

It is hardly necessary to reply in detail to the above ludicrous attempt to revive the long-exploded notion that Cetshwayo was in the wrong with regard to the war of 1879, or that he even "accepted" war in any other sense than that he fought when his country was attacked, and both Zibebu and Sir T. Shepstone seem to forget that one of the methods in which the former showed his "energy in carrying on hostilities" was by breaking the three days' truce, and so bringing on the quite needless slaughter at Ulundi. As to the little story about the letter, if there is any truth in it at all, it certainly tells against, not the King, who could neither read nor write, but Dunn, who was Cetshwayo's adviser and secretary then. It is impossible to avoid observing that in the whole of Sir T. Shepstone's report there is not a kindly word spoken about any single Zulu who was not personally opposed to Cetshwayo. Zibebu is the most favoured, certainly, of these few, and Sir T. Shepstone expresses much anxiety for his safety when he left the camp; needlessly it would seem, as he was riding with a troop of horsemen, and had an armed body of foot close at hand, while any attack upon him from the Sutus would have been an action totally out of keeping with the forbearance they had shown towards him for so long, and was less likely than ever to be committed at this critical period. But others who

Zibebu with this unusual and fine-sounding title, he pointedly avoids using the word "king" concerning Cetshwayo in the whole of this long despatch of twenty pages, but applies the term "chief" to him repeatedly, both before and after the re-installation.

were looked upon as more or less "staunch to us" receive their share of consideration from the Commissioner. He demands sympathy for Tshingwayo, who, he says, with Hamu,

"could not perceive the justice of their being forced to leave their homes and fields to seek for new ones, to gratify one man,"* and continues, "It was touching to see the condition to which Tshingwayo was reduced; he who commanded the Zulu army in its victorious attack on the Isandhlwana camp now received a storm of jeers and abuse from the young soldiers † gathered round Cetshwayo's tents, and narrowly escaped a severe beating from them, all, he said, because he had been ostracised by the Usutu party for having been appointed a chief over a section of the country by the British Government."

This is all very well from Tshingwayo's point of view, but the *facts* were somewhat different. He was unpopular with the Zulus generally, including those of his own district, not because he had "been appointed a chief, &c., by the British Government," but on the following grounds:—For several years he had remained loyal to Cetshwayo, joining in the "prayer" for him, and proving that he did so sincerely by contributing what was, for him, a considerable sum of money, as part of one which was sent down to the Natal Government with a view to *purchasing the King's release*. ‡ But, as time went on, he was reduced from

* Sir Henry Bulwer says, "Tshingwayo has no tribe, only a small following." He plainly did not find himself "forced to leave" his homes and fields, for he never moved after all.

† Tshingwayo contributed 6*l.*, Seketwayo 3*l.*, Siwunguza 5*l.*, Mynamana 5*l.*, Sitshaluza 5*l.* The money was taken by the Natal Government and given to the destitute Princes, who had been turned out by Zibebu.

‡ Tshingwayo would appear, however, to have recovered him-

his allegiance, either by the sweets of independence, or by official influence, and, for a season, renounced Cetshwayo. As Sir T. Shepstone tells us that this chief came into the camp ill-affected towards the King, it hardly seems remarkable that he should have been stigmatised as a turncoat and a traitor by the loyalists.*

Another chief towards whom indulgence is shown by Sir T. Shepstone is Mfanawendhlela, who came into camp on the 22nd to pay his respects to the Commissioner, to whom he brought a present of three head of cattle, but "he brought nothing for Cetshwayo" [p. 47]. He "seated himself in a chair which was carried for him by an attendant," and explained that although he did not intend to quarrel with Cetshwayo, who was, he said, "his friend, and the son of his sister," he did not wish to come under his authority again, yet would not leave his lands, i. e. move into the reserved territory. He went into the history of his ancestors, and the wars of Chaka, to show that the

self, for he was in attendance on the King at Ulundi, and was killed there, when Zibebu and his white confederates attacked the royal kraal and murdered the old men, women, and children, a few months later. It does not quite appear why his having led the attack upon the Isandhlwana camp should have given him a claim to especial favour, for it was made against the King's orders, and proved more disastrous in the end to the Zulus than to ourselves. The King spoke to the present writer on this point at the end of 1881, adding that he was well aware that his soldiers had that day deprived him of one of his best friends—referring to the late Colonel Durnford, R.E.

* Mfanawendhlela himself brought five head of cattle to the King a little later.

land which he occupied was, by rights, his own, independently of any Zulu King,* and, which was more to the purpose, he claimed that he had not broken the conditions on which the English had secured it to him. This was perfectly true, and as Mfanawendhlela was the only one of the thirteen kinglets who had neither broken the conditions nor "prayed" for the restoration, it was, as Sir Theophilus Shepstone remarks, a "serious position" for him to take up. But Mfanawendhlela was not personally hostile to Cetshwayo, and there was no reason why, with a little encouragement, he should not have resumed the satisfactory position which he had held under the Zulu King up to 1879, except one which it has not occurred to Sir T. Shepstone to mention. During the King's exile Mfanawendhlela had built a kraal for himself, right in the

* He said that Chaka had conquered what was once the land of his (Mfanawendhlela's) ancestors, but did not disperse the tribe, and that Panda had followed in Chaka's steps in this matter, and had paid the tribe the compliment of *asking permission* to build Nodwengu (where he was afterwards buried). Cetshwayo, in his turn, apparently, had treated his uncle well. But the tribe had dwindled to, as Sir Henry Bulwer says, "an insignificant size" [3466, p. 203], and as to the people of the district assigned to Mfanawendhlela by Sir Garnet Wolseley, Mr. Osborn pointed out to the chief, and he "frankly admitted," before Cetshwayo's return, that he had been "utterly unable to exercise efficient control" [*ibid.*, p. 287] over them. But if the claims of the aborigines to territory in Chaka's time were to be considered, we might find ourselves rather uncomfortably situated in Natal, and, in point of fact, many more modern and more urgent ancestral claims than those of Mfanawendhlela were disregarded in the new settlement of Zululand, but were not thought worth mentioning, because those who were the losers were upon Cetshwayo's side.

midst of the sites of the Royal kraals, and had planted mealie grounds over the spot sacred in the eyes of the Zulus, where the old King Mpande was buried, and the chief knew very well that he could not be allowed to retain that position after Cetshwayo's return. He did not wish to leave it, and this was why he would neither submit to the King nor move into the Reserve as he was free to do. Sir T. Shepstone's previous account of another and older burial-place of Zulu Kings, given in his "Report" of 1873, shows in what estimation such sacred spots were held by the Zulus [1137, p. 10].

"It is still considered sacred," he says, "and is preserved from all desecration. No twig or branch is ever broken from any tree growing on that ridge; no Zulu allows his walking-stick to rest on its soil; the annual grass fires have for very many years been prevented from sweeping across it; snakes and lizards of various unknown kinds and of marvellous size are said to reign there; no one disturbs them; the spirits of the dead live in them!"

As Mfanawendhlela was a connection only, and not a descendant of the royal house, his desecration of Mpande's burial-place was a less serious crime in him, personally, than it would have seemed in the eyes of the Zulus had he not sprung from another original tribe. And there was this further excuse for him, that at the end of the war of 1879 Mpande's grave was opened by the order of a British officer, and the bones removed, apparently under the impression that the act, by showing contempt for Zulu prejudices and Cetshwayo's line, would completely crush the national energies, and make the Zulus feel

themselves most thoroughly conquered. The removal of Mpande's bones did not destroy the reverence of the Zulus for the spot where he had been buried, as his spirit was supposed still to haunt the spot.* But whatever palliations may be found for Mfanawendhlela's desecration of the ground, it was not possible

* The Zulu feeling upon the matter is shown by the account given of a solemn investigation made in 1880 by order of Mnyamana and the princes, into the condition of the rifled grave.

"On the return to Zululand of the late deputation, as they had heard reports, both in Zululand and in Natal, that the grave of (Panda) Mpande had been opened, and the bones of the old king taken out and carried away by the English, which they were loth to believe—they determined to send five men of rank, two from Maduna, one each from Ziweddu and Mnyamana, together with Jojo, who had helped to bury the king and had been put in charge of the grave, to go and see if anything had really been done to it.

"By Mnyamana's orders they took with them two head of cattle, one from Langazana, widow of Senzangakona, father of Tshaka, Dingane, and Mpande, the other from Mpande's son, Msutu, whose kraal was near the grave, that they might pay their respects with them, i. e. sacrifice them, at the grave to the spirit of the deceased. And they did so, saying, 'Oh! Father, no! Think not that we have come to disturb you! We have only come to see what treatment you have received here.'

"And when they had dug down and examined, behold! the grave had been opened and disturbed, and the bones of the king were gone, and there were left only blankets, disarranged and rotten, and mixed with the earth that has fallen in since the grave was disturbed. The white men in their digging had begun some way off, and had dug a road or trench till they reached the grave, and took out and carried off the bones it contained.

"So they returned to those who had sent them, and reported what they had seen. And they have left the grave open, so that those who doubt may see and be convinced that this thing has really been done by the English soldiers. 'But we, Zulus, are amazed at it. For did Mpande ever fight or quarrel with the English?'"

that Cetshwayo should allow it to continue, and this was the chief's real reason for objecting to the King's return. On leaving Sir T. Shepstone he passed the encampment of Cetshwayo, whom he had not on that occasion intended to visit,* but who sent several messages to ask him to do so, to which he at length consented. Sir T. Shepstone remarks that the case "afforded Cetshwayo an admirable opportunity for marking the commencement of his new rule by showing a spirit of compromise, such as would be in harmony with the conditions under which he was to be restored to authority," and the King had evidently come to the same conclusion himself, for he not only distinguished his uncle by pressing him to visit him when he seemed reluctant, but he also waived his immediate right to the royal site, and burial-grounds, until the crops already planted should be reaped for that year. But Mfanawendhlela wanted no compromise, he wished to retain the whole, and that was what the King had no right or power to permit, and "they separated without coming to any arrangement" [p. 48]. The chief's affectation of pomp in causing his chair to be carried after him was not unlikely to give offence at the commencement of the interview.

Sir T. Shepstone's account hardly gives the reader a clear impression of the state of the case between King and chief, as he makes no mention of the royal burial-ground, speaking only of "old sites," as of

* Not, we are given to understand, however, from ill-will, but "because of his not having performed some ceremony necessary after death in his family." [3616, p. 48.]

kraals. The omission may be explained by the circumstance that Panda's grave was made *in* his royal kraal Nodwengu, from that time set apart as sacred, while Cetshwayo's kraals, the new Nodwengu and Ulundi, were built not far off. All these "sites" were within the territory now held by Mfanawendhlela, and, as already mentioned, some of his mealie-grounds were planted right over the grave. It will be seen at once that an account of the dispute which omits these facts is unfair to the King. Mfanawendhlela acknowledged afterwards that he was afraid at first, on account of what he had done, to go to the King, but that, when he found that he was not severely reprimanded, as he had expected, and, probably, felt that he deserved, he regretted that he had brought no offering to Cetshwayo as well as to Sir T. Shepstone, and sent one head of cattle to the former, to make amends.

Mfanawendhlela was brought into camp by one of the evil *genii* (white), of whom each chief who showed himself hostile to Cetshwayo seems to have had at least one at his elbow, to point out to him the way in which he should *not* go. These men have done more mischief in Zululand than the whole thirteen kinglets put together could have contrived without them, as we shall have occasion, later on, to show. The one in question was a Dr. Oftebro (not Sir Bartle Frere's supporter, but a relative). The *Mercury S. C.* writes of a third member of the same family—that he "was really the European who captured the King at the close of the Zulu war." Young Oftebro's visit to the camp, a day or two before his relative brought

in his chiefly puppet, was the occasion of the one faint word of commendation spoken by the *Mercury* of the King.

“To-day he (Oftebro) waited on Cetshwayo, and shook hands with him; the last time his hand was laid on that of the King, was when as a loyal servitor of Her Majesty [N.B.—He was neither an Englishman nor a soldier] he entered the hut in which the King was resting, and forcibly drew him outside to be made a prisoner by Major Marter. Cetshwayo received his visitor, who came as the representative of his father [a violent opponent of the King, and although a missionary, a strong advocate for war in 1879], with a good grace, and, if not with actual warmth, letting bygones be bygones, and expressed a wish to see him again. This be it related to the King’s credit, that he bore no illwill to the one who (he knew perfectly well) had been mainly instrumental in effecting his deliverance to the then enemy of Zululand,” and who, it may be added, was still thoroughly hostile to Cetshwayo.

The above is all the notice that was taken by his enemies of this magnanimous conduct on the part of the Zulu King, who might in this have taught a lesson to many a civilised magnate. The official report makes no allusion to the incident, but the *Advertiser* points out that it *promises well for the future*.

Instances might be multiplied of the manner in which every incident was made to tell in some way against Cetshwayo. Plainly “the King could do no right,” and if, by any chance, he did a thing for blaming which no reason could be found, his *motive* was immediately called in question. But we have lingered long enough upon the way, and must hasten on to give some account of the “reinstallation” which closed this chapter in the melancholy history of the ruin of Zululand.

CHAPTER VII.

THE Sutu leaders put in an appearance, as already stated, on the 28th Jan., but there is a curious difference between the accounts of Sir T. Shepstone and of the *Mercury* S. C. as to the hour of their arrival. The former writes [3616, p. 51]:—

“Mnyamana did not fulfil his promise of coming to the camp until afternoon, when he appeared with Undabuko and Ziwedú; they came from having seen Cetshwayo to go through the usual interview with me.” On the other hand the *Mercury* says, “At about 11 A.M. some dozen horsemen were descried, coming over the brow of the hill above the camp. . . . The mounted men, who were Undabuko, Mnyamana,* Ziwedú, and others . . . went straight to the King’s camp.”

Apparently they did arrive soon after eleven A.M., but Sir T. Shepstone only counts their arrival from the hour at which they came to *him*, and the *Mercury* S. C. expresses himself very indignantly at what he calls a “flagrant act of discourtesy, and breach of etiquette” on the part of the Sutu chiefs in going first to the King instead of to the Resident and Commissioner. On examining Sir T. Shepstone’s report, however, we find, not only that he says nothing about this “flagrant act of discourtesy,” but that it had

* This item is a mistake. Mnyamana does not ride.

been the usual practice, to which hitherto no objection whatever had been made, for the Zulus to go first to their King. In paragraph 20, Sir T. Shepstone says [3616, pp. 43 and 45], speaking of "the groups of Zulu men and women, varying in number from 250 to 20 or 30," who "met us on our way," that "their uniform practice was, after congratulating the chief [King] to come in the same vociferous and excited way to thank me for his return." And again, paragraph 25, "Among those who came to see Cetshwayo, . . . and, as usual, afterwards to see me, were two of Panda's widows." Why, therefore, the Sutu should have been severely blamed for doing what all those who came before them had been allowed, or apparently expected to do, it is not easy to understand. The official report does not, indeed, find any direct fault with them on this point, but the statement that "Mnyamana did not fulfil his promise of coming to the camp until afternoon, seems to endorse the reproach which the *Mercury* S. C. had made.*

* This correspondent was avowedly in the confidence of the officials, to such an extent indeed that his report was said to express throughout Mr. Osborn's views and feelings, and those of the authorities generally. Dr. Seaton says of him, "My worthy confrere of the *Mercury*, representing the feelings of those in authority, has been, by special invitation, placed in possession of them [the conditions of the restoration] this evening [Jan. 28th]. Indeed nearly all official communications have only reached me second-hand through him."

The *Mercury* S. C. is so eager to find the Sutus in the wrong that he complains that when on their way to Sir T. Shepstone's tents "they met Mr. Fynn, the new Resident to Cetshwayo." . . . "not one condescended to salute or recognise that functionary." As Mr. Fynn had not yet been introduced to them as "Resident," there was

As far as Mr. Osborn is concerned the accusation against the Sutus was palpably absurd [3616, p. 45]. He had only met the party at Emtanjaneni on the 17th, and therefore could not possibly have acted as master of the ceremonies between Sir T. Shepstone and the 3000 Zulus "roughly estimated" by the officials, as having "presented themselves to see and welcome Cetshwayo," before that date; and, in the presence of his official superior, Sir T. Shepstone, the Resident would not, of course, have been put first by the Zulus. Zibebu and Mfanawendhlela alone seem to have thought of begging his countenance and introduction (Sir T. Shepstone says "they went first to Mr. Osborn, to ask that officer to introduce them"). Certainly, whether the Resident himself was to blame, or whether the fault lay with

not of course the smallest reason why they should salute him, unless any amongst them chanced to be numbered amongst his private acquaintances.

A curious instance of the manner in which this correspondent (Mr. Carter) made opportunities for speaking against Cetshwayo may be found in a passage written by him on January 23, that is to say, some days after the arrival of the party at Emtanjaneni. "The renowned 'Coward's Bush,' where a slow death, by puncturing in the armpit with an assegai, was meted out to those who had lacked courage in the face of an enemy, is nowhere near here."

The incident referred to occurred about sixty years before, in the time of Tshaka, and has never been repeated since. The writer does not mention this, but would leave his readers, unacquainted with the fact, to suppose that the practice was continued under Cetshwayo, who never sent out an *impi* during his reign. Otherwise, except to raise a prejudice against Cetshwayo, it is difficult to see why this matter should be dragged into his narrative, as the place in question was "nowhere near here."

those from whom he received his orders, he had obtained very little influence over, or affection from the Zulu people generally. A few there were, of course, personally attached to him, but the majority had no confidence in him, and the Sutus, especially, had little cause to love him. A firm yet gentle hand, and, above all things, absolutely just and impartial treatment, was what the Zulus had required, and Mr. Osborn had not the requisite characteristics for the task.

“On the morning of the 29th January,” writes Sir T. Shepstone, “every arrangement was made for carrying out the restoration ceremony, and, should nothing happen to prevent [it], the return of the column towards Natal. Mr. Osborn, Lieut.-Col. Curtis, and I, had arranged the programme of the proceedings. About 800 yards from our camp a natural circular depression in the open grassy ridge, well suited to the purpose, had been selected as the spot on which the meeting should be held, and Mr. Fynn [the King’s future Resident] had undertaken the marshalling and seating of the people in readiness to receive us. I sent my secretary, Mr. Arthur Shepstone, to explain the whole programme to Cetshwayo and to inform him that, as, in going to the spot selected, I should have to pass near his camp, I should call for him, and we would proceed together to the place that had been selected for the ceremony. He thanked me and expressed his full approval of the programme, except that, he said it was his place to come to me, rather than mine to call for him; but as he would meet me on my way, and as I waived his coming to me, he was content. He stipulated that, during the ceremony, he should sit close to me and be near ‘our own troops,’ alluding to Her Majesty’s soldiers.* By noon the troops had formed line behind the flag-staff, facing the assembled Zulus, who numbered about 6000.†

* It has been pointed out before that this stipulation alone is a complete answer to all the official suggestions of intended treachery on Cetshwayo’s part.

† Sir T. Shepstone had insisted on the exclusion of the “young men” from the ceremony, threatening Cetshwayo that [3616, p. 51]

When all was ready I started from the site of our camp, which had during the morning been moved a short distance, so as to be ready for our homeward march, and proceeded with Mr. Osborn and my secretary to meet Cetshwayo, who with Mr. Fynn, Mr. R. Dunn, and his native attendants proceeded with us to the place of meeting, where we were received with a general salute and took our seats under the flagstaff, Cetshwayo sitting on my right, and Lieut.-Col. Curtis on my left . . . and the Zulus forming a large semicircle in front [3616, p. 51].

Before describing what passed at this ceremony, let us consider the situation from the Zulu point of view.

Cetshwayo had been brought back to Zululand, Her Majesty's Government having decided to restore to him as much of his old kingdom as possible without breaking our word to those Zulus to whom we had promised exemption from his rule, and who might find it impossible to return to their national allegiance. The Home Government expected, and Cetshwayo was satisfied, that if this exception were honestly made, the portion of Zululand to be reserved would be so small that neither King nor people need complain of its loss as a condition of independence. And this was the widespread understanding and feeling amongst the Zulus generally, the majority being either ardently eager, or else quite willing to show their loyalty to the King. There was, of

“if he would not heed my warning, the consequences must be borne by him, for I should take measures myself to have my determination on this point carried out.” [N.B.—How? His force numbered 250 soldiers and some dozen civilians.] If the “Amadoda” present numbered 6000, 12,000 Zulus must be far under the mark of those who had come to welcome Cetshwayo.

course, a discontented minority—when is there not ? But these, without Natal Government suggestions and encouragement, would have been gradually absorbed by the national sentiment until no opposition except that of Dunn remained.

It should have been the Natal Government's part to bring this about, as far as possible, by moral influence and without coercion, but either the notion of practically annexing a large part of Zululand, or else that of founding a "Black-Kingdom" under British rule, or sheer opposition to the restoration policy, so far guided the actions of all the officials concerned, that the very opposite line was taken ; a large part of Zululand on one side, and a lesser, but still important portion, on the other, was cut off beforehand, and it then became the business of the officials to prove that this was necessary. It was only during the last few weeks before the King's return that this arrangement was made known to the Zulus in the proposed Reserve, i. e. the portion chiefly affected, by the mouth of a Government official who had long lost his character for truth amongst them. They could not believe the evil tidings. The original plan, the news of which had reached them direct from England, had seemed to them so just and good, so altogether, therefore, what Cetshwayo himself, and their other best friends, had taught them to expect from England, that they could not believe that it had really been thrown aside, and they came to meet the King and to hear the conditions of his restoration from Sir T. Shepstone, still incredulous

of the fact that half their country had been taken from them.*

Sir T. Shepstone explains that his object in excluding the young men from the meeting was to

* This is no mere figure of speech. According to the *Mercury's* semi-official exposition of the new settlement, "three-eighths" of Zululand formed the "Reserve," "one-eighth" was cut off for Zibebu, and "four-eighths, or one-half," was left to Cetshwayo. But the writer says nothing about the fact that much of what was thus "left" is barren and stony land, and that another large tract on the coast is swampy and fever-stricken, wherein few people can live, while the land in the Reserve is for the most part excellent, and to a large extent possessed by chiefs and their tribes who were thoroughly loyal to the King. The same correspondent remarks: "On the plateau [at Emtanjaneni], I suppose, the ceremony of installation . . . will take place, and from there Cetshwayo *will, if the day is fine, be able to take in at a glance the whole of his new territorial possessions.*"—*Mercury S. C.*, January 22.

The diagrams and distances given in these pages are taken mainly from the authorised official map, made by Captain Alleyne, R.A., in December 1879, and appended to Blue Book C. 3466. But it has been found necessary to supplement its use by reference to a map compiled "from original sources, and from personal observation and information," in 1878, by the late Colonel A. W. Durnford, R.E. This latter sketch, although made after a (necessarily) rapid personal examination of the country, and without those advantages of leisure and complete scientific appliances which, probably, render Captain Alleyne's map the more correct in outline, differs singularly little from the latter, and more favoured work, in that respect, while it remains the more complete in others which are especially valuable in a map of a new and uncivilised country, viz. in notes of natural features, "bush," broken and difficult country, marsh, swamp, &c., &c., and gives, therefore, a truer idea of *what was left to Cetshwayo* than does the authorised edition, which does not so plainly indicate what extent of country is habitable or the reverse. To exhibit *other* omissions from the latter which Colonel Durnford's map supplies, it may be mentioned, that, while Captain Alleyne's gives "*Emtanjaneni range*" only, we find in Colonel Durnford's "*Emtanjaneni, reputed highest point in this part of Zululand*" (which observation chances

prevent the serious catastrophe of "factious disturbances" arising "*among so large and so many-minded an assemblage of barbarians, &c.*" In the use of the term "many-minded" he would appear to have been mistaken, for, with a few exceptions (i. e. of late "appointed chiefs"), the great gathering appear to have been entirely of one mind on the only two important points, feeling great satisfaction at Cetshwayo's return, and utter dissatisfaction at the partition of the country. There does not seem to have been the smallest symptom of the discord amongst themselves apprehended by the Commissioner, although the fact did not result from the absence of the younger men, for Mtokwane describes how, notwithstanding the mass of the people was left at a distance at first in consequence of Sir T. Shepstone's orders, they could not be kept away, but "just came up of their own accord, by twos and threes, till the whole place of meeting was crowded."

Already many who had been, for a time, and during the King's absence, led away from their allegiance, were returning to Cetshwayo of their own accord, and these were well received by the stauncher loyalists, one of whom told the Bishop of Natal, "*We do as you advised, and think kindly of them, as woman-*

to prove important now, since this was the spot selected by Sir T. Shepstone for the ceremony of re-installation, as "the highest and most open land in the country" [3616, p. 46]) and also that "Point Durnford," though already of historic importance in connection with the Zulu war, and marked upon the older maps (in memory of Captain George Durnford, of the 27th Regiment, who died there), is not indicated at all in Captain Alleyne's map.

kind, who must be forgiven for weakness, and the King just holds out his arms, and they run under." *

But how would it be likely to affect these weak ones when they should hear from the Queen's representative that the King's arm was in future to possess no power either to save or punish, when they should see that the officials, one and all, treated him in a grudging, suspicious spirit, as one who must be bound and restricted in every imaginable way, before the farce of setting him free should be carried out? To obtain Cetshwayo's promise to observe certain conditions, and to place a Resident with him to see that they were carried out, was no more than would have been right and reasonable on the part of the

* Amongst these were two headmen, former adherents of Dunn's—Sikunyana and Sigwelegwele. The latter's conduct is put forward by the King's opponents as a proof of "the terror of Cetshwayo's presence," since, says the *Mercury S. C.*, "this man was one of those who fled for his life into Natal during Cetshwayo's reign." This is a characteristic distortion of the actual facts, which were as follows:—After the fight between the Tulwana and Ngobamakosi regiments at the Feast of First Fruits in 1878, Hamu, being Induna of the Tulwana, laid the blame on Sigwelegwele, the Induna of the Ngobamakosi, and finally "went away home in great wrath saying that Sigwelegwele should be killed before he would be appeased. And, as the chiefs sided with Hamu in this matter, Cetshwayo sent a reprimand to Sigwelegwele, bidding him fly to the forest, and that the Ngobamakosi should guard him, as the Zulus would kill him. Therefore he and the Ngobamakosi fled, and lay hid at the Ngoye, until all who had fought had been fined, Sigwelegwele himself being fined 100 head; and so that quarrel ended, and Sigwelegwele returned home' (*Dig.* p. 262). The King having thus protected him in old days, the man's conduct in welcoming him back is hardly "extraordinary," and does not need to be explained, as due to "the terror of Cetshwayo's presence"!

great Power which had conquered and now restored him. But surely these conditions should have been officially imposed upon the King and his great council only,* and it should have been left to Cetshwayo himself to make known, at his own pleasure, to the people generally, that such and such unpalatable changes were compulsory, and to let other more agreeable ones pass as acts of grace on his own part. So would all the legitimate desires of the conqueror have been fulfilled in the establishment of gentler laws, and the removal of what was called "the military system," and consequent supposed "standing menace" to Natal, while Cetshwayo's power over the hearts and wills of his people would have remained uninjured, or even have been augmented. But this was not the

* In point of fact it was this *great council*, composed of the aristocracy of the nation, and therefore, naturally, highly conservative, which required to be checked in the unsparing application of the "ancient [and severe] laws and usages" of the people. Cetshwayo himself had always inclined towards mercy, and would have gradually introduced a milder code even without the British admonitions, which, indeed, *might* have been used so as to assist instead of hindering him in his task. The notion that his rule was ever an irresponsible despotism is almost as unfounded as that which represented him, individually, as a ruthless tyrant, exercising his cruel powers to the utmost. An instance of his humane and reasonable disposition is mentioned by Sir T. Shepstone [3616, p. 53] in his Report, where the latter says that the King mentioned, in assenting to the second of Sir H. Bulwer's "Further conditions" (i. e. the one by which the girls of the royal household who had married during his absence were left "unmolested" with their husbands, parents, guardians, and other "relatives," &c.), that "even if it had not been proposed to him, he should have acted in accordance with its provisions of his own free-will."

aim of the Natal officials, though manifestly the Home Government desired nothing better. The latter can never have intended that conditions of the King's restoration should be read out in the ears of the whole assembled people by which they learnt that practically he would in future have no power over them at all, no means of enforcing obedience, of carrying out old laws, or of making new ones. He might not require them to work for him, nor forbid their leaving the country to work for others. Natal was to control his trade, his treaties, and his succession; not only might he punish no crime, but also he might right no wrong committed during his absence; he was required to prevent this, and to permit the other, but he was allowed no means whatever of upholding his authority beyond "a few police."* He was, in fact, deprived of all that constituted kingly authority, or (in its present uncivilised condition) could constitute it in Zululand, except the birth-right, which could not be taken from him without the annihilation of the nation, i. e. the respect due to the rightful heir of all the old Zulu kings, still—as they believed—advised and watched

* The *Mercury S. C.* says that Cetshwayo reminded Sir T. Shepstone that there was one condition which the latter had forgotten, viz. that he (Cetshwayo) could have a force of police, and that Sir T. Shepstone replied "Yes, it is true," and that the conditions "said nothing against Cetshwayo's keeping a few policemen to preserve order. He could have just a small number of people around him, and that would not be considered unlawful."

A reply was given in the House of Commons, he it observed, to the effect that *no restrictions had been placed upon the number of armed men that Cetshwayo might employ.*

over by their spirits. At a later date this sentiment alone sufficed to save Cetshwayo's life from Zibebu's spearmen, who had already wounded him unawares, and it was greatly enhanced by the personal influence of the King's own moral character.

In fact, Sir T. Shepstone's mission was an attempt to force what might be called a free charter upon a people utterly unprepared to receive it, who had no written laws, and who, as Sir H. Bulwer previously pointed out, required, therefore, to be ruled by a "duly recognised and adequate paramount authority."

The conditions having already been given [p. 76] need not be recapitulated here, but some further remarks are necessary upon the second and very important one against "the existence of the Zulu military system or the existence of any military system or organisation whatsoever," within Cetshwayo's dominions.

This condition would no doubt have been modified, or rather explained, had the Home Government understood more upon the subject than they learnt from Sir Bartle Frere and other South African officials. Her Majesty's Government believed, beyond question, that by this condition they were simply abolishing a standing army, and thereby depriving the Zulu King of the (objectionable) power of attacking neighbouring states. They certainly cannot have understood the truth, namely, that the condition as it stood, abolished not merely the fighting power, but also the equivalent of the whole civil service of a civilised country. In the latter

there is an exchequer, supplied by a system of taxation, from which, and certainly not from the Queen's private purse, the civil servants of the Crown are paid for their services. In Zululand no system of taxation has yet been started,* and it certainly could not be brought to bear suddenly in a crisis such as we are describing, and by a ruler deprived of all but moral force.

"The King's work," of any kind, whether civil or military, is performed by levies of young men, called *amabuto*, which word is commonly translated "soldiers," but which properly means *collections*, whether of soldiers, workmen, of boys, or of girls. The system is of very ancient, immemorial date, and exists amongst all the neighbouring tribes, Swazis, Tongas, Pondos, and is strictly kept up to this day by many of the chiefs in Natal under British rule.†

* By the end of February the King had received as free-will offerings from his people over 1000 head of cattle, of which he had already had 600 head slaughtered in order to provide food for those who came to him. He directed Mnyamana to tell the people that all who were able to do so should bring a "thank-offering" in money, and that he who had only a shilling to give, "let him not despise it, but bring it." No compulsion whatever was used, but the call was responded to so readily, that Cetshwayo was very soon able to acquit his debt to Mr. Saul Solomon of 50*l.* The *Natal Times* and *Mercury* did not lose the opportunity of trying to make out that the King was already afflicting his people, and the former attempts a sneer in the words, "His Majesty was graciously pleased to have it [the money raised in the above manner] appropriated to his own private uses, and has accordingly stuck to it." One would like to know how these editors and correspondents would have had Cetshwayo act!

† Report of Natal Native Commission, 1882, p. 5.

Tshaka's innovation upon this system was to forbid the marriage of these levies until the chief pleased, as is the practice in some Natal tribes to this day. And Cetshwayo would have made no objection to the removal of this restriction. The young men would then have still been called out by the King in regiments for planting, weeding, kraal-building, &c., as is done by chiefs in Natal, or for road-making, as is done by the Natal Government, or for police purposes, for which no provision whatever is made in the conditions. As the second condition stood it struck at the root of all established law and order in Zululand. The King was forbidden to exact any of the above services, although it is plain that in no country can government be carried on without either such direct service, or else its equivalent in taxation.

The Home Government was, no doubt, utterly unaware of the sense in which their condition would inevitably be received, but it seems incredible that the Natal officials, especially Sir T. and Mr. J. Shepstone, and Mr. Osborn, should have been equally ignorant. They were, of course, well aware of the native customs in these matters, and the absence of an explanatory speech on the part of Sir T. Shepstone cannot easily be accounted for except by the supposition that the full meaning of the condition was intended by them. That it cannot have been an oversight is sufficiently proved by Sir T. Shepstone's reply to Cetshwayo's reminder, and his use of the expressions "a few policemen," and "he could have

just a small number of people."* But if further proof is required, it may be found in an incident which Sir T. Shepstone records, though without giving it its full value, towards the close of his report. He says that, just as the meeting was breaking up, Cetshwayo asked him "to direct the people to assist in building a kraal for him," showing plainly enough that the King understood the prohibition concerning "Amabuto" in its full, or Zulu sense.

Sir T. Shepstone consented that the order, on this occasion, should be given in his name, and the fact of his doing so, without fully explaining both to Cetshwayo and to his "Resident," Mr. Fynn, that there was no restriction whatever upon the calling out of the people for peaceful purposes, speaks volumes for the official intention. Nor was this all. A great number of people gladly took advantage of this special permission to gather round their King, to rejoice in his return, to perform the necessary labours for his comfort, and, very shortly, when rumours of Zibebu's sinister intentions† reached

* The local papers fully endorse this view, and as there was no official contradiction, they must be held to expound the official intention. The *Times of Natal* remarks, "There is nothing said in the conditions of restoration as to the means of preserving the country ruled by Cetshwayo from internal strife. Cetshwayo is not to establish any military kraals or military system. But the chiefs [Zibebu, Ilamu, &c.], on the other hand, have their men drilled, and an organisation, now more or less perfected, which may be employed in an effective manner, should the leaders determine to use force to retain the territory given to them by Sir G. Wolsley's settlement."

† To be related in a later chapter.

them, to protect him from danger. This would seem a natural and innocent proceeding on their part, and also on the part of the King who permitted and encouraged it. Yet no sooner was it known that he had not been left to the "few policemen" specified by the Commissioner, that a large and loyal body of his people clung around him, in spite of the discomfort, and even want, which inevitably attended the service of a King without a revenue, a court without accommodation, no sooner did this disappointing fact become known to Cetshwayo's white enemies in Natal, than he was promptly accused of breaking the conditions of his restoration, and levying an army as soon as he was left alone.

Sir T. Shepstone, indeed, with the curious *acquired* suspicion of Cetshwayo's good faith which tinges his every word at this time, says that he consented to the order being given in his name because "at the moment" he "could not see any objectionable use that might be made" of his complying with the King's request, and he adds, "I afterwards found [though he does not tell us how] that this had been construed to include the inhabitants of the Reserved Territory, upon whom it was considered that a direction from me would be felt to be binding" [3616, p. 56]. But the writer is entirely mistaken in his view of Cetshwayo's motives. These were twofold—first his wish to show that he scrupulously obeyed the commands of the British Government, however difficult and irksome that obedience might be, and, secondly, not that any of the people from the

Reserve should be forced by the Commissioner's order to render service to the King, but that the very large number from thence whom he knew to be warmly attached to him should neither be prevented from staying with him now, nor punished for having done so on their return to their homes in the confiscated territory. Sir T. Shepstone remarks that "a great number of young men" ran off, to evade the order as soon as the proclamation was made, but it is a question of how many the "great number" consisted, or whether all those whom Sir T. Shepstone observed really ran away. A few did, no doubt—idle young men, apparently, who were glad of any excuse to escape hard work. Sir T. Shepstone records an interview, which gives this impression, with "several young men" whom he met on his way back to Natal, "some of whom" had been present at the ceremony, and who, when asked why they had not stayed to build Cetshwayo's kraal, replied [3616, p. 57], that "such work was no longer theirs," as they lived on the "Reserve" side of the Umhlatuze. They continued "we have been spoilt by the last three or four years *for such service*," * i. e. for *work*,

* A curious little insight into the dreaded "military system" was given by this young man. He is reported to have said, "We used to think that our military system was a good thing, although we had to serve [work] so many months near the chief, with so little to eat, that, when our term was ended, it was as much as many of us could do to crawl back to our homes to get food and recover strength." If there is any truth in this statement, it would hardly seem as though the service of the King was likely to make his men very formidable opponents in battle.

and the remainder of the sentence, "we have found what it is to sleep without feeling alarmed in the night at the bark of a dog, lest it might be the approach of a party sent to destroy us," is curiously out of keeping with the evident meaning of the former phrase. The implication is altogether false; Cetshwayo's previous reign had been remarkable for its clemency, while the appointed chiefs, Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu had killed or "eaten up" more Zulus in three years than Cetshwayo in the whole six of his actual reign. The whole passage, in fact, gives the impression of having been spoken by a rather conscience-stricken young man, who was not, at first, quite sure that he would not be reproved by the white chief for shirking his work, and who, when relieved from this anxiety, was inclined to be more voluble than exact in the statement upon which he grounded his excuses. A general permission to pay Her Majesty's taxes or not at pleasure, might possibly affect a few easy-going Englishmen in like manner.

The Zulu report of the speech with which Sir T. Shepstone opened the meeting at Emtonjaneni, is so *naïve*, so concise, and (as may be judged from a comparison with the English reports) so exactly what the people really understood by what was said to them, that we cannot do better than give it entire. They related that

"Somtseu said, 'My children! the Queen is restoring Cetshwayo out of pure kindness. My children! there is nothing to pay for

it; the Queen requires nothing from you.* The property, the King's cattle, which have been eaten up, are to be theirs for ever who now possess them, my children! That is an old story.† And the royal women (*isigodhlo*), who have been taken, they will belong to those who have got them. And the people's cattle, which have been eaten up, they are to be theirs for ever who have got them, my children! All property which has been eaten up, whether of King or people, the King will not interfere with it. This land which has been cut off by the Umhlatuze belongs now to the Natal Government.‡ It will not be inhabited by white men; it will not be inhabited by Natal natives; † it is to be for the dissatisfied (*izihlupeki*) here in Zululand. The King will not enrol soldiers; he will allow the young people to go and work for themselves; he will have just a few youths—a mere handful—of policemen to do his work for him.§ He will just stay by himself. Land has been cut off also for Zibebu; he is installed as a king, and is to rule his country as hitherto. The strip between the two districts is to belong to the King. He will have nothing to say in these matters; they are all settled; the Governor has set his foot down on them. Here is Mr. Fynn, who has been appointed across the sea to remain with the King; for it is he who will talk over matters with him, and send them on in letters to Maritzburg. And if the King wants guns, he must ask Mr. Fynn, and if he refuses, the King must let it alone. Here also is Mr. Osborn, who has hitherto had the care of Zululand.' Said Mr. Osborn, 'I was ordered to look after Zululand; I now give it back into the King's hands. I give it back, O Zulu (Cetshwayo)!'"

* "We do not want your cattle; we do not want your women. We want nothing from you for bringing him back. We simply give you him back by the grace of Her Majesty."—*Mercury S. C.* (This writer makes Sir T. Shepstone say "I do not hand him over to you because it is my wish that he should return. I do so because I am ordered to," which, although the exact state of the case, was probably not exactly what the Commissioner's speech expressed.

† This is a *variation* on Lord Kimberley's instructions. "It is the desire of Her Majesty's Government that all cattle formerly belonging to Cetshwayo, and their produce, should be collected for him before his return" [3466, p. 128].

‡ N. B.

§ "He could have just a small number of people around him."
—*Mercury S. C.*

The newspaper accounts of this speech are considerably longer, but much to the same effect, and both they and Sir T. Shepstone's own report cannot fail to seem somewhat unfriendly and suspicious towards Cetshwayo, to the unprejudiced reader. The King's disabilities and restrictions were plainly expounded to the people; Sir T. Shepstone told them that although he was restored, it was not to

“the same seat that he had occupied before; it did not empower him to kill without full and fair trial, or upon the irresponsible declarations of witch doctors,* or to interfere with girls marrying or being given in marriage, or to exact military service in any way” [i. e. any service at all]; that he was prohibited from “going behind the event of his restoration; what took place during his absence was not to be the subject of blame or punishment.” [The property, the King's cattle . . . are to be theirs for ever who now possess them, my children! And the royal women who have been taken, they will belong to those who have got them . . . my children!]

The principal point omitted from the Zulu report is Sir T. Shepstone's allusion to the failure of Sir Garnet Wolseley's settlement, which the *Mercury S. C.* records somewhat quaintly, though quite in accordance with the Commissioner's own report:—

“After these chiefs [the thirteen kinglets] had been appointed some time, we saw a thing we did not expect. The people and the chiefs quarrelled among themselves, and so we found then that this ruling by chiefs would not do. . . . And when we saw this, we recollected that we had Cetshwayo, and that he was still alive, and we thought we would bring him back.”—*Mercury S. C.* Compare Sir T. Shepstone [3616, p. 52].

The “conditions” were then rehearsed. When the one concerning Zibebu's and the Reserve terri-

* Cetshwayo had always been averse to capital punishment, and had prevented it literally in thousands of cases. He had also very little faith in the witch doctors.

tories had been read, Cetshwayo endeavoured to record his protest against the Capetown (i. e. Sir H. Bulwer's) rendering of the English intentions (as he had never failed to do whenever he was required to assent to it), but he was not allowed to speak then, and but little notice was taken by the "authorities" of his subsequent remarks. The assembled chiefs, however, asserted their right to speak upon the point.

Now, one very serious official fault had been committed with reference to Zibebu's boundaries. Six separate official communications fixing them had been made in less than four months, and of these six communications, the first, second, and fifth gave one line, the third and sixth gave another, and the fourth gave a third. All three decisions were officially delivered to the Zulus as England's final word upon that boundary, and it is hard to see how a better plan for making war in Zululand inevitable could have been adopted.

The first of the six communications was made by Sir Henry Bulwer's orders to the Sutu Princes in October 1883 [3466, p. 213], and was to the effect that

"the portion of Zibebu's territory to which Undabuko and Ziwodu, and certain other chiefs* belong, should be taken from under Zibebu's authority, and included in the part of the country which is to be placed under . . . Cetshwayo."†

* "Umsutshwana, Umbopa, Mahu, and others," mentioned by Sir H. Bulwer in his despatch of Oct. 3rd [3466, p. 200].

† Zibebu receiving full compensation by the addition of Umgojana's land to his territory. See diagram, p. 238, *supra*.

It is quite plain that in making this arrangement Sir Henry Bulwer intended to restore to the Sutu Princes and people the whole of "their old lands," for he continues—

"In this way the immediate and real grievance of the two brothers will be removed," and "the main causes of complaint . . . on the part of Undabuko and Ziweddu . . . will be at once practically removed."

This was also the arrangement explained to Cetshwayo at Capetown on December 7th, as stated, evidently with authority, by the editor of the *Cape Times*, in his issue of December 30th:—

"Zibebu is to be left an independent chief. That portion of his country which previously belonged to Ndabuko and Ziweddu will be taken away from him and placed under Cetshwayo, so that Undabuko and Ziweddu will be able to return to the King's country, and live subject to his authority."

A third communication [3616, p. 44] to the same effect was made by Sir T. Shepstone at a "formal interview" with Cetshwayo, held upon the way to Emtongani, on January 15th, 1883, in presence of the three chiefs who had attended the King to England, besides the principal persons of the British expedition, and others accompanying Sir T. Shepstone. The account of the "conditions," then read over by the Commissioner to Cetshwayo, and officially communicated to Mr. Carter, was published in both *Natal Times* and *Mercury*, and contained the following passage, almost identical with the statement of the *Cape Times*:—

"From Zibebu's territory and authority will be taken away . . . the country that belongs to Ndabuko and Ziweddu, and this will be placed under Cetshwayo, so that these chiefs can return to their own districts, and live subject to Cetshwayo's authority."

It is, however, plain that Sir Henry Bulwer had been altogether misinformed as to the extent and position of the Sutu lands, for, in his despatch of October 3rd [3466, p. 200], he defines the district to be returned to the Princes as "all that extent of country situated between the range of hills lying to the north-east of the Black Umvolosi and that river." He fixes the said "range of hills" as the boundary between Zibebu and the Sutus, in ignorance of the fact that there were Sutu lands and kraals far to the north-east again of the range, and this second arrangement, which limited them to the country on the one side of the range, was communicated to Mr. Osborn on December 22nd [3466, p. 271], with directions for beaconing it out with the aid of Mr. Fannin.

It was this narrower boundary-line which was announced at the reinstallation, and which, although very different from, and less satisfactory than the one to which Cetshwayo had signed submission (under protest) at Capetown, and which had been read to him again on January 15th, he was required to accept before the assembled people on January 29th.

"From Zibebu's territory and authority will be taken away all the country situated between the range of hills lying to the north-east of the Black Imfolozi and that river. This is the country that belonged to Undabuko and Ziweddu, and this will be placed under Cetshwayo, so that these chiefs can return to their own districts, and live subject to Cetshwayo's authority."

By this arbitrary and entirely incorrect definition, "*this* is the country, &c.," the whole meaning of the sentence is altered, or rather reversed, and a con-

siderable portion of the Sutu territory left to Zibebu. Nor was this all. So far the confusion, though sure to produce disastrous consequences, may be explained by sheer blundering on the part of the officials. But what is to be said of the fact that the line actually beacons out by Mr. Osborn's orders was drawn considerably to the south-west of even Sir Henry Bulwer's boundary-range of mountains, taking another large slice from the Sutus, while the only reason given by Mr. Osborn (and, apparently, accepted as satisfactory by Sir Henry Bulwer), for the alteration is that it was made *to please Zibebu!* [3705, p. 55].

At the very time when Sir T. Shepstone announced to the people that Zibebu was to have up to the range of hills in question, his boundary was newly beacons out, by which he got a good piece more of the Sutu land, so that when the Sutus returned home they simply found that they had been deceived. What is still more remarkable is that, although it was Mr. Osborn himself who "readjusted" the line (to please Zibebu) entirely on his own responsibility, and without any reference to his official superior; *

* It is a somewhat remarkable fact that, while Sir Henry Bulwer himself could not fix these boundaries without first referring them to the Home Government, Mr. Osborn should have taken upon himself, apparently without rebuke, and certainly without subsequent rectification, to choose another line and to have it beacons out, without consulting any one except Zibebu, for whose gratification the alteration was made. This is the way in which England becomes involved against her will in wars with savage races, towards whom her officials elect to act, not according to her directions, but according to their own inclinations.

and although he went straight from doing this to Emtanjaneni, and was present at the reinstallation, he nevertheless permitted Sir T. Shepstone to announce one boundary to the people when he knew that another had been beaconsed out. Apparently he did not even report the considerable alteration he had made, for on April 14th, just three months later, Sir Henry Bulwer writes to Mr. Fannin asking for an explanation of the variation as shown by the latter's survey of the line marked upon the map, which the Governor had only just received. This map and accompanying documents [3705, p. 57] were sent by Mr. Fannin to Mr. Osborn when the latter was at Emtanjaneni for the reinstallation, i. e. before the end of January, but were "unfortunately left behind with his [Mr. Osborn's] other papers" [3705, p. 55], writes Sir Henry Bulwer, and only forwarded by Mr. Osborn on April 6th. Mr. Fannin's reply is this: "I acted, by direction of your Excellency, entirely under the instructions received from Mr. Osborn," and he explains that the latter's alterations were made to meet Zibebu's views, and, especially, to retain for him an old kraal belonging to the chiefs of his tribe which he valued. There were, of course, such kraals situated far down the territory of the Sutus, for Zibebu and his sub-tribe, the Mandhlakazi, were themselves part of the great Sutu tribe, and they and the other sub-tribes had lived interlaced as it were, and without attention to strict divisions, for generations, until the white invaders sowed dissention between them, and turned

their assegais against each other's hearts. But the accompanying statement that "no kraals belonging to the Usutu party are within Zibebu's line," is absolutely incorrect, for not only Mbopa's whole sub-tribe* and those of several other Sutu chiefs were left within it, but even the kraals of the King's late mother, and those of the Princes Undabuko and Ziweddu themselves, and a large portion of their tribes were given to Zibebu, i. e. either left, through misapprehension, outside Sir Henry Bulwer's line, or else deliberately cut out by Mr. Osborn's "readjustment."

The question of Sutu *versus* Zibebu cannot be rightly followed unless the reader first understands the full meaning of the term "Usutu." Its origin was as follows:—

"The chiefs and headmen under Songiya, Cetshwayo's grandmother, were considered to belong specially to him from his birth, e. g. Mbopa, Songiya's brother, Mapéta, Zibebu's father, and Mfusi, indunas, and Mfinyeli an innceku, of Mpande's kraal, Umlambongwenya, with the sub-tribes under them. From among these the young Prince collected the youths who should form his own personal following, and with them founded the ukuBaza kraal.

"When Mpande sent an *impi* out against the abaSutu (Basutos) under Sikwata, father of Sikukuni, the Zulus brought back much cattle, which were greatly admired, being very much larger than the Zulu cattle, 'they would swallow, at a gulp, water enough to satisfy a herd of the latter.' So the ukuBaza lads would say, boasting, 'We are the Sutu cattle! See how we drink our beer!' And then they took the word 'uSutu' as their distinguishing cry, and used it in their games, pelting one another with mealie-cobs,

* Mbopa's tribe is particularly mentioned by Sir H. Bulwer as one which will receive back their lands by his new settlement. This is the same chief who proved his loyalty to Cetshwayo so triumphantly under torture at the close of the Zulu war.

&c., before there was any idea of their fighting. And, when afterwards the ukuBaza had become a powerful kraal, filled with men saved, when condemned to death, by Cetshwayo's intercession, its people still kept the cry 'uSutu!' Being thus the distinguishing cry, in peace and in war, of Cetshwayo's special kraal, it became the war-cry of his party in the civil war with his brother Mbulazi in 1856. Since then it has become a national cry, as the whole Zulu people are uSutu, as belonging to Cetshwayo, and would use the word as a war-cry, or in its proper place on great occasions, as during the great National Feast of First Fruits, when, after shouting their own separate distinguishing cries, and being all marshalled in order, the whole assembly would shout 'uSutu' immediately before singing the 'National Anthem' in honour of Cetshwayo, viz. '*Uzitulele! Kaqali'muntu,*' 'He-keeps-quiet-for-himself! He-does-not-begin-to-attack-any-one!'"*

Each chief's following has its own distinguishing cry, besides the national one, except Cetshwayo's original Ukubaza kraal, whose cry was the same as, i. e. had become, the national one upon his accession. Zibebu, therefore, was himself "a Sutu," until he was set up on his own account by Sir Garnet Wolseley, and started a fresh distinguishing cry of his own.

Sir T. Shepstone summarises the subjects on which the chiefs addressed him at the meeting thus [3616, p. 54]:—

1. Thanks for Cetshwayo's restoration.
2. Admiration of a government and people that could perform such acts as to treat kindly, and ultimately to reinstate, an enemy captured in war, that enemy being the chief who had carried on the war.†

* This account of the "origin of the name Usutu" is taken from the Bishop of Natal's 'Digest of the Blue Books, with Notes' (unpublished).

† This is a somewhat ambiguous phrase. The Zulus certainly said nothing meant to imply that Cetshwayo had sinned against the English, by whom he had been invaded and conquered.

3. Objections to the retention of the Reserved Territory.
4. Protest and bitter feeling against Zibebu's elevation to independence, and against any portion of Zululand being allotted to him.*
5. Disappointment that the programme of the meeting did not include requiring all the appointed chiefs to attend, and to give an account of their stewardship.
6. Cetshwayo's forfeited † cattle, which had not been handed over, as they ought to have been, to Her Majesty's Government. ‡
7. The women and girls of the royal household; these were, however, but slightly alluded to, since Cetshwayo had himself publicly expressed his special approval of the provision regarding them.§

* This was the universal feeling of the Zulu people, with the exception of the Mandhlakazi tribe, naturally attached to their chief Zibebu, but of which some important sections left him when he turned (or rather *was turned*) against Cetshwayo.

† Cetshwayo's "forfeited" cattle, i. e. those of which "we" robbed him in 1879. Sir Henry Bulwer makes a great point of impressing upon Cetshwayo that he had no *rights* whatever in this matter, that the cattle he received (the poor little 310) were a gift from England's grace, for which he should be humbly grateful, since *all* the said "forfeited" cattle belonged by right of conquest to England. But by the Earl of Kimberley's despatch [3466, p. 128] of Sept. 7th, 1882, England resigned that right in favour of the Zulu King, therefore Sir Henry Bulwer's rebuke to the King, through Mr. Fynn, for referring to the cattle as "his," was uncalled for; and when he writes [3616, p. 30] that Cetshwayo "has no right or claim to any of them beyond what Her Majesty's Government may choose to give him," he forgets that Her Majesty's Government had chosen, some months before, to give Cetshwayo back whatever "right or claim" they had themselves.

‡ e. g. the great herds, numbering thousands, in the possession of Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu.

§ Nevertheless, that part of the clause which protected the chiefs who had carried off girls against their own and their parents' will, from even the payment of a fine was passionately protested against. See Mayepu's speech, p. 133.

Sir T. Shepstone says that "although he [Cetshwayo] took the credit of having, beforehand, approved of the one [condition] by which he had bound himself to make no claim upon the husbands,

8. Attachment of the people to Cetshwayo, and clamorous calls for such as did not like him to step forward and show themselves. These were responded to by the appointed chiefs Siunguza and Umgitshwa in person, and by the representative of Umlandela.

From Sir T. Shepstone's own more detailed account of what passed concerning these three appointed chiefs, as well as from the reports of both Zulus and "correspondents" present, we may gather that there is a looseness of expression in this last paragraph which is rather misleading. The "calls" to which the two chiefs and the representative of the third "responded," were not for those who "did not like" Cetshwayo, but *for those appointed chiefs who were accused of robbing and murdering the people placed under them.* The people asked [Sir T. S., 3616, p. 54]:—

"Why they were not present to answer for themselves? Siunguza . . . took notice of this, and said that he was an appointed chief, and that he was there to answer for himself."

parents, relations, or guardians of the girls of the royal household who had become married during his absence in respect of any such marriage, he had given the people to understand that in every case he should expect to receive a girl, a child of any such marriage, or other compensation equivalent thereto." It is a curious fact that Sir T. Shepstone, who is held to be such an authority in Zulu matters, should have made the mistake of thus representing the "Royal Household" as a sort of *tax in girls* levied by the King for himself, instead of being a position of honour in the eyes of the Zulus, as it really was. In point of fact, by the above-mentioned arrangement, the King would have restored to the child the rank and position lost by the mother, and it was about the only kindness he could now show to the latter. Cetshwayo's own letters from Capetown about the girls of his former household, some of which appear in the Blue Book, are sufficient to show how kindly his feelings and intentions were towards them.

The appointed chiefs whom the people chiefly, and with good reason, accused, were Dunn, Hamu, and Zibebu, who were *not* "present to answer for themselves," and of these three Cetshwayo accused only the two latter, having been misled by *official* reports of the Sitimela massacre into believing that Dunn was not guilty.

Sir T. Shepstone continues—

"Cetshwayo had shown an inclination to shield all the appointed chiefs, except Hamu and Zibebu, from the reproaches cast upon them, and Siunguza, in allusion to this, asked, 'How does Panda's son [Cetshwayo] know that two only of the appointed chiefs have shed blood; does he say so because those two are not present?'"

If Siunguza really asked this, it is no wonder that, as Sir T. Shepstone says,

"Some confusion was here caused by the clamour of the Sutu party, and a body of young men, which was checked by Cetshwayo's demanding for the speaker a fair hearing. Siunguza then came to the front, and, after protesting against the interruption, declared that he went to the white people for protection; he thanked for the restoration of Cetshwayo to his people, but said that he would himself remain under the Queen. Umgitshwa, another appointed chief, presented himself to answer any charges that might be brought against him, and to declare that he could not accept Cetshwayo's rule, but in spite of Cetshwayo's endeavours he was interrupted so boisterously that he could not proceed."

Siunguza was not, according to Zulu customs, the rightful chief even of his own tribe, as he was only uncle to the heir. The people would only acknowledge him under pressure from Natal, and the mere fact of the King's return relegated him to his natural position. But he was also unpopular on account of his late cowardice. He had been amongst the first

to "pray" for the King's return, but, when he found how greatly displeased the Natal authorities were at the prayer, he was readily induced to deny having joined in it, to disown his own messengers, and even to "eat up" their cattle, at (as he himself stated) official instigation.

Mgitshwa also was not the natural head of his tribe, being brother to the rightful heir. On Cetshwayo's return both he and Siunguza inevitably lost the position into which, by Dunn's advice, Sir Garnet Wolseley had forced them; and this by no will or wish of the King, nor, necessarily, misconduct on their own part, but simply by the operation of natural laws.

The other reports, from Zulus, and from the correspondents, hardly bear out Sir T. Shepstone's view that these chiefs spoke in a manner positively adverse to the King, or that they said they "could not accept" his rule. From these accounts it appears that their main point was to justify themselves in the eyes of King and people by attributing whatever unpopular action they had taken as appointed chiefs to the orders of the English authorities. The first order given them by the latter after the appointment of the kinglets in 1879, viz. to collect and hand over all the King's cattle, was a bad beginning for the appointed chiefs' chances of popularity. Even by carrying it out honestly they were forced to deprive a number of people of their chief means of subsistence, while it opened the door to tyranny and plunder on the part of the less well-disposed kinglets.

And to this must be added all the coercion, either directly ordered, or indirectly permitted, which was used to suppress the petitions for the King's return [see vol. i.]. It was these matters, and no inability to accept Cetshwayo's rule, as such, which made these chiefs, in official language, "*staunch to us.*"

The Zulu account of their words is that

Siunguza said "Yes, sirs, we were appointed by the English. And what I have done, that has been found fault with, has been done by the order of the English authorities [Mr. Osborn]. We thank on seeing this son of the Queen; but we don't know who are the 'dissatisfied ones,' for whom the land is to be cut off, and we don't know where the King is to put his people."

Mgitshwa said the same.

The interpreter of the *Advertiser* S.C. has rendered the phrase

"What I have done . . . has been done by order of the English authorities, thus I am one of those [who were] appointed; *but I had to go to the authorities to get protection from the Zulus,*" which is manifestly an error, as no such incident or necessity had ever occurred.*

But he also gives what is evidently the same as the Zulu report of the remainder of Siunguza's speech, thus:—

"You see the people all cry to you. They are not satisfied at the two words [viz. that he is restored as King, and at the same time is stripped of his country]. If he is a king, the country belonged to him. You, our King [addressing Cetshwayo] are the only one that has suffered."

While the *Mercury* S.C., with his usual twist, gives it, "What has Cetshwayo come here for? He has

* See Sir T. Shepstone's version (p. 128), which merely implies that he *now* "went to the white people," &c.

not room to live!" Yet even this account shows nothing of the repudiation of Cetshwayo implied in the official report.

"I am here ready to answer for my acts. Those who have done wrong you must not mix up with those who have not done wrong," said Siunguza, according to Mr. Carter, and Mgitshwa follows in this report with "What I have done I have done as a chief, and because I was an appointed chief, and I merely collected cattle according to orders. I had my orders to do so, and I did it."

The latter part of Mgitshwa's speech, as given by Sir T. Shepstone—i. e. that the chief came "to declare that he could not accept Cetshwayo's rule"—would seem to have been privately communicated to the officials by Mgitshwa as what *he had intended to say*, as all reports agree in showing that he never got further in his speech than his justification of himself, when, as Sir T. Shepstone says,

"He was interrupted so boisterously that he could not proceed." "A representative from Umlandela," continues this writer, "expressed this appointed chief's regret that, being old and infirm, he could not be present to welcome Cetshwayo back, but that he intended to remain a subject of the British Government."

The Zulu report is that

"Mlandela's mouth-piece said 'Sirs, Mlandela thanks for the King's return. If he were only younger he would be here in person. Mlandela died when the King was taken away, and he held down his head grieving, until he was roused by the Sitimela affair. It was for that reason only that he fled to Dunn.'

In point of fact, Mlandela's weakness was rather of mind than of body. He knew very well that his own conduct in the "Sitimela affair" would not bear investigation, and that the King would shortly find this out when he came to hear the truth from Somkele

and others concerned. Cetshwayo was prepossessed in Mlandela's favour, partly through official (mis)representation, and partly because the chief was a nominee of his (the King's) father, Umpande; but Mlandela's own guilty conscience and Dunn's influence caused him now to hold aloof.

As illustrations of the other clauses of Sir T. Shepstone's summary, it will be sufficient to quote a few specimens which are taken mainly from the Zulu account of what passed, as being more detailed than the short official report, and very much more accurate than those of the correspondents.*

The old Prime Minister, Umnyamana, made the

* Mr. Carter's interpreter was Martinez Otfebro, one of Dunn's late overseers, who was strongly opposed to Cetshwayo, as a matter of course. His rendering of Zulu passages is always markedly prejudiced, and often offensively so. A striking instance of this appears in his translation of the words of the headman Vumandaba, who said to the King, "The English have restored you with kind hands, let your hands be kind towards them also—let bygones be bygones (as to the Zulu War.)" In fact, let us "forget our sufferings, and be friends with the English, who have now shown us the great kindness of restoring our King," would have been an honest though free translation of Vumandaba's speech. Now the adjective *hle*, here rendered "kind," signifies in Zulu all that is desirable, pleasant, acceptable, proper, &c., and might as correctly, under suitable circumstances, be translated "clean." Accordingly Mr. Carter's interpreter makes Vumandaba say to the King, "As you have come back with clean hands, keep clean hands, and don't act as you did before." But the Zulus indignantly deny that Vumandaba (who was thoroughly loyal) intended the smallest reflection upon the King's previous reign, and the *Advertiser* S.C., Dr. Seaton, writes, "From the result of numerous inquiries I find that the man simply meant to congratulate the King on being able to recommence his reign with 'clean hands,' and to let bygones be bygones, wiping out all remembrance of any former offences." [*Adv. S.C.*, Jan. 24th.]

opening speech. He thanked Sir T. Shepstone for bringing back "the Bone of Senzangakona,"* that is, for the King's restoration, and said that Cetshwayo was "now the son of the Queen, not of me,"† i. e. that his rank was now much higher than it was before; but he protested against Zibebu's elevation, and the division of the country, saying,

"If you now speak of cutting off the country, and of leaving the King stripped of his cattle, what is to become of him?"

Sir T. Shepstone says that [3616, p. 54] Umnyamana's short introductory speech "gave the cue," and that

"the majority of the forty, or more, speakers that followed, adhered, with varying emphasis, to the programme that had thus been suggested."

It would, however, more accurately express the facts of the case to say that Umnyamana shortly stated what were the strong feelings of the assembled Zulus, and that, therefore, each speaker who followed him expressed the same with "varying emphasis," according to their different powers of self-control. It is hardly strange if some of the speakers were vehement, seeing how greatly they were disappointed by the boundary conditions, and that the very man who was to benefit more than any other by the partition of Zululand was the one from whom the country had already suffered so much, their grievances against whom they had depended upon

* Senzangakona, Cetshwayo's ancestor.

† Umnyamana always called the Princes his sons.

Cetshwayo's return to set right, and of whom Sir T. Shepstone says [3616, p. 54]—

“They accused him of every kind of violence and atrocity, and of being a persistent disturber of the peace of the country. Some speakers described the position in which Zibebu had been placed as intended to be a trap to cause Cetshwayo's downfall.”

Hemulana (one of Mnyamana's chief councillors) said—

“We thank you, son of Sonzica (Sir T. Shepstone) for bringing back the ‘Bone’ of Senzangakona. But even to-day in bringing him back you are killing him, killing him, I say, as you have done all along! Did you not set him up at first and then destroy him for nothing? Did you not take him to his Mother (the Queen) and bring him back, and now do you cut off the land, saying, ‘it is for those dissatisfied’? Where are they? You have taken the King's and the people's cattle, and given them to those chiefs whom you set up! You have taken the royal girls and have given them to those chiefs of yours! The Government left them all the cattle [at the former settlement]; but you to-day have taken them! You have taken these our children, and given them to common people! You have taken these our cattle, and given them to common people! And do you to-day set up these chiefs of yours, and give them the King's property? What is he to live upon? We thought that this King was now a child of the Queen. Do you mock us in saying that you are restoring him? We thought that you would go back to the appointment of the thirteen chiefs [i. e. examine into their conduct], when it was ordered that they should not shed blood, but should govern the land quietly, since he, ‘the shedder of blood,’ as you called him, was removed. We thought that you would inquire how these chiefs came to do as they have done, killing our people, and seizing our daughters, and eating up our cattle. What sort of settlement is this, sir? We do not call it a settlement at all. We say that you are killing us also to-day as you did before.* How do you decide? What

* The speaker refers to the Blood River Meeting between Sir T. Shepstone and the Zulu Indunas (Oct. 18th, 1877), about the “Disputed Boundary” question, when Sir T. Shepstone (according to the Zulus) threatened to take away their land as far as the

sort of a judgment is this? Where is Hamu? Where are Zibebu and Ntshingwayo?* Where is John Dunn? Have they not come to you, and did you not send them back? Do you leave out the real offenders? Whom did the King kill?—since he killed no white man, no policeman [Natal native messenger], no Zulu. Those who have killed—you have sent them away. Where are they? We want them to be here; we want them to be questioned. Name them, then, these men you speak of as ‘dissatisfied’! Show them to us! You are his enemy! You are in arms against him! You have come to kill him! †

Said Somtseu, “Do you say that I am his enemy?” Said he, “Yes! you are his enemy from the beginning! You are the author of all our troubles! Why don’t you inquire about those kinglets of yours, those murderers? You have sent them away and allowed them to keep all the King’s property? How will you deal with us? We shall arm, and seize the cattle, and stab those who try to keep them! For we have learned that with the Government one who spills blood is not blamed; on the contrary he is praised, and is given the women, and the cattle, and the land of the peaceable ones.” †

This was pretty strong speaking, but Hemulana belonged to the most powerful tribe in the kingdom, and could not easily be silenced. It was another matter when Dabulamanzi rose and spoke something to the same effect. He said—

“We thank you, sir, for bringing him back. But since it is we

Umhlatuze, and parted from them angrily. Other speakers, it will be seen, regarded this action as the beginning of sorrows, and Sir T. Shepstone as the origin of all.

* “Ntshingwayo came to Emtonjaneni, and so did Hamu’s son, as well as Zibebu. They went first to Mr. Osborn, and then to Somtseu, and then went away, without coming to the King. We say that they were prevented from coming to him.”—*Miokwane*.

† Melelesi, one of the chiefs from the Reserve, spoke in the same strain. “Is this how the Queen restores him?—when some of his own kraals are in the land which you gave to Zibebu, and others are south of the Umhlatuze? And, if he were coming down some day to Maritzburg, it is we, living south of the Umhlatuze, who ought to go in front of him.”

of that district [the Reserve] who came down to the authorities in Maritzburg, praying for him, and saying, 'This chief and that chief are troubling us, but we cannot fight them because they too are Cetshwayo's people,' tell us now, who are these 'dissatisfied ones,' for whom you are cutting off the land? Do you say that you are restoring him, this son of the Queen, while all the time you are destroying him, just as you did formerly? Sir, you are killing him still as you did before, when you first made him King, and then killed him. Say, then, son of Sonzica, show us these 'dissatisfied ones,' for whom you are cutting off our land, the land of the King! Say 'I cut off the land for this one and for that, who do not wish for the King'! Do you say that we are to move? Where will you put us, then, since you are eating up all Cetshwayo's land? *Tell us where you fix Zibebu's boundaries.** Why do you come and give the land to the very people who have been killing us? Do you approve of their bloodshedding? You have come to kill him, not restore him!"

Dabulamanzi, unhappily for himself, belonged to the Reserve, the people of which were required either to give up their homes and lands, or else to express themselves willing to submit to British rule. He was also in very bad odour with the authorities for having done his best to make the Queen's good intentions known to the Zulus, and to encourage the latter to speak the truth without fear, on the subject of their loyalty to Cetshwayo, yet to remain where they were, i. e. not to remove their families from the proposed "Reserve," and so "prove to the satisfaction of the Government that no necessity for a reserved territory exists" [3616, p 12]. It is no wonder that he was not popular with the officials who wished to prove quite the reverse "to the satisfaction of the Government," but it was surely a little strange that the Special Commissioner should so far

* Author's italics.

lose his temper as to call Dabulamanzi a "boy," and tell him to hold his tongue? The chief is a bearded man, with a son (then) of nineteen or twenty. He was a noted Zulu soldier and general,* and, failing a succession of Cetshwayo's mother's house, he would, under Zulu law, succeed to the throne of Zululand. "*Tula wena' mfana*" (Be silent, you boy!) was hardly a suitable phrase to use to such a man, and to English readers it will probably occur that Dabulamanzi showed more dignity in not resenting it than did Her Majesty's Commissioner in applying it.

Mayepu (late headman of Dunn) said—

"Sir, can we say that you *are* restoring him? No, you are killing him!† There are daughters of mine belonging to the royal household who have been taken [against their wills and the wishes of their parents] by Zibebu. All have perished, girls, cattle, and land! Do you think that we brought forth children for a dog like that? I would rather cut my throat before you here," and he came forward before Sir T. Shepstone, making the sign of cutting his throat, but crouching because of the King.‡ "Is the King, then, to pick up food like a bird, as he can?"

* But was not in command at the attack upon the Isandhlwana camp, as frequently stated.

† The verb *bulala*, "to kill," is used by the Zulus in a figurative sense, for all severe injury of any sort, as well as for the infliction of actual death.

‡ The Europeans (? civilians) of the installation party seem greatly to have resented the homage paid to Cetshwayo by his own people. The *Mercury* S.C. describes the latter as "cringing, creeping, and fawning [upon the King] in a manner that has excited the disgust of the meanest European in camp." The writer was probably qualified for making this assertion, but one would like to know whether he himself is too independent spirited to uncover to "God save the Queen," or whether it is only reverence to the black monarch that strikes him with disgust.

Msutshwana * said—

“Has not Zibebu, even this day (i. e. quite lately) killed a man—since the King has landed? I have not yet had time to report it. He killed him as he went back from you, sir [the “killing” was here meant literally]. Do you, sir, give all our property to Zibebu? My father Mfusi was as great a man as his father Mapita. Give us back our property, or set Zibebu before us, and examine the case. You are not giving a fair judgment, but are taking his side against us.”

Haiyana (Zibebu’s elder brother) said—

“We ask, sir, where is Zibebu? Whereas he is Mapita’s son, I am Mapita’s eldest son; here, therefore, sir, is Mapita speaking to you. We thought that you would have brought Zibebu face to face with the King. Have you cut off for him a portion of our country, and ordered him to go away privately? We thought that you had come to wash out his crimes; but have you come merely to support him, and hush them up? What is Zibebu that you should give the country to him?”

Magondo, Zibebu’s other brother, said the same. The *Advertiser* S.C. quotes him thus:—

“Our sympathies are with Undabuko. It is not one day since we complained to the British Resident that Zibebu was killing the Queen’s people; but to no purpose. We only know one King—Cetshwayo.”†

Undabuko, the King’s brother, said—

“All this time we have been carrying our grievances to Mr.

* *Msutshwana*, chief of the tribe, turned out by Zibebu to starve in the “bush.”

† Sir T. Shepstone says, “It was remarkable that the most uncompromising denouncers of Zibebu were his own brothers; I required the reason of this, and found that they had had a family quarrel and been obliged to leave.” But it must be added that the “*family quarrel*” meant that Zibebu was furious with his brothers for joining in the prayer for Cetshwayo’s release, and that their having “*been obliged to leave*” means that Zibebu turned them out of house and home, and drove them by force of arms from his “territory” for having “prayed.”

Osborn, and we hoped that to-day you would call us and Zibebu, and look into the matter.* But to-day you are cutting off our land for Zibebu, so that even my own kraal (*Kwa-Minya*) is given to him, and my brother Ziweddu's own kraal (*Emateni*), and a large number of others belonging to our people.†

Ziweddu, the King's half-brother, spoke to the same effect.

The *Mercury* S.C. gives his speech as follows:—

“You have brought the King back! But what is he going to eat [how is he to live]? Zibebu has taken some of his cattle, and you have divided the country, so that there is nothing left for the King. What are we going to do? We have nowhere to live now. The country is not large enough. For some time past, since we heard that Cetshwayo was coming, we said to ourselves ‘We are going to live now!’ But now we say that we continue as dead men.”

Somkele spoke like the rest, as also did Siganda, Nobiya, Qetuka, Mabuzi, these latter four being chiefs from the proposed “Reserve.” All gave thanks for the King's return, and all protested against the division of the country. Towards the close of the meeting some excitement was raised by recriminations between those who had taken opposite sides in the Sitimela affair. Mlandela's messenger having

* Zibebu was ordered by Sir E. Wood, on August 31st, 1881 [3182, p. 103], to restore to Ndabuko and Ziweddu on their quitting his territory (which they did) “one-third” of the cattle he had seized from them; and Mr. Osborn writes, December 20th, 1881 [*ibid.*, p. 134]: “By Y.E.'s award, on the complaint of Ndabuko, Zibebu became liable to restore to him upwards of 200 head of cattle.” By February 10th, 1882, he had restored seventeen head and two calves, and has restored none since, though he has made other extensive confiscations [*Supp. Dig.*, pp. 284–5].

† This was actually the case, although Sir T. Shepstone had just announced the contrary to them.