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I.—Mischievous Suggestion concerning the Exiled Chiefs.

When the case of the Zulu chiefs in exile at St. Helena was brought before the House of Commons eighteen months ago, by Mr. Alfred Webb and Mr. J. A. Picton, Mr. T. E. Ellis quoted Mr. Bradlaugh's "strong and decided opinion" that

"there was a clear and complete case on the side of these Zulu chiefs, that the only fair policy towards these three chiefs—

"the only wise and just policy towards the Zulu people, and in

"the interest of that part of South Africa—was to liberate the

"prisoners, make them subjects of the Queen, and remove the

"soreness that must exist until the young King* and his uncles

"are restored to their people."

Mr. Ellis, who had recently visited South Africa, said also

"If any appreciable number of Members on either side

"would look into these matters, I am certain there would be

"such a pressure of opinion that the Government would be

"induced to reconsider their decision in this matter."

Mr. Bryce said

"I think a division ought to be taken, so that we may have

"an opportunity of recording our protest against the policy

"which has been pursued. If the protest be unsuccessful at

"the present time, I hope that those who have brought the

"question forward will lose no chance of doing so on subsequent

"occasions."

In reply, the Under Secretary for the Colonies, Baron H. de Worms, said

"... There is no immediate intention of remitting the

"sentences, and though I cannot say what may be done here-

"after, I can give no pledge at the present time."†

* The uSutu and Miss Colenso do not claim this title. See

"The Zulu Impeachment Confirmed," p. 25.

† "They [the Government] might reconsider the matter, with a

"view possibly of the remission of the sentences."—Times, July 14, 1891.

"The Government ... would reconsider the matter, possibly with

"a view to a diminution of the sentences."—Daily News, July 14, 1891.

"Promised that the whole matter should be reconsidered, with a

"view to the possible remission of the sentences."

Daily Telegraph, July 14, 1891.

"When Zululand quieted down, it was not improbable that Lord

"Knutsford would reconsider this matter of the sentences with a view

"to their remission."—

Standard, July 14, 1891.
If any steps were thereafter taken in this matter, they have not been made public. But Sir Charles Mitchell’s remark, "I need scarcely point out how undesirable it will be even to consider the question of returning Dinuzulu to Zululand," suggests that he had been requested to consider the matter.

At the time of the Debate, Mr. Commissioner Osborn was in England on leave. On his return to Zululand, a Commission, of which he was President, was appointed "to define and mark off, where necessary, the boundary lines "between the various tribes to the north of the Black Umfolozi "river."

A glance at the map which accompanies the Report of this Boundary Commission, shows the largest division in the district marked "Zibebu's location," and next to it an "uSutu location." The following extract from a Natal paper shows the notion circulated among the handful of Europeans (most of them officials) in Zululand—

"What is the meaning of the energy just now in marking "off boundaries in the Ndwandwe district? It is the country "of the uSutu and Mandhlakazi, of Dinuzulu and Zibebu, and "it seems to indicate that preparations must be made for the "return and location of the St. Helena exiles, in fact, there "seems to be a pretty strong opinion that it will not be long "before Zululand sees them again. . . ."

Our own correspondent, Natal Witness, Sept. 17, 1891.

There have also been indications of a proposal to send back Dinuzulu only, leaving his uncles in exile, and to place him in this "uSutu location" as a "petty chief" under the present system of administration.

That the present local officials should entertain the proposal implies that it is held to be not inconsistent with the policy, which has prevailed since 1879, of breaking up the Zulus by dividing them against themselves. It is not too much to say that it would be less cruel—and not more impolitic—to leave things as they are, and to let the exiles die at St. Helena.

* See "Mr. Commissioner Osborn as One Cause of Confusion in Zulu Affairs."
Such a proposal assumes:—

1. That the present system is satisfactory.

2. That the "uSutu location" is large enough to accommodate Dinuzulu’s following, the so-called "uSutu party."

3. That the uSutu leaders deserve disgrace, though some excuse (presumably his youth) may now be accepted in Dinuzulu’s case.

II.—Is the present system satisfactory?

The system of government inaugurated in British Zululand on annexation to the Empire in 1887, and now being enforced and developed there, is essentially the same as the system in force in Natal: it is designed to bring the Zulus to the same condition as the Natal natives; and if continued, must inevitably do so.

As Natal has now been a British colony for fifty years; and as, ultimately, the two countries are likely to become one, this may at first seem a natural and proper intention. But there are few thinking colonists who, were it possible, would not gladly restore the Natal natives to the present moral condition of the Zulus; and who do not hold that the system under which the Natal natives have passed these 50 years, is largely responsible for their general deterioration.

1. This system attempts to combine in the person of one European the definite position and duties of a magistrate, and those of more than one or two native chiefs administering the unwritten native law of their several tribes; and with an indefinite extension, in the white official’s case, of the powers supposed to be inherent in an actual native chief.

One result is that hereditary chiefs are slighted, and an opposition thereby created, most unnecessarily, seeing that at the same time much of the administration is devolved on native hirelings (some of them introduced from Natal), who are created "petty chiefs" or headmen, while the hereditary chiefs—those not actually disgraced or exiled—are reduced to the same level. Of these "petty chiefs" there are now from 20 to 30 in each of the eight
districts of British Zululand, with no other source of income than the fees and fines of office.

Jan 23, 1893. “It is easy enough to understand how effectually these "centres of . . . authority [magistracies in Zululand] exercise a "weakening and corrosive influence upon the forces of native "chieftainship and native authority.” — Ed. Natal Mercury, Jan. 23, 1893.

Of the results of forty years of the system in Natal the Attorney-General* for Natal, in 1887, wrote that in evidence given before him† in 1882, "the exercise of civil jurisdiction [by so-called 'chiefs,' hirelings] was declared to be corrupt, rotten, and partial."

Similar complaints—by others than the uSutu—are now made in British Zululand.

July, 1892. "[In Zululand] the Governor is supreme chief, the magistrates are his deputies, they have their subordinates, and "along with them are the native chiefs, isinduna, and headmen, "who are petty chiefs under the supreme chief, but who do "very much as they like, fining for their own benefit, under "their own imperfect, and often unfair, system of trial, per- "fectly irresponsible, and free of all enquiry or review. "Several instances, gathered from a small locality, can be "given of gross unfairness and tyranny, and this is only one "side of the iniquitous system that seems to be the pride of "those that have to administer it.” — Our own correspondent in Zululand, Natal Witness, July 6, 1892.

2. The law administered in British Zululand is either Zulu law, or Natal-law-for-natives, which latter may be enforced "so far as applicable."

Concerning Natal law-for-natives.

The Zulus, before they were annexed to the British Empire, obtained a legal opinion (from Mr. W. Y. Campbell, since employed by the Natal Government to assist in codifying Natal-law-for-natives) that

May 12, 1887. "(d) I advise the Zulus that they have good reason to "pray the Queen to leave them under Zulu law, as opposed to "the system known as Natal native law.”

* Sir M. H. Gallwey, K.C.M.G., now Chief Justice.
† As a member of a Commission on Native Affairs.
Before European intervention native law in Natal was one with Zulu law. In the paper quoted above, Sir M. Gallwey continues:—

"What our natives [witnesses before the Natal Commission, 1882] desired ... was, that the native law prevailing in civil cases in Zululand should be administered unaltered by any changes in that law prevailing in Natal ..."

The context implies Sir M. Gallwey's approval of the preference thus expressed, and "our natives" examined by the Commission included representatives of converts to Christianity, and other more or less civilised natives.

In preparing for the annexation of Zululand, Mr. Osborn had declared the Natal law unsuitable for the Zulus—to begin with.

"I would point out that Native law, as administered in Natal, is not, in many respects, the same as that prevailing in Zululand. ... It appears to me very doubtful whether these altered conditions could be suddenly extended over the people in Zululand without considerable dissatisfaction to them, and without incurring the serious risks attaching to such conditions. If Zululand be joined on to Natal, it will be necessary that the laws and customs of the Zulus be not interfered with at once; any changes thereof should be effected gradually."

Colonel Cardew too had written

"I am certain that they [the people of Zululand] would not willingly accept the Natal native laws."

Mr. Osborn did not describe the "changes prevailing in Natal" as bad in themselves, but as "of about 35 years' gradual growth. ..."

"many alterations and additions ... from time to time ... made in the native laws and customs, by local enactments. special orders from the supreme chief, rulings in the native high court and inferior courts, and by customs acquired by long contact with civilised Europeans in the colony."

The following statement* by Mr. W. Y. Campbell, throws further light on the situation; though it does not disclose the whole mischief, for which see pp. 11, 12.

"Native law, as affecting the tribes inhabiting the littoral of S. E. Africa ... has many underlying vital principles in

* Memorandum, replying to question of Miss Colenso's.
common, but there are many details of differences according to the two or three hundred tribes which inhabit that stretch of country. When Natal was annexed to the Crown [1843] the one hundred odd tribes aboriginal to that country had practically a common law, with variations incidental to each tribe as aforesaid. Each tribe had its own chief, who administered civil and criminal law as such prevailed and was accepted in his own tribe. The [English] Government . . . in course of time limited certain of the chiefs' powers, especially in criminal matters, leaving them, however, practically free in civil matters.

Up to this time there was no confusion in native law in Natal, as each tribesman knew the law he lived under. In course of time, however, the Government appointed magistrates and administrators with jurisdiction in native law. With few exceptions those men knew nothing of native law, and had to acquire it from the natives themselves. . . . So long as the magistrates remained in the same divisions their decisions were uniform; a time came, however, when the magistrates were changed and passed on to other divisions . . . [where] they set about laying down the law . . . [they had learnt]. This of course unsettled matters: the natives knew the law, but the white chief ruled so and so, and though puzzled, they had perforce to submit. . . . Thus it was that as the magistrates were changed about, and as they grew in number, so also grew the confusion.

The code drafted by me was brought about by my recognition of this miserable state of affairs. I found all the magistrates giving different judgments upon the same points . . . My draft code was duly laid before the [Natal Government] Board of Native Law, and they have produced something from the draft which has, I believe, gone before the legislature and passed into law."

Mr. Campbell's draft code is dated July 3rd, 1888, and the "miserable state of affairs" was that extant in the colony of Natal, in 1890, after forty-seven years of British rule.

Notwithstanding a protest from Mr. Escombe, M.L.C., that "there were 300 sections, and 32 ordinances to be considered," the "something" produced from Mr. Campbell's draft was "passed en bloc" by the Natal legislature; and, having received the Royal assent, has since been put in force, and is now Natal law-for-natives.

There is still ample scope for variety in interpretation, as the code is promulgated in English, and no authorized
Zulu version has yet (1893) been published. Two motives may have swayed the elected members of the council to such criminally careless legislation for seven-eighths* of the total population, (i), the feeling that, under the present constitution, the officials, representing the colonial office, and not the colonists, are responsible in native affairs, and (ii) the conviction that, whatever measures might at that time be forced through the council, reform in the management of native affairs must claim early attention under the approaching regime of responsible government. Of the authorites who produced the code it is difficult to suppose that they hold it not worth translating; but it is not easy to account in any other way for the delay of two years and a half since the code was gazetted as read a third time and passed. And a leading Natal journal and supporter of "Responsible Government," notes that

"there is a growing feeling of dissatisfaction, especially amongst the older and more loyal natives, with the present methods of procedure in the native courts of this colony,

and publishes with approval letters written by Mr. R. C. A. Samuelson, an advocate, well acquainted with the Zulu tongue and ways, to show that

"the so-called code of native law is a contradiction to principles of justice, order, and equity."

"The matter" it is declared, "is one of vital moment, and should be taken up without delay. Mr. Samuelson has done good service to the colony by his outspoken declaration."—Editor Natal Witness.

Concerning Zulu or original Native Law.

The Cape Government Commission on Native Laws and Customs reported of the "Aboriginal population generally" and especially of "the tribes inhabiting the eastern and frontier districts of the colony . . . and comprising . . . broken clans of Natal and Zulu origin," that

"Among them a system of law has, for generations past, been uniformly recognized and administered. Although an "unwritten law," its principles and practice were widely understood, being mainly founded upon customary precedents, embodying the decisions of chiefs and councils of bye-gone
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 exercising despotic power to such an extent as to induce some

witnesses to come to the conclusion that the will of the chief

is law to his tribe, the power of making law does not in

reality rest absolutely in the chief. The chief himself is

subject to the laws in force when he assumed his chieftainship.

... Mr. Orpen says that the laws of the Kafirs are not

usually made by the chief and his councillors without reference

to the people; that the laws have all grown up among the

people, and are only administered by the chief. That

of ... three laws altered by Mosesh [paramount chief of

the Basuto] only the one published after long council with the

tribe ... held its ground; the other two, his individual

commands, were failures.

"From this it will be seen that the natives have not been

subject to the capricious laws made by a chief, but to laws

emanating from the national will, which laws have been

administered by the chief. ..."

"The inference we may draw from the whole evidence

upon the subject is, that although natives have nothing

corresponding to a representative form of government, their

existing laws embody the national will, and that no chief

would attempt to alter a law without taking the opinion of his

councillors, or referring the change to the people."

The conclusions thus stated by the Cape Commission

are the more important because, though chiefly occupied

with Cape Colony natives, the Commission examined as

a witness on the one side Sir Th. Shepstone, a principal

supporter in Natal of the theory that by native law

a "supreme" or "paramount chief is above all law in his own

tribe, ... and is supposed to do no wrong,"

and as to the Zulu kings that

"their organization was a pure military despotism."

On the other side the Cape Commission examined

the Zulu King Cetshwayo himself, then a prisoner of war
at the Cape, whose evidence on the point in question was as follows, given through an interpreter:—

Question 15.—Cannot you alter laws?
Answer.—"No, the King says he cannot alter a law like that, because it has been the custom in Zululand he supposed ever since the nation was created. Every king has agreed to the law, and so must he."

Answer (to question 20).—"He would not consent to that law being abolished because of the right or wrong of it, but because the whole nation agreed to it."

Mr. Escombe has described Zululand under Cetshwayo as "a monarchy qualified by the control of the headmen," "a country which had hitherto been under one man—"not a despot but a man governing constitutionally with "the advice of his headmen."—

Speech in defence of Dinuzulu before Special Commission.

But the magistrates in British Zululand have no time and no means provided them for studying Zulu laws and customs. These are unwritten: the principal depositaries, the uSutu chiefs and headmen, are under the cloud of imputed disloyalty, liable to be accused afresh if they venture to take part in public affairs†; and their place in approaching the magistrates is taken by the newly appointed "petty chiefs," dependent on the fees and fines of office. The magistrates are also, and necessarily, exchanged from time to time; and, in fact, the process described by Mr. Campbell as resulting in such a "miserable state of affairs" in Natal, is now being exactly repeated in British Zululand.

Further, Mr. Campbell mentions the variations in native law itself, and the shifting of magistrates administering it, as causes of the "confusion" which he describes. Another and far more serious cause exists. The theory that among South African natives "the will of the chief is law to his tribe"—examined and found fallacious by the Cape Commission,—has been adopted as a main principle of the system practised by British officials in Natal and Zululand.

* Not only the chiefs in exile, but those throughout the country accused of sympathising with them. See forward, III.
† See the case of Wombe and his companions, p. 23—4 of "The Zulu Impeachment of Officials confirmed."
In Natal the dictum that a "supreme" or "paramount chief is above all law in his own tribe... and is "supposed to do no wrong,"* has been quoted in support of the action of the Governor as supreme chief, in so serious a document as a judgment of the Lieut.-Governor with the advice of the Executive Council.† And quite recently, a Natal newspaper stated plainly that

Oct. 18, 1890. "cases between natives have hitherto been decided neither by "the law of white people, nor by that of black, but by the "mere will of whoever gives the decision." ‡

The causes assigned by Mr. Campbell were perhaps enough in themselves to lead to this result, but the high sanction given to the theory that a magistrate is a chief whose will is to be law to the tribes placed under him, has made the result inevitable.

In British Zululand, it is held that

Nov. 21, 1888. "the magistrate holds the position of chief placed over the "native chiefs of his district by the government of the country." Deputy Attorney-General for Zululand, addressing the Special Court trying the Zulu Chiefs.

And, as Mr. Escombe has stated,

May 27, 1889 "the magistrates have contracted the idea... that the officials "are... chiefs whose will is law." "There has been no law "in Zululand except the ipse dixit of the magistrate."

These notes on native affairs in Zululand and Natal are, of necessity, brief and incomplete. But it is submitted that they are sufficient to disclose that the present system of government in British Zululand is not satisfactory.

It is claimed that the description given of the course of native affairs in Natal presents an example to be avoided; and at the same time a faithful picture of what has been intended and must result from the system of government recently inaugurated in British Zululand:

* "The best of being supreme chief is that you are above the law and can do as you please," is a remark once seriously and amicably addressed to Miss Colenso by a personage familiar with the position."

† Including Sir Th. Shepstone.

‡ The "Inkanyiso," a paper for natives, published under ecclesiastical (not "Colensoite") auspices.
that this system has been planned to carry out the policy of breaking up the Zulus; and however well disposed the administrator, that policy must thus be at work against him, and demoralizing the Zulus, until the system is modified; and that if the two countries are to be united, it is especially undesirable to enforce in Zululand a system which must obviously be subjected to speedy and serious reform in Natal.

It is further submitted that the choice of Europeans competent and willing to become officials in British Zululand, is extremely limited, and likely to remain so for a long time to come; and that this difficulty should be taken into account in assigning the duties to be performed by these officials in the midst of a quick-witted people, accustomed to manage their own affairs, and possessed of a very keen sense of justice.

Also, that since, even under the present regime, much of the administration is unavoidably devolved upon natives, it is for the interests of justice, and consequently, of order, that use should be made of the chiefs, between whom and the people there already exists a recognized bond of duty, who, in Mr. Campbell's words, "represent "the recognized peace-factors and controlling elements "of the Zulu people, . . . respected not alone because "of birth, but because of brain-power and governing "ability"*; rather than of hirelings dependent on the fees and fines of office, "a class of native official who will "make disturbances as long as they are employed."†

It is submitted that this reform is needed in the interests of government in Zululand, apart from any question as to Dinuzulu and his uncles, or of the Zulu feeling for them; and that any official objection to the exiles' immediate return, based on the assumption that such return may injure the peace or good order of the country, is an admission—not only that the influence of the exiles is extensive, but—that the present dispensation has not taken root, or given satisfaction to the Zulus generally.

---

* Memorandum, drawn up in 1890 on behalf of the uSutu party.
† Mr. Escombe. [C—5,892, p. 265, line 5-8, p. 306, line 41-2.]
III. On the nature of the uSutu party: will the uSutu location accommodate it?

One argument used by those supporting the policy of breaking up the Zulus is that there never has been a Zulu "nation properly so called"; that before Tshaka's time* "the Zulu tribe" was a "small" insignificant one; and that what, since his conquests, has been called the Zulu nation, has been nothing but "a collection of tribes, more or less autonomous, and more or less discontented, yearning ... always ... for their ancient "separate existence."—

Sir Th. Shepstone.

It is argued that the "breaking up" policy is welcome to all these tribes, and only obnoxious to that "terrible incubus, the Zulu royal family," with a limited personal following, and described as "military" as opposed to "patriarchal hereditary" chiefs.

"At the end of the Zulu war [1879] 60 years ... [after Tshaka] it was found that most of the incorporated tribes "that made up the bulk of the Zulu nation had kept themselves "so distinct that on the removal of the Zulu king they were "found ready to re-enter upon their separate existence. ..."

"There are only four of these ['military despotisms,' "military chiefs, kings, as they are called'] in South Africa, "the Zulu, the Swazi, Gungunyana, and Lobenzulu. These are "all collections of conquered tribes. ... The remarks which "follow are not intended to apply ... to the military organi-"zations above referred to, but to the hundreds of other "hereditary chiefs and tribes whose constitution is more pat-"riarchal than military. ..."

Sir Th. Shepstone.

No doubt many conquered tribes were included in Tshaka's dominions, which extended before his death beyond what is now the British colony of Natal, and the present Transvaal districts Utrecht, Wakkerstroom, and Vryheid †; and the above theory was perhaps founded

* About 1810 to 1828; sometimes written Chaka.
† Tshaka's military conquests extended over a large portion of the Portuguese, Transvaal, and Orange Free State territories; they included the whole of Natal and some of the present districts of the Cape Colony as far as the Umtata river.
on accounts given by members of such tribes, among whom the greater part of Sir Th. Shepstone's official career has been passed, but who are not accurately acquainted with the early history of the Zulu nation proper, "the grand old Zulu people," as Natal natives have described it.

Some correction of Sir Th. Shepstone's premisses is needed to secure an understanding of the present position, i.e., of the nature and extent of the connexion existing between Dinuzulu and Zulus other than those now officially recognized as his adherents, "the uSutu" in Ndwandwe district. But the fallacy of his conclusion has been sufficiently proved by recognized historical facts, e.g., the English invasion of Zululand was opened with a proclamation that the English were "not waging war against the Zulu Nation, but only against the King," and the English General had soon to admit that "the Zulu people themselves are not prepared to accept the distinction it was thought desirable to make." "Our troops have had to contend with the whole strength of the Zulu nation."

Three years later the Zulu Deputation, 2,000 in number, led by 646 chiefs and headmen of these "conquered tribes" "discontented" with the Zulu rule and now restored by England to the "ancient separate existence" for which they had "yearned," undertook the weary journey to Natal, not to express gratitude but to pray for restoration of their "terrible incubus the [head of the] Zulu royal family"; and carried out their intention in the face of all possible opposition from the local representatives of the Colonial Office.*

In disproof of Sir Th. Shepstone's premisses it may be noted that not counting Dinuzulu, the Zulu chiefs can be traced back through eleven generations† of one family, the earlier nine succeeding one another from father to son. Sir Th. Shepstone has argued that among the Zulus

---

* C 346, p. 27, last line, p. 28, line 27.

In like manner the Rev. J. Mackenzie gives genealogical tables of the chiefs of the Bechuana tribes, tracing one branch for seven "Austral Africa" generations, and another for eleven.
generally, little importance is likely to attach to the burial places (all well-known) of the seven most ancient of these chiefs "being those of the Zulu tribe only, and while that tribe was yet but insignificant, and of no account . . . ." 

But several of the principal tribes forming the Zulu nation in Cetshwayo's day, not only claim but are able to trace the descent of what Sir Th. Shepstone would call their several patriarchal hereditary chiefs to one or other of the nine elder Zulu kings, e.g., the Ntombela, an important tribe, claims descent, as it takes its name, from the eldest but one of the Zulu kings.

So also the iGazi tribe and (?) the Umgazi in the north, the Biyela and Mpungose in the midlands, the Sibiya, part in the south, part in the north, claim and trace descent from one or other of the earlier kings, and are called by the isibongo (family title) of the Zulu royal family.

In order to prepare a complete statement on this point, further reference to the Zulus themselves would be necessary. The above examples are, however, given with confidence, as gathered from statements made by various chiefs and headmen, members of the Zulu Deputations in 1880—1882, and in most cases verified by members of the tribes in question.*

The statements prove at any rate that none of the persons who made them held the theory that they were members of "conquered" "discontented" tribes. And all Zulu tribes or sections in similar circumstances, however fortunate in their present tribal chief or headman, regard Dinuzulu as the head of their race, their patriarchal hereditary chief. Of such a connexion Sir Th. Shepstone has written lately, †

"If there is one truth more necessary to be known than another by a South African statesman, it is the impossibility of effectually abolishing hereditary chieftainship. Hereditary chiefs may be officially deposed by the paramount power;"

* The reality of the relationship is witnessed by the careful distinctions drawn with regard to marriage, e.g., into some of these tribes Dinuzulu may marry, into others "he may not, but his grandchildren may." 
† But intending apparently to exclude Dinuzulu—as merely a "military despot," from the category of hereditary chiefs.
"may be refused recognition; may be sent into exile, or placed
under personal disabilities. These are the means which
'civilised' governments generally use, and which have been
used in South Africa; but they have succeeded only in
making martyrs: in augmenting the power of the chiefs
concerned for mischief, and in clothing with greater reverence
their persons and their utterances. The effect is to inflame
the tribal sentiment, and to strengthen attachment to its
representative members."

Natal Mercury,
Jan. 29, 1892.

It may well be that the national sentiment also has
been inflamed among tribes in Zululand less nearly related
than those mentioned above, by the opposition to that
sentiment which has been ceaseless since 1879 among the
local representatives of the Colonial Office. It is at any
rate, a fact that among the most pronounced uSutu are
numbered tribes,—e.g., the Mdhlutshe—which have not
been ascertained to trace their descent to any of the Zulu
Kings, and even some which have within historical times,
been markedly antagonistic to the ruling branch of the
Zulu family.

Mgamule is now described by Mr. Commissioner
Osborn as the "principal uSutu headman." Makul-
umana is another. They have recently declined to take
office as "independent headmen" on the ground that
they "belong to Dinuzulu." What is their tribal history?

Mgamule’s father was Dingane’s Prime Minister, and
in charge of much of what is now called Ndwandwe dis-
trict. He, like Zibebe’s father, lost place and power on
Dingane’s overthrow, (1840) and fled the country after
fighting for him against Cetshwayo’s father, with whom he
subsequently made his peace.

Makulumana’s story is still more significant. Sir Th.
Shepstone and other authorities are agreed that when
Tshaka was a youth, and “the Zulu tribe insignificant;”
"the Umtetwa was one of the most considerable tribes in
the country now called Zululand,” that somewhat later,
"perhaps about 1818," this tribe “took refuge under
Tshaka,”* having been defeated by “Zwide, chief of
the most powerful neighbouring native tribe.”† This chief

* "From that time to the present day (Jan. 18, 1864), they have
continued to form a portion of the Zulu power, although they have
retained their separate tribal name."
† The Ndwandwe.
was thenceforward Tshaka's chief antagonist, but was beaten after a long and chequered struggle, and fled far north, while a large portion of his tribe remained and became Tshaka's subjects. A direct descendant, and a leading representative of Tshaka's old antagonist is Makulumana, who declines personal advancement lest he should thereby become separated from Dinuzulu.

In fine, for one or other of the reasons indicated, either because a Zulu nation proper has long existed, animated by the tribal sentiment to the strength of which Sir Th. Shepstone bears witness; or because a national sentiment was created and "inflamed" by the invasion of 1879 and its sequel; because the exiled chiefs have been "made martyrs," or as a natural result of their unselfish devotion to the interests of the people; or from a mixture of all these reasons, certain it is that uSutu feeling (i.e., sympathy with the chiefs, not antagonism to English authority) exists in every part of the country. In official language "the uSutu party" usually means a certain majority of the inhabitants of Ndwandwe district. These may be the most faithful or "dogged" uSutu in British Zululand, but the name has now a much wider and deeper meaning, and an uSutu is any Zulu who still dares to express the national—or tribal—feeling, the desire to remain one people under English rule, with which thousands sympathize in secret. One grave evil resulting from the policy pursued since 1879 is that any expression of this sentiment has been suppressed in such ruthless fashion that it is now next to impossible for an official to estimate or in any way to realize popular feeling in Zululand. To do that one must have been behind the scenes on the uSutu side, in their confidence when they dared show their feeling. Miss Colenso has been in that position since 1880, and Mr. Escombe since he spent weeks among the uSutu, in what was called "the rebel camp" at Etshowe, as Counsel for Dinuzulu in 1889. At that time sympathy with the captive chiefs was met from every part of the country; among the very turnkeys and police, as well as among Natal natives, Zulus supposed to be attached to John Dunn, or to Missionaries, and among so-called "loyal" Zulus generally.

The feeling, whatever its origin, is too deep and too widely-spread to die out in a few years, or in one generation, and some indications of it in quarters not officially
accounted uSutu, have reached Miss Colenso since she has been in England. When she left Zululand three years ago it was in response to the often repeated question of various uSutu chiefs and headmen "can the governing power in England be aware of what is taking place, and of what is before us here?" and they parted from her with a promise that while she should seek relief for them from England, they would bear their grievances patiently; and that she would return and tell them should she fail in the appeal.

The Annual Report on Zululand for 1891 states that "Order has prevailed throughout the territory. The natives appear to appreciate the blessings of a settled government and to be contented and prosperous, with the exception that an embittered feeling still exists as a consequence of the disturbances of 1888, between the uSutu and Mandhlakazi tribes, especially in the minds of the former . . . ."

The Report for 1891* repeats that "Good order prevailed throughout the year."

It is officially claimed that the bulk of the Zulus are now "loyal" and "appear contented." That they are loyal is not questioned, but it is submitted that national or tribal feeling and sympathy for the exiled chiefs may be none the less strong and wide spread among them; and that under the circumstances an appearance of contentment proves them to be patient as well as docile. More than three years ago, in defence of the uSutu leaders, Mr. Escombe expressed the opinion that "there is not in the whole of Her Majesty's possessions a race more loyal and more wronged than the Zulus on whose behalf this remonstrance is penned."

Thus identifying the uSutu party with the Zulu people.

It is submitted that by the policy pursued since 1879 a wide spread and deep rooted sentiment deserving conciliation, has instead been placed under ban, and that no arrangement will now place Zulu affairs on a safe foundation which does not include at least an implied admission that this sentiment is not held to be incompatible with loyalty to British administration, and which

* No Report for 1892 has yet been published.
does not remove from the whole uSutu party the stigma of alleged rebellion, of which any disgrace still attaching to their leaders would be for them a sign and token.

The uSutu location shown on the map does not contain even those tribes, which suffered most for being uSutu in 1887-8, and are still termed "dogged" uSutu; and it is submitted that to reduce Dinuzulu on his return to the position of a "petty chief," in that location, under the present regime, would only aggravate and perpetuate existing grievances.

IV. Have the uSutu chiefs deserved punishment, either as rebels, or as murderers?

It is not proposed to repeat here the whole defence of the National Party, but to emphasize points affecting the personal characters of the exiled chiefs, which need to be borne in mind in considering the future of Zululand.

To the weighty opinions quoted at the beginning of this paper may be added the following from the same debate.

Captain Bethell expressed the opinion that
"it is impossible for anybody who did not hear the evidence "[given before the Special Court which convicted the uSutu "leaders in 1889] to form a judgment as to its weight and "character," and pointed out that the judgment of the Special Court cannot be depended on either.

"I am obliged to point out here an observation by [Mr.]† "Justice Wragg of Natal, which induces one to think that there "was more than the nature of the crime behind the sentences "imposed upon the chiefs .... That is to say, that there were "political motives behind what was required by the justice of "the case .... His business was simply to adjudicate upon the "offence as it was alleged against the prisoners; yet in his "Report to Lord Knutsford he added .... [a] sentence, which

○ e.g., The Mdhlletshe tribe under the late Umsutshwana (now Wombe), and the Hlabisa under Umtumbu.
† Mr. Wragg is a puisne Judge, not "Chief Justice" of the Supreme Court in Natal.
"clearly shows that there was something behind, which acted as an additional reason."*

Captain Bethell's own conclusion was

"All that these men [the uSutu chiefs] did was to commit a breach of the peace . . . . They declined to give up certain men and to pay a fine to the officers of the law, and later on Dinuzulu . . . . attacked and routed Zibebo. But he never proposed to drive out the Governor of Zululand. What he did was to offer resistance to the police twice, once without violence. . . . I think it is undoubtedly a case in which the clemency of the Crown may be very justly exercised."

As a definition of the nature of the acts charged against the chiefs in official Reports, Captain Bethell's statement is accurate. But these Reports are in conflict with one another, and with the evidence of white officials before the Special Court.

As counsel for Dinuzulu, Mr. Escombe carefully watched the evidence. He had taken this position with reluctance,† as a matter of onerous public duty, at great personal inconvenience and an expense, in mere money, of £1,000‡. He is a leading politician in Natal, one of those who will be immediately responsible for the peace and order of Zululand, if that country is joined to Natal under Responsible Government: and he has expressed the deliberate opinion that what these chiefs have deserved is to be "thanked in the name of the Queen for maintaining order amongst their people in

* "The misreception of hearsay evidence is a good and sufficient ground in English law for quashing a conviction. This appears to have been allowed in the present case, and the subsequent Report of the judge makes it obvious that in his opinion the evidence so misreceived was calculated to influence the mind against the prisoner. Had the evidence been available at the application about Dinuzulu, I should have hoped to have induced the Privy Council to set aside the conviction." Opinion of W. Macleod Fullarton, Esq., Q.C.

† In the first instance because "Miss Colenso would not take no for an answer. She pointed out that it was in my power at once to put an end to bloodshed, and under this plea I agreed to stand by the chiefs if they would lay down their arms."

MSS. Notes, by Mr. Escombe, for a magazine article, Jan. 22, 1889.

‡ £500 to brief a substitute during his own absence at the beginning of the trials, £500 Privy Council expenses. The remaining expenses of the Defence have been discharged by Miss Colenso.
"the face of wanton and wicked persecution," e.g.: the eviction now officially admitted, of 4,800 people.*

Official "dispatches and reports," he says, "show that broken promises, bad faith, oppression, cruelty and wrongs could not shake the loyalty of the Zulus, or their firm belief that justice would be eventually done to them." †

The uSutu leaders doing no more than their duty . . . in protesting against the arbitrary boundary of . . . 1886, were looked upon as troublesome persons who were to be got rid of . . . The so-called "traitor," Dinuzulu, refused to transfer his allegiance from the Queen to the Boer Government. He came to Natal to answer any charges which might be brought against him, and to demand an inquiry into his own grievances.

As to the chiefs having committed the acts rightly described by Captain Bethell, Mr. Escombe has pointed out that

"[The official] report of 25th April, 1888, did not disclose the important fact that the cattle (120 head) had been given up [by Ndabuko and Dinuzulu] although the right to claim them was disputed, and the still more important fact that Dinuzulu had paid every head of the Governor's illegal fine."

That, in addition, the day before the date of the above Report, "an armed party of 60 to 80 men" levied unresisted "about 80 head" of Ndabuko's and Dinuzulu's cattle, and "knocked the people about," having "left the magistracy at night, so as to arrive by surprise, beginning its work early in the morning." That again, the next day, "an armed party of 100 men [Natal natives and Zulus, with a young white leader] left the Magistracy over-night; . . . so as to reach the uSutu kraal by surprise, at dawn [and 'surrounded it without halting, 'at the trot, the men in the kraal were surprised']." ‡

* "The Zulu Impeachment confirmed," p. 11.
† This belief dates from Cetshwayo's return from over the sea, January, 1883.
‡ We thought there was nobody there, and we did not know that they were there, until we were in the act of surrounding the kraal . . . trotting; then I saw a person coming out of a hut carrying a war shield." Sergeant Matuta's evidence.
Ndabuko had under him from 1,000 to 1,500 men,* . . . he gave the order which checked . . . . [their] impulse to attack the 100 Zululand police. These police had been employed to evict, to flog, the people who sought asylum at the uSutu kraal . . . A few calm words from the ‘traitor,’ Ndabuko, saved the oppressors’ lives †

Such, according to Crown evidence, is the nature of what has been officially chosen as a typical example of Ndabuko’s rebellious acts. This is the resistance “without violence”: the event which Baron H. de Worms, in his reply in the debate already quoted, described as follows:—

“the first rebellious act of the uSutus was in April, 1888, at that time Ndabuko led a body of men against the police.” . . .

It would have been strange if Ndabuko could have availed to prevent violence on the second occasion, as Crown evidence proved him to have been more than a mile away when the collision occurred.‡

In his closing address, as Counsel at Dinuzulu’s trial, Mr. Escombe has given fuller expression to his opinion of this chief, as follows:—

“It is impossible for me with what knowledge I have acquired of this country to mention the name of Ndabuko without using words at all events to refer to the complete self-denial and perfect dignity with which that man, as the leader of a national party, has comported himself from the beginning to the end of Zulu history. He is not an official favourite, but he never appears in any place except to behave himself with complete propriety. He is never asked a question to which he is not able to give a complete and respectful reply. He seemingly never opens his mouth except to speak on behalf of others. That man does stand out prominently throughout these proceedings as one who has acted faithfully, in the best meaning of the word, for the interests of his ward Dinuzulu. Advocate

* The able-bodied men among the 4,800 evicted people would amount to over 1,000.
† “At the uSutu kraal, when Ndabuko called out to Zeyiza, who was bringing the impi towards us, it stopped, and did not come on.” Police Messenger Situta’s evidence. Zulu Trials, p. 130, line 13.
‡ [C 5892, p. 269, whole page, especially line 34-40.
"in the cause of Dinuzulu, I should fail in my duty to my client if I omitted this opportunity of saying what I see of Ndabuko's conduct all the way through the proceedings. Stolid as was that man's silence during his own trial, the silence was at times broken, but only when there was necessity for him to speak, not on his own behalf, but for somebody else."

Defence of Dinuzulu, before Special Commission.

Compare Ndabuko's own words spoken in 1881, and reported by Mr. Osborn:—

"I have not understood that I am forbidden to bring to notice of Government acts oppressive against the people of the Government. The people belong to the Government and [as well as] the country also."

During his trial Ndabuko spoke once to express esteem for the two Hollander storekeepers, Dirk and Klaas Louw, and indignation at their murder during the disturbances:—

Prisoner, Ndabuko, says: "I have nothing to say to all these lies which are spoken. What I wish to say is that we are very angry with those who have killed these store-keepers. Klaas was one of us, and, in killing him, they killed us. That is all I have to say."

And again, at his own expense, to exonerate Dinuzulu:—

"I say that Dinuzulu is one who should not be brought into this matter; he is still a child; his matters are in the hands of others, I am in charge of them."

"I rely on the Queen, who wishes this case to be tried without favour to either side."

One proof of his devotion was his trying the experiment of surrender on himself first, before risking Dinuzulu.

False charge of murder against Dinuzulu.

Perhaps the only charge which needs notice as still injurious to the exiled chiefs is that of personal violence, of "murder"; because, in Mr. Escombe's words, people will say, "a man capable of driving his assegai into the back of a child is capable of doing anything wrong;" and because it has been sought to discount the complete

* Here again Ndabuko has been victimized, in translation, and this appeal, which Miss Colenso heard him speak, is distorted to a phrase of contrary meaning in the printed report.
and singular absence throughout the proceedings of any evidence on which such a charge could be based, of any trace of such a disposition in any one of the three exiles—by alleging a solitary exception to the contrary, ascribing the killing of a Zulu boy of 8 or 9 years old, to Dinuzulu himself; three men and one woman being killed at the same time by his alleged companions.

This charge was used to arrest Dinuzulu, to extradite him,* the evidence against him was given in full, in his trial for high treason, and also in Ndabuko’s. In his address to the court on this point Mr. Escombe said

“If the second indictment comes before your Lordships the prisoner will be acquitted, and we are content to wait quite patiently until that acquittal is accorded us. In the meantime I point out that we have put into the box a man who was present at Butshelezi’s kraal when the raid took place; we have proved that Dinuzulu was not there, and we have given you the name of the man who committed the deed, a man from Delagoa Bay. We have given you further evidence which makes the committal of the crime by Dinuzulu in a high degree improbable.”

The evidence to be met was that of “a boy of 12 years old,” who described the murder of the child “with all the circumstantiality of truth,” but described the murderer as “carrying assegais in a sheath”† slung over the shoulder. “Your lordships have never heard another witness in the case from beginning to end speak of Dinuzulu carrying an assegai or assegais in a sheath.” In point of fact, Dinuzulu possessing a gun, never carries assegais: to carry them slung “in a sheath” is the special fashion of certain tribes northward of Zululand, and the description in this case is something like that of “a Londoner wearing a kilt”; and proves that at any rate the murderer was not Dinuzulu.

Mr. Escombe also showed that Crown evidence relied on to bring Dinuzulu at least within sight and hearing of the event, proved him instead to have been eight or ten miles away.

“We have put evidence before you,” said he, “which as far as we are concerned is amply sufficient to dispose

* See Zulu trials, p. 974, for the opinion of the Committee of Privy Council thereon.
† Zulu trials, Ndabuko’s case, p. 250, line 53-4.
"once for all of that charge of murder. It makes no difference "to us whether the Crown enters a nolle prosequi on the [murder] "indictment .... or whether the Crown goes on with the "charge."

The Nolle prosequi was entered, and thus an acquittal by the Special Court was avoided.

But the Secretary of State for the Colonies at once acquitted Dinuzulu of the charge of murder. Having granted Miss Colenso an interview, and in reply to an inquiry from her, Lord Knutsford said that as soon as he had got the papers in that matter he "saw that the case could not stand."

Baron H. de Worms was present when Lord Knutsford spoke, yet in the debate, eighteen months after, he said "There was some strong evidence against the prisoner of " having murdered a trader and his family."

Mr. G. Osborne Morgan: "I was speaking of Dinuzulu."

Baron H. de Worms: "That is the very murder with " which Dinuzulu is charged.

Dinuzulu was charged with killing a Zulu child, not any "trader" or "trader’s family"; and the statement is remarkable, if only because the phrase "the murder with which Dinuzulu is charged" implies a single charge, i.e., that he was still charged with the murder of which Lord Knutsford had acquitted him.

The debate continued:—

Mr. G. Osborne Morgan: "It was not proved."

Baron H. de Worms: "It was proved that one of his "[Dinuzulu's] followers was guilty of the murder, and the man "was sentenced to death. His punishment was subsequently "commuted to hard labour for life. Dinuzulu was guilty to the "extent of having brought about the circumstances which "directly led to the murder of this man and his family."

The recent official admission that 4,800 uSutu had then been or were being evicted, relieves the uSutu chiefs from the charge of having "brought about" the general disorder. Of the above statement it must be further noted that one man only was sentenced to death by the Special Court, and his punishment has been commuted to hard labour for life. But he was convicted of killing—not "a trader and his family," but C. V. Tonge, a trader apparently possessing no family; of killing him on July 3rd, a month after June 4th, the date of "the very murder with
which Dinuzulu is charged"; and of killing him 40 or 50 miles on the map away from the scene of that murder, and still further from Ceza where Dinuzulu himself was on July 3rd. It is thus a misnomer to call this criminal a "follower" of Dinuzulu's, except in the widest sense in which most young Zulus might be so called.

The one act of violence in which Ndabuko and Dinuzulu both took part was the fight with Zibebu, near the magistracy of Ndwendwe district. Of this act Captain Bethell says:—

"Dinuzulu saw Zibebu, his ancient enemy, within his grasp. He did what anyone would do under the circumstances; he attacked and routed him."

Mr. Escombe calls it "a faction fight on a large scale," and admits that "not only were they [the uSutu chiefs] wrong in committing the act, but it was an error of judgment, their first error, all the way through the proceedings."

Unless fighting be condemned under all circumstances, they were wrong, in so far as, being subjects of the Queen, they were bound to leave the protection of themselves and their people in the hands of her officials. But "Dinuzulu saw Zibebu," and the 4,800 evictions began, in the previous December, and they had waited in vain for that protection for nearly seven months, receiving in the fourth the governor's explicit declaration that "Zibebu and his people have done wrong" what "they were forbidden to do," which did not prevent Zibebu's followers subsequently killing, in his presence, the important uSutu chief, Um-sutshwana.

It is claimed that the sole crime amounts to this, that under such circumstances the uSutu leaders* took part at last, and in self-defence, in the disorder into which others had plunged the country.

It is submitted that for England's credit it may well be hoped that such a choice of evils can never again be forced on these of her subjects; and further that the fact

* The responsibility of the third exile, Tshingana, is in like manner limited to the fact that he defended his family from an attack in which, against the governor's orders, Zibebu and his men took a prominent part, and in which one of Tshingana's wives received a gunshot wound.
of their restraining themselves and their people for six months under such provocation is of good promise for the forbearance—even towards Zibebu—which may be expected of them under happier auspices.

Among the evidence brought against Dinuzulu of having taken part in this fight was that of one of Zibebu's fighting men, taken prisoner and brought before Dinuzulu in this hour of his first battle and first victory over his father's foe: "a moment" says Mr. Escombe, "when a man might easily be carried away by evil passions or excesses."

"Do not kill them, God is taking care of them," was Dinuzulu's order, said Zibebu's man, concerning himself and companion.

Later on, Dinuzulu gave signal proof of how he understood the duty of a chief to his people. One of the peculiar conditions of the Zulu State Trials was that witnesses could be forced to give self-criminating evidence, the protection usually afforded being withdrawn. Mr. Escombe held that he had no right thus to jeopardize uSutu who had taken part in the disturbances, and Miss Colenso undertook to tell Dinuzulu of this difficulty, though most reluctantly, for it might so easily have seemed to him that his defence was being shirked for reasons that he could not see, and hanging was being freely spoken of as the probable end of the trials. But while she was as yet only describing the nature of the danger to the witnesses, the lad broke in:—"You must not put my father's people "into danger to save me," he said, "not any of them; "rather than that, you must let it alone, and let them do "as they please with me." And this position he steadfastly maintained throughout.

It is claimed that the past record of the exiled chiefs not only discloses no ground for distrusting the effect of their future influence, but gives good hope of their usefulness under sympathetic guidance. It is also claimed that the whole facts of the case, here only sketched, are known and thoroughly appreciated throughout Zululand.

* The man "put into the box" against the charge of murder was an exception; a Transvaal Zulu under safe-conduct.
The chiefs' "martyrdom" has absolved them from the duty of further protest as to the partition of the country and people between the Dutch and English. Their return will not set right this wrong, which Mr. Escombe has described as Solomon's judgment carried out. But if that return be used to indicate sympathy with Zulu feelings, a wish to gather the Zulus, instead of breaking them; the effect, even on the discarded Zulus, will be a measure of conciliation and (while not at variance with Transvaal policy in Zulu matters) to substitute for Dutch patronage of Dinuzulu that of the Queen.

It is submitted that any continuance of their exile can only impair the influence for good of Her Majesty's Government with chiefs and people.

V. What might be.

It has been submitted that
(i.) The present dispensation is not satisfactory;
(ii.) A strong national feeling and sympathy for the exiles exists among the Zulus of British and Dutch Zululand;
(iii.) The Zulus, as a people, deserve conciliation at England's hands;
(iv.) The exiles deserve "the thanks of Her Majesty's Government."

It is now submitted that the indispensable change of policy may be effected most naturally and most effectually in connection with the return of the exiles; and that to this end the only present addition wanted to the constitution of Zululand is a proclamation by the Governor, as follows:—

"As from the 189, there shall be a Head-Induna appointed in the name of the Queen at a salary of four hundred a year, who shall hold office during Her Majesty's pleasure.

Such Head-Induna shall aid and assist in the government of Zululand by carrying out the orders and instructions of the Governor of Zululand as conveyed to him by the Chief Magistrate."

* Sir T. Shepstone's word.
Dinuzulu's appointment as above would be such a taking of him by the hand on the part of the Queen as would ensure the absolute peace and safety of the country.

The lad has had experience of exile. He knows the unbounded powers of England, and he has given proof of that love of abstract justice which is in the hearts of all Englishmen.

If the lad is kept in exile for ten years he has then to return to his home a man of 32 or 33 who has brooded for a decade on supposed wrongs, and the chance has been missed of moulding his mind when it is plastic.

He, of course, will be liable to dismissal from office, and this liability, with his past experience, will have effect, not only with himself, but with his people.

Dinuzulu's appointment need not necessarily interfere with any of the "petty chiefs" now recognized, while they obey the law. But it is essential that the wide spread feeling for him should not be roused to rivalry by his being put on the same footing with any of them.

Fear of the officials has created many "loyal" or double-faced Zulus, whose path would be smoothed if they might receive Dinuzulu as Induna of the Government. But in certain cases "loyalty" to the present regime has resulted from individuals being permitted to retain trust property for their private use.

Dinuzulu's appointment (as above) appears to present the only chance of relief of the strained conditions existing as to Zibebu.

This chief, and those responsible for his acts and for his welfare are, at present, in a false position. For, even if his intentions throughout have been dutiful to British officials,* certain acts which he has been led to commit while in a position of trust are such as no civilised Government can approve or reward; e.g.,

The deliberate killing in his presence of the defenceless Umsutshwana, an act which Zibebu ratified by step-

* This point is denied by the Attorney-General for Natal and Zululand.
ping to and fro over the dead body in sign of triumph;*

His murderous raid northward after the proclamation of the cessation of hostilities;†

And his distribution of 300 captive uSuti women among his men, who violated many of them.‡

Least of all can such acts be rewarded by placing Zibebu in authority over a district “far in excess of the requirements” of his adherents, at the expense of the very people thus injured. Col. Cardew has noted “the embittered feeling which still exists” between Zibebu’s adherents and the uSuti of Ndandwe district.

Zibebu must always be a disappointed man. He has helped to break up his own people, and the price has turned to dust and ashes in his mouth; while in Zulu eyes he and his adherents are outcasts. Reconciliation must in any case be slow, and as things now are, no inducement thereto exists for either side. Dinuzulu’s appointment to a central position under the British Government would at any rate bind the uSuti generally.

* “Zibebu went from the magistracy against the orders of the magistrate, who told him to ‘sit down,’ in order to take revenge upon the deceased Umsutshwana . . . Zibebu’s impi . . . . early in the morning of the 12th June surrounded deceased’s kraal, killed deceased and several men and women . . . . Zibebu . . . . states that he surrounded deceased’s kraal and killed him.”

Minute by Attorney-General of Natal and Zululand. C 5,892 p. 349.

“Zibebu . . . jumped over Umsutshwana and back again being then on foot and then he went away.”

Evidence of Woman for uSuti Defence. Zulu Trials, p. 862.

† “I am sent by the Governor of Zululand to . . . call upon them [the uSuti] to surrender their arms immediately, after which the common people will be allowed to return to their kraals.”


‡ “Information reached me . . . that the chief Zibebu, during August or September last, made a raid on . . . tribes, inhabiting country in the north-eastern portion of Zululand. Sir A. Havelock.

“As the military were being withdrawn, I consider that Zibebu should not have acted without instructions, and that his action was one of attack and not defence.”


† “Measures taken to ‘discourage’ rebels . . . embraced the seizure of over 300 women, the partition of women among Zibebu’s men by Zibebu, and the appropriation by Zibebu himself of the young women.”

Mr. Escombe C 5,892, p. 290. line 49-4.
to let bygones be bygones. On the other side, whoever told Lord Wolseley that he was "of a time-serving dis-
" position," knew Zibebu well; and, Dinuzulu being 
" taken by the hand " in token that the Zulus are to be 
gathered instead of broken, it is not impossible that even 
Zibebu might ere long see that it would be to his advan-
tage not to remain shut out from all that is best among 
the Zulus.

Finally, Dinuzulu's appointment to be Head-Induna 
would have the support of Mr. Escombe, who has lately 
been accused by political antagonists of "moving heaven 
" and earth to bring about Dinuzulu's return."

It is claimed that the close attention which Mr. 
Escombe devoted to Zulu affairs in 1888-9, has given him 
a special knowledge of them, and interest in the Zulu 
chiefs and people; and that his action during the last five 
years has won him the confidence of the Zulus generally.

It is submitted that this good understanding between 
the principal native race, and a leader of the Forward 
party in Natal politics, is an influence on the side of 
peace and order in that part of South Africa which it 
would be difficult to over-estimate, and which deserves 
recognition and support.

HARRIETTE EMILY COLENSO.

March 6th, 1893.