land with pleasure and with pride, instead of impatient bewilderment, as at present.[49]

This vision for the future provided a remarkable contrast with the political reality of contemporary southern Africa. Yet Mackenzie strove to make such a vision come alive for his audiences using maps, illustrations and stories, to try to convince his readers and listeners that his dream *was* possible. He believed that his vision would be endorsed by a variety of

[47] John Mackenzie (letter dated December 1879 to Sir Bartle Frere and Sir Garnet Wolseley) reproduced in Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie*, 243.

[48] Mackenzie, memo, quoted in Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie*, 244.

[49] Mackenzie, memo, quoted in Mackenzie, *John Mackenzie*, 244–245.

different interest groups, appealing 'not only to the British Statesman, but also to the broad-minded Philanthropist, to the promoter of Colonisation, to the advocate of Temperance, and to the friend of Peace, as well as to the multitudes who are interested in Commerce'.[50] Reading 'the friend of Peace' as missionaries and their supporters this can be interpreted as a rather late rendering of the '3 Cs' of Christianity, civilisation, and commerce in missionary thinking. It certainly shows that he considered colonisation and peace to be compatible, despite arguing elsewhere that 'trouble' was 'inseparable from empire'.[51]

This vision is most strongly advanced in his 1000 plus page, multivolume text, *Austral Africa,* a combination of personal memoir of Mackenzie's political involvement in southern Africa, an account of the historical and geo-political context of the contemporary crisis, and a manifesto for future action in the subcontinent. The concept of peace framed this extensive work. Opening with his reflections on the 1886 Colonial Exhibition Mackenzie applauded the productions and industries which bring together 'the minds of the various parts of the English Empire, for the good of the empire, and the peace of the world'. He contrasted the visitors' responses to the 'strange idols' and 'oriental grandeur' of the Indian Empire, to the 'nobler trophies of peace and industry which had been sent to the mother country from her children inhabiting the Greater Britain beyond the seas.'[52] In concluding, he turned from constructing the history of southern Africa to imagining its future, writing that he saw 'this peaceful progress and prosperity of the whole country advancing step by step as it never did before'.[53] Throughout he charted the process whereby peace would be achieved and maintained.

[50] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, vi.

[51] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 133.

[52] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 2.

[53] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 2, 503.

This was an overtly imperial ideology, for when contemplating these colonising projects, and the violence they brought, Mackenzie did not recoil from colonisation generally, but rather advocated an imperial framework, radiating from Britain (or in Mackenzie's writing, despite his Scottishness, from England), through which to render these processes peaceful. Mackenzie was painfully aware of the pervasiveness of colonial violence, and drew attention to its evils throughout his negotiations in imperial politics. Whatever his idealism and his commitment to Britain, he wrote that he was 'disgusted' by the way in which Britain handled the South African situation, the 'mess' that had been made and its unwillingness to get involved in the way he deemed necessary.[54] In repeatedly deploring the British policy of non-engagement in South Africa, he constantly acknowledged the violence inherent in the colonial system. When still working for the LMS, Mackenzie saw his position as missionary as bearing a duty of 'witness' to record the 'wrong' and 'unpleasant' occurrences in southern Africa back to the metropole.'[55] He was 'not unwilling' to give those he met

> a sketch of our doings in South Africa – how we got it; how we improved it at once from what it was; how we allowed swarms of white men to get beyond our control and to become independent; how in the end we handed the future of the country over to them in the Sand River Convention, pledging ourselves never to make treaties with natives, but allowing the Boers to do so; and granting the Boers ammunition and the natives none.'[56]

This bleak picture of the Transvaal drew attention not only to the violence, but the way in which this was legally entrenched.[57]

Evoking the uniqueness of southern Africa in contrast to colonies such as India, where the Indigenous population remained numerically dominant, and Australia, where the Indigenous population was believed to be 'dying out', Mackenzie wrote of southern Africa as

[54] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 131.

[55] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 132.

[56] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 135.

[57] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 136.

having ‘immense unoccupied tracts, into which it has been satisfactorily shown of late that emigrants can be peacefully introduced with the approval of the native chiefs and people’.[58] Such an image, which evokes the myth of *terra nullius* common in justifying colonial expansion, strongly posits the possibility of peaceful European expansion, a process, in reality underwritten by violence. The ‘growth or expansion of the European population’ was something that he explicitly wrote could and should be ‘peaceful’.[59] As well as being committed to a general belief that the British empire brought ‘peace and industry’, he believed that specific imperial initiatives, such as the Warren Expedition, defended the ‘prosperity of all peaceful people’ and would ‘secure the peaceful and orderly opening up of the country which had been ruined morally and commercially by lawless freebooters’.[60]

Peaceful expansion was not assured of course and even Mackenzie only saw it as one pathway the British could take if they intervened in the situation in a particular way. The alternative was violence. ‘[I]s the spread of Europeans in South Africa to be peaceful and orderly and remunerative to a Central Government’, he asked, or is it to be accompanied by outrage and war?[61] Discussing the persistent violence in southern Africa, he wrote:

> The alternative, which I propose … is to respect private property, and to be just and firm, and sever when there is occasion; then the natives will believe in you, and the country will make peaceful and rapid progress. The way to avoid war and bloodshed is to incorporate peaceful native communities by arrangement with the chiefs, under a General Government, before complications have arisen, take over all unoccupied lands as belonging to Government, and defray the expenses of local administration by local taxation.’[62]

Mackenzie envisaged various Indigenous peoples, as well as different groups of European settlers, being brought under ‘the peaceful sway of Her Majesty.’[63] Following in the tradition

[58] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, p. 3.

[59] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol 1.

[60] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1., p. 6.

[61] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol 1., p. 97.

[62] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa,* vol. 1, 99.

[63] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa,* vol. 1, 105–106.

of humanitarian intervention dating back to the Aborigine Select Committee of the 1830s, which purported that direct British rule would stop the abuses of various 'natives' by settlers, he repeatedly called for British intervention in southern African politics – including creation of a Crown Colony as far as the Zambesi.[64] However, unlike previous articulations of such a policy, which did not intrinsically require British intervention, such a policy would need enforcement.[65] Mackenzie was unwilling to engage with the realities of what this enforcement might entail. His insistence that imperial rule equated with peace may be considered naïve. Given Mackenzie's significant experience of southern African politics, however, it reads more like a deliberate erasure and refusal to engage with the violent realities of British rule.

Mackenzie's imagining of a southern Africa characterised by peace was also distinctly utopian, evoking as it did a subcontinent blessed with racial harmony, the eschewing of greed and exploitation and, perhaps most importantly, characterised by Christianity, 'civilisation' and commerce. Such ideals are more commonly associated with the missionary movement of the first half of the nineteenth century than the second. Their persistence indicates the lingering connection between missionaries and humanitarianism, and perhaps more importantly, an enduring and intimate association between peace and humanitarianism.[66] The utopia Mackenzie envisioned was Providentially ordained, and

[64] Dachs, *Papers of John Mackenzie*, 153.

[65] Geoffrey Troughton, 'Samuel Marsden and the Origins of a New Zealand Christian Peace Tradition,' in Geoffrey Troughton, ed., *Saints and Stirrers: Christianity, Conflict and Peacemaking in New Zealand, 1814 – 1945* (Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2017), 29–47.

[66] Alan Lester, 'Humanitarians and White Settlers in the Nineteenth Century', *Missions and Empire*, 80–84; Porter, *Religion versus Empire.* The literature on humanitarianism is newly expansive and may need closer consideration in connection with issues of peace not least to track the extent to which this periodisation (with humanitarianism waning after the 1840s) is complicated by later developments. For examples of this recent literature on humanitarianism, see, for example: Penelope Edmonds and Anna Johnston, 'Empire, Humanitarianism and Violence in the Colonies', *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History*, Vol 17, Spring

deeply and unambivalently linked with the British empire – an empire he believed would provide the ideological underpinning, political scaffolding and practical infrastructure for a Pax Britannica. As Anthony Sillery, Mackenzie's biographer, has argued 'Mackenzie's importance does not lie so much in what he did as in what he said'.[67] Whilst Mackenzie's political influence both as a missionary and as Commissioner was far more limited than he wanted, his thinking had a wider significance in propagating a notion that the British empire, however violent its lived realities, was underpinned by the desire for and ability to realise peace. This idea permeates Mackenzie's writings, producing a remarkably consistent discourse in which peace, despite colonial violence, is the prerogative of the British.

Peace and Racialisation

If peace discourses were central to Mackenzie's imperial vision and work, they were also critically related to ideas about racial superiority and inferiority on which that imperial vision depended. Mackenzie's deployment of peace may be regarded as serving a crucial role in justifying such ideas and also making them palatable back in Britain. Kenneth Hall argues that 'Mackenzie saw no conflict between humanitarianism and racial subordination' and whatever his evocation of a peaceful 'comingling of the races' there is plenty of evidence in

2016. See also articles in this special issue. Useful articles sited in this introduction include: Rob Skinner and Alan Lester, "Humanitarianism and Empire: New research agendas," *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 40 (5) (2012): 729–747; Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Peter Stamatov, *The Origins of Global Humanitarianism: Religion, Empires, and Advocacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); Didier Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012); Michelle Tusan, 'Humanitarianism, Genocide and Liberalism,' *Journal of Genocide Research* 17 (1) (2015): 83–105; Fae Dussart and Alan Lester, *Colonization and the Origins of Humanitarian Governance: Protecting Aborigines Across the Nineteenth-Century British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[67] Sillery, *John Mackenzie*, 185, quoted in Hall, 'Humanitarianism and Racial Subordination,' 97.

his writing that this imagined world did not entail racial equality.[68] Instead, the structural racism embedded in Mackenzie's thinking took for granted that British rule would operate at a 'higher' level of civilisation and that its imposition would be beneficial for all concerned. As Hall argues, Africans, by contrast appeared in Makenzie's thinking as incapable of ruling themselves, and dependent on the spread of the European rule that he saw as both inevitable and ordained. A racial hierarchy is implicit in Mackenzie's description of 'the natives' as 'our Divinely provided helpers in the great work of subduing the wilderness and compelling the mine to give up its treasures'.[69] Whilst he was unusual in seeing cooperation between races, such cooperation always anticipated British leadership.

Analysis of Mackenzie's concept of peace helps us to extend these insights. It demonstrates that peace was far from a benign concept in Mackenzie's writing: it was not only equated with British rule to justify imperial expansion, but also to justify and explain racial subordination. Ideas of 'peacefulness' help construct and maintain racial hierarchies which were in turn deployed as part of a justification for British rule. This interpretation builds upon Hall, and is also the counterpart to an argument I have made elsewhere about the use of violence.[70] I have argued that the belief that certain groups (such as the Ndebele) had a propensity for violence was used to 'Other' them; the evocation of violence, which included visceral descriptions of mutilation and dismemberment, were used to define certain groups of Indigenous people through the somatic. This had the effect of justifying missionary involvement in Matabeleland and later helped to explain the hesitant and inconsistent missionary response to its violent colonisation and incorporation into southern Rhodesia. A similar argument can be made of the relational opposition: peace. Mackenzie depicted the

[68] Hall, 'Humanitarianism and Racial Subordination,' 110.

[69] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 268.

[70] Cleall, *Missionary Discourses*, chapters 5 and 6.

Tlhaping, for example, as of 'peaceful disposition', living for half a century in 'entire-peacefulness' near the colonial boarder.[71] 'It speaks volumes for the peaceful disposition of the Bechuana tribes', Mackenzie wrote, 'that for more than half a century these people have lived near our colonial border in entire peacefulness, and that while their own tribal system was slowly decaying.'[72] Elsewhere, Mackenzie wrote that the 'peaceful history of Bechuanaland' was well-known.[73] Despite the largely positive connotations 'peace' signifies, the evocations here are of childlike innocence, passivity and reliance on European influence.

The relationship between 'peace' and 'race' in Mackenzie's thought is complex, as it is in imperial thinking generally. From constructions of the Scots, Sikhs and Gurkhas as 'martial races', to constructions of Aborigine Australians as 'passive' victims of violence and colonisation, the ability, willingness and aptitude to fight was valorised in imperial thinking.[74] In keeping with such thinking, Mackenzie characterises the Ndebele, Zulus and Xhosa throughout his writings as 'warlike' whilst other groups are constructed as 'timid and unwarlike tribes'.[75] There is a complicated relationship between these epithets and racial hierarchies. Here, as elsewhere in imperial writing, the so-called 'marital races' attracted more respect from the British. Yet Mackenzie's references to 'rude and warlike clans' also speaks to the way that violence could be used to evoke 'savagery'.[76] Throughout Mackenzie's writings, being 'peaceable' was also highly racialised. That is, it was interpreted as an inherent racial characteristic rather than the product of particular circumstances within the turbulent geopolitical situation of his time. The racial hierarchy also intersected with religious

[71] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1.

[72] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa,* vol. 1, 45.

[73] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol 1, 413.

[74] Heather Streets, *Martial Races: The Military, Race and Masculinity in British Imperial Culture, 1857–1914* (Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2004).

[75] See for example Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 319, 489, 501; 243.

[76] Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 365.

and cultural difference as a straightforward correlation between peacefulness and civilisation was complicated by the extent to which various polities were seen as receptive to Christianity. Those who were seen as resistant, most notably the Ndebele amongst whom conversion rates were notoriously low, were not also described as 'peaceful'. At the same time, the Tlhapping, who has noted above were considered peace-loving, were seen as particularly receptive to Christianity.

With this in mind, it is unsurprising that white violence occupied a particularly difficult place in Mackenzie's thinking. White violence, perpetrated against Indigenous peoples who were acknowledged to be disadvantaged in conflict owing to the more rudimentary military technology available to them, disturbed notions of 'fair play', particularly when it was directed against women and children. Nonetheless, Mackenzie was able to reconcile the potential disruption posed by white violence within an established racial hierarchy. First, there was a clear distinction in his thinking between violence perpetrated by 'Boers' and by the British, with the former consistently portrayed as more prone to 'lawless' and wanton violence. Indeed, identification of differential deployment of violence was one way in which Mackenzie separated the two groups in his thinking. When reflecting on the British colonisation of the southern African subcontinent, Mackenzie emphasised the inevitability of the process, the only thing left to be determined, he believed was the manner in which colonisation occurred. On the one hand 'it can be done in a manner actually beneficial to the native' (that is by the 'peaceful' British), on the other 'it can be done by violence and the destruction of the native races' (that is by the 'violent' Afrikaner settlers).[77] Whilst advocating the former course of action, Mackenzie both demonstrated an awareness of the violence that often accompanied colonising processes, and implicitly endorsed

[77] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 55.

colonisation as inevitable, or in his words, 'a fact'.[78] All violence was not equal in Mackenzie's thinking and politics.

Second, war and peace, as a dialectic, operated to help forge the 'path of progress' or racial development through which Mackenzie expected Indigenous people to proceed. Mackenzie's writing was inflected with stadial thinking, which anticipated that Indigenous peoples would follow European peoples down a pathway to progress. This presumption is evident in a conversation Mackenzie reports with an English trader in Bechuanaland. 'I'm afraid this is slow work', the trader said. Mackenzie agreed, replying 'the history of our own native land leads us to expect that', before continuing: 'Say that you and I are near to perfection, finished specimens of what civilisation and refinement, as well as religion, can accomplish we must remember two things: that "good people" are still proverbially scarce in our own country, and that it has taken a long time to bring humanity to the elevated position which Englishmen occupy!' Intriguingly, Mackenzie's path to progress was shaped by the peace/war dialectic that shaped his thinking elsewhere. It was, he argued, through the 'commingling of races, and the aid of peaceful commerce, with perhaps the sterner discipline of war' that 'civilisation' would be reached.[79]

While both war and peace played a part in racial development, peace was the apex of the kind of civilisation Mackenzie valorised. Whilst violence, or the supposed propensity towards violence, was a key element defining 'savagery', peace increasingly became linked with 'civilisation'.[80] This kind of racialisation and the political use to which the concept of peace was put, can also be seen in Mackenzie's construction of Austral Africa. As Oliver Ebert has recently noted, 'the notion that peace is the achievement of the civilized is one of

[78] Mackenzie, *Austral Africa*, vol. 1, 55.

[79] Mackenzie, *Ten Years*, 82–83.

[80] Cleall, *Missionary Discourses of Difference*, chapters 5 and 6.

the great narratives of European history'.[81] From the eighteenth-century Scottish Enlightenment on 'Civil statehood, prosperity, and trade' were thought to 'constitute the triangle of a concept of development' that sought to explain Europe's 'progression from its uncivilized, "rude" beginnings to "civil society".' Ebert argues that this assumption formulated the basis of nineteenth-century international law: 'cooperation and therefore peace, was possible only among the civilised'.[82] This kind of thinking underpins Mackenzie's analysis, both in his sense that southern African could be 'civilised' and that this 'civilisation' would bring peace. The very notion of 'peace' was thus linked inextricably with a colonising project.

Conclusion

John Mackenzie's missionary life and political career were shaped by the presence of violence. He witnessed numerous conflicts between Indigenous peoples, and was shocked by the violent relationship between the Tswana and the Ndebele. But war and violence were by no means confined to Indigenous peoples and white settlers and 'diggers' appear as particular culprits in his writings. Mackenzie was also acutely aware of the ambiguous and ambivalent margins between settlers and Indigenous peoples, especially in the form of mercenary white colonists trading their services for land – a practice Mackenzie found deeply disturbing. During his missionary career, Mackenzie was not only witness but also a protagonist in violent incidents. It was perhaps this proximity that made peace such a powerful signifier in his writings. Peace was not a remote concept, used only rhetorically, but a powerful indicator with whose relational corollary Mackenzie was only too intimately acquainted.

[81] Oliver Ebert, 'The Paradox of Peace with "Savage" and "Barbarian" Peoples,' in Miloš Vec and Thomas Hippler, eds., *Paradoxes of Peace in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 219.

[82] Ebert, 'Paradox of Peace,' 219.

Using peace as an analytical framework through which to understand missionary activity is work that must be done carefully. Whilst missionaries such as Mackenzie readily constructed themselves as agents of peace, the language of peace may present as a discursive screen, obscuring the part that violence played in processes of colonisation in which missionaries were entangled if not always complicit. And yet peace is nonetheless helpful in understanding the missionary worldview. As 'messengers of peace', missionaries believed they were spreading a gospel of 'civilisation' and hope, and this language, whatever its ambivalent relationship with missionary praxis, helped to make sense of their activity. Far from dismissing the concept of peace in missionary writing, the ubiquity of such language in missionaries like Mackenzie demands more careful attention in order to better understand the discursive contours and political significance of the global missionary project.