

chiefs went to their kraals; we delayed a little, and again collected together at Emtanjaneni. As we were going towards Etshowe, messengers came from Mr. John to say he was going to Entumeni to Mr. Galloway's place.\* We reached that place early the following morning; and found the horses being saddled. We were then told that Mr. John would speak to us at Equdeni, and that we were to follow him there.† When we got there—Mr. M. Oftebro's house‡—we were told to lay down our arms, and we put them under a tree some distance, about 100 yards from the house.§ When we arrived, the policemen were singing Mr. John's praises. They were saying, the white and the black bulls are facing one another; let us see whose horns will be broken before night. We all went in at the gate and saluted. Mr. John was sitting on the verandah. We were told to sit down. When we who were in front were about to sit down, it was said, 'Those who are behind must come in front.' When we were attempting to do so, Mr. John jumped upon us. He had a sjambok in his left hand, and with his right hand he took a knobkorry from Makatshana. This was the stick with which he 'killed' Hozana.|| Mr. John gave the word to attack, saying,

\* Mr. Galloway, an adherent of Dunn's, and since a subordinate of the Resident in the Reserve.

† What a dance these unfortunate men—most of them men of rank and position, and some of them elderly—were led is hardly apparent without a map of Zululand showing the places mentioned.

‡ Mr. M. Oftebro, previously mentioned, one of Dunn's henchmen.

§ "We were told to leave our sticks, and we put them down under a tree, some little way off; they were only walking-sticks, no knobkerries, nor assegais, nor shortened assegais; so we went with our hands empty." (*Interpretation of Muntumpofu's speech by the Bishop of Natal.*)

|| Hozana himself, a month or two after his injury, said to the Bishop of Natal, "My head is still very painful, especially when the sun is hot. It throbs, and my eyes turn black [dizzy], and there is a singing in my ears, and I find that a man must tell me a thing three or four times over before I can thoroughly under-

‘Strike them ; give them the stick hard.’ Thereupon the policemen drove us to the gate, and we crowded to get out ; we then scattered in all directions. Mr. John was in amongst us striking in all directions. His men shouted, ‘Hurrah, Umgunguhlovu.’ I saw Mr. John strike Hozana.”\*

The editor of the *Natal Witness* in publishing the first account of the above, i. e. the “hearsay” story, commented upon it thus :—

“We have always regarded Mr. Shepstone as a most unfit man to send into Zululand, if for no other reason than this—that the Zulus entertain towards him neither respect nor confidence.† To these disqualifications he has now, if our information is correct, added another, which is far more damnatory. Such an act as he has now been guilty of cannot be passed over if any kind of

---

stand it.” On the same occasion Muntumpofu said, “Magegeba’s hand they broke, it hangs at the wrist . . . but I did not see that [done]. What I saw with my own eyes was the knobkerry coming down on Hozana’s head—a light-coloured one, not very large, with the round head partly sliced off.” The defence on Mr. Shepstone’s part was that he neither struck nor ordered to be struck any blow, but that a fight arose between two parties in his presence. The blows would appear to have been all on one side, as while many names of injured “Sutus” (who had no weapons, not even sticks) have been given in, none have appeared on the other side. Sir Henry Bulwer in one of his palpably prejudiced despatches on the subject says, “Some of whom [i. e. the anti-Sutu party] Mr. Shepstone informs me were badly hurt,” but there is no mention of even this vague and general statement in Mr. Shepstone’s (published) report, and no single instance has ever been brought forward.

\* Several others gave the like account, and mentioned severe injuries.

† The editor may here have alluded to Mr. Shepstone’s conduct in the Matshana affair, well known in Zululand, to which country Matshana escaped.

friendly relations are to be maintained between this Colony and Zululand,"

and more to the same effect.

A little later, the same story having reached Mr. Statham from an eye-witness, \* it appeared again in the *Witness* in its fuller, and slightly corrected form. Before the publication of this second statement, all available means were taken to verify it. One of the employés of the paper was sent out to Bishopstowe, where, by that time (May 15th, 1883), were some of the beaten men themselves, and, careful inquiries having been made by the Bishop† as to the trustworthiness of the speakers, and the origin of their testimony, he took down their words with the assistance of Miss Colenso‡ and two native interpreters.

\* *Times of Natal*, Report of Action, Sept. 17th, 1883.

† The death of the Bishop having meanwhile occurred, his daughter appeared as a witness on behalf of the defendants. Having occasion afterwards to supply a slight omission in her evidence which she thought might cause misunderstanding of her father's action, she published a few lines in the *Natal Witness*, and on Sept. 22nd, sent a copy to Sir H. Bulwer requesting him to annex one of them to such report of the trial as the Governor might send to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and on the 6th of December she received a reply from Sir H. Bulwer's private secretary to the effect that "His Excellency desires me now to say that he has received a despatch from the Secretary of State, in which His Lordship requests that you may be informed that he has received and read your letter." The despatch here alluded to does not, however, appear in the Blue Book, nor does Sir H. Bulwer's report, to which it was presumably the reply, and we have, therefore, no means of knowing how the matter was regarded in Downing Street.

‡ Miss Colenso, in her evidence, said that "she was pretty well acquainted with the native language; but in matters of impor-

A similar statement was sent home to the *Daily News*, as well as published in the *Natal Witness*, and the following official telegrams [3616, p. 111] were exchanged upon the subject.

First, from the Earl of Derby to Sir Henry Bulwer:—

“Daily News telegrams, Shepstone, 19th and 22nd March. Can you contradict statements?”

and second, from Sir Henry Bulwer to the Earl of Derby:—

“Wholly untrue, Shepstone striking or causing to be struck; on contrary, interposed to stop fight between two factions; fined altogether seven chiefs; continued disregard of summons, not for reason stated; no detention custody.” \*

This assurance must have been given in dependence upon Mr. J. Shepstone's personal denial. It is proper to add that in this official's despatch of March 7th [3616, p. 86], reporting, at the time, the incidents of the journey, and meetings with chiefs when the assault or “fight” is said to have taken

---

tance, to the truth of which she particularly wished to get, she obtained the services of a native interpreter.” But it was only Miss Colenso's extreme care in learning, and as far as possible, speaking the exact truth which induced her thus to qualify her knowledge of the Zulu language. There are, probably, very few Europeans living who can speak it as correctly, and understand it as rapidly and thoroughly. (N.B. The Miss Colenso mentioned here is sister to the writer.)

\* Sir Henry Bulwer says, “Cetshwayo, in preventing them from going, has interfered unduly with them,” although Mr. Fynn had reported that the King ordered them to go, and speaks of Cetshwayo “giving orders that Umnyamana is to send the headmen . . . at once,” as early as Feb. 8th.

place, makes no mention at all of any sort of disturbance having occurred, while in another of March 22nd [p. 125], he speaks of the six chiefs \* who had not attended on him in person, but only by their representatives, as "the only chiefs who have given any trouble." It was not until the Zulu statement appeared in the *Witness* that anything was heard of the "faction fight," or serious disturbance, commenced in Mr. Shepstone's presence, and stopped by him, which was given later as the explanation of what had happened. The *Times of Natal* correspondent, writing from Etshowe on March 8th, said [*Times of Natal*, March 8th], that

"Very arduous work has devolved upon Mr. Shepstone in order to bring *recalcitrant chiefs*† to see the error of their ways."

And again,

"Natives tell me that at the meeting near Rorke's Drift called by Mr. Shepstone, some of those present insisted upon bringing into his presence, and retaining their assegais and shields, and Mr. Shepstone was obliged to order his own men to disarm them before the talk could commence."

As a matter of fact they did not attempt to take even sticks with them into Mr. Shepstone's presence; but these and similar statements made before the publication of the matter in the form of a serious accusation against the official concerned, show plainly enough that a certain amount of *coercion* in the Reserve was generally taken as a matter of course.

\* These chiefs, Qetuka, Nobiya, Godide, Melelesi, Umbandamana, and Undwandwe were amongst the most important in the Reserve.

† Author's italics.

It can certainly not have been intended by the Home Government, in the first instance, that any pressure, even to the extent admitted by Mr. Shepstone himself,\* should be brought to bear upon the Zulus to make them disown Cetshwayo. The "Reserve" was to be for those who *could not, and would not*, come again under his sovereignty, those who were (supposed to be) horror-struck at the very idea of his return, and eager to flee into a country under British protection for safety. Had the matter been placed before them thus:—"There are, probably, a certain number of Zulus, who—after long and careful consideration of prospective personal advantages, from every point of view, and under the influence of the threats and promises of an arbitrarily disposed British official—will decide that, on the whole they may, if not permanently at least immediately, find themselves better off in our proposed 'Reserve' than under Cetshwayo, with the conditions and restrictions now imposed upon him," had this true view of the case been laid before the Home Government, there cannot be a doubt that the whole scheme of a Reserve would have been abandoned. With the additional fact that these people were called upon promptly to choose on the one hand between

\* In September of the same year, Mr. Shepstone himself replied to questions as to why he had fined the chiefs, and how many he had fined. "I fined them for persistently neglecting to obey my summons to appear before me" [i. e. to leave Cetshwayo in the first hour of his return], and "I think there were seven, I am not sure."! (From Mr. J. Shepstone's evidence. Report of Trial, *Natal Witness*, Sept. 17th, 1883.)

quietly remaining at their homes, on their old-accustomed, and comparatively fruitful lands, without practical injury or danger to themselves, and on the other, being thrust forth homeless with their families, into a partially uninhabitable and poverty-stricken district, where there was no room for them, and therefore could be no welcome, the only wonder is that any of them should have preferred so forlorn a lot with the sole consolation of that loyalty which still exists amongst these untutored races, and perhaps hardly elsewhere beneath the sun. They were allowed no breathing space. Already, while the King was still arriving, "Mr. Jan" was calling the chiefs of the "Reserve" to come to him, although it was not many days since the Government intention of dividing the country had been announced to them at all. Mr. Shepstone appears to have been unreasonably irate at their delay in obeying his inconsiderate summons, and neither he nor his superiors seem to have thought of giving the Zulus time to see their restored King's face, to hear from his own lips his views for the future of the country, and to make up their minds on the serious question which awaited them. As early as February 8th, only ten days after the King's re-installation, we learn from a letter written by Mr. Fynn, in reply to one of the 6th (unpublished) from Mr. J. Shepstone, that messengers from the latter were harassing the people of the Reserve, and that Mr. Shepstone was peremptorily ordering them to leave the King [3616, p. 64], and threatening punishments if they did not

obey. Another remarkable little circumstance is that in this same despatch from Mr. Fynn to Mr. Shepstone, occurs the following phrase, "*I did not* \* tell him [Cetshwayo] what you say you will do to them or their people, or his messengers, if they do not comply." This was in evident allusion to some vigorous threat, for Mr. Fynn continues "*I did* \* tell him you would report [i. e. to Sir H. Bulwer] if the men did not appear before you." Yet, apparently, no explanation of the expression was ever asked or rendered, and no mention of these threats was made even when the question of Mr. Shepstone's conduct in the Reserve was before the public, a few months later. Mr. Fynn by Cetshwayo's directions formally reported the account that had reached Ulundi of the matter, and the documents were brought down to Maritzburg by Shingana and his party, the Acting Secretary for Native Affairs, Mr. Symons, reporting that he had sent the letter up to Government House the day the Zulus brought it, i. e. the 22nd of March.

Mr. Fynn wrote that a messenger sent by a chief of the Reserve

"reports that Mr. J. W. Shepstone fined Matshana Sitshakuza five large cattle, and seized by force cattle, ten from Sigananda, ten from Ndwandwe, and seven from Fokoti for not appearing when ordered, and that Mr. Shepstone sprang at the people, and set his police to beat the people, who fled, *but no one actually received any blow.*" \*

This last phrase, Mr. Fynn asserted, showed un-

\* Author's italics.



truthfulness on the part of the witness, who, he said,

“had first alleged people were injured, had been struck by Mr. Shepstone, that his Impi was eating up cattle; *but when I questioned h'm,* \* he admitted that he was not present and *no one* was hurt, and fines were inflicted and messengers sent to fetch the cattle.”

Mr. Fynn said to the chiefs that

“the term ‘Impi’ . . . was untrue, and if messengers or police were sent to confiscate or recover fines, that was not an Impi, and this messenger deserved punishment for exaggerating.”

But the man does not appear ever to have said that he *was* present, and a modification of strong expressions would be but natural from a hearsay reporter when he found himself strictly questioned. The distinction between an “impi” eating up cattle, and an armed party of police sent to confiscate them, is hardly sufficiently apparent to justify a reflection upon the speaker’s honesty. On the following day, February 26th, however, further information had been received, and several eye-witnesses gave the following account, which Mr. Fynn took down in Cetshwayo’s presence, translated, and sent to the Governor :—

“. . . . five days ago inclusive (22nd), at Martin Oftebro’s, Equdeni, before Mr. J. W. Shepstone, were assembled a large number of residents of the Reserve. . . . The assembled people were removed, fresh men arriving seated themselves where the others had been previously removed from, and Mr. Shepstone sprang up, seized a stick near him, and struck Magegeba across the arm, calling upon his police and people to beat these people.”

\* Author’s italics.

Then followed a detailed account of the injuries received, and the fines imposed upon members of the party, for non-appearance, and the detention of the representatives of those who were absent,\* the same account as that published [3616, p. 116] by the *Witness* a little later.

An additional statement was also made that, after the men escaping from the blows had been called back, two of them remonstrated with Mr. Shepstone, saying :—

“ ‘ Did not your brother say we were to build [might build] huts for him (Cetshwayo), when at Emtanjaneni, and now we are being injured.’ . . . Mr. Shepstone said, ‘ You are doing this to yourselves, and so have become injured [it is your own fault; you have brought it on your own heads]. You are cheated by that insignificant mad one, Cetshwayo, then has he a country? (*sic*). When (or seeing) the country belongs to us! Whom did you overpower (conquer) and give the country to? Cetshwayo was

---

\* It has been repeatedly denied [3616, p. 111] by, and for Mr. J. Shepstone, that any Zulus were imprisoned, or arrested, or detained “in custody” by him, in the Reserve. Of course there were no prisons there, nor was Mr. Shepstone accused of travelling about with a waggon-load of fetters, but he [3705, p. 27 and c.] said himself, “I told these people they were not to go away; they were to sleep at the kraal near at hand, and I did not want them to leave for some days,” and this was a command, not a mere request. Mr. Martin Oftebro also, giving evidence on Mr. J. Shepstone’s behalf, says [Report of Action, *Natal Witness*, Sept. 15 and 17, 1883], “That he knew they [the beaten men] were told they would be held responsible for what they had said. Mr. Shepstone said he would *bopa* them for what they had said.” Now *bopa* is the Zulu word universally employed for every form of imprisonment, arrest, official detention, &c., meaning, literally, tied or bound, whether by the word of a chief, who could punish for disobedience, or by actual bars and bonds.

told, and he admitted the boundaries of the Umhlatuzi, is he [then] still King? Is he not then a chief [only] like myself?" and again,

"I will not crouch for Cetshwayo, it is he to crouch to (or for) me, I am greater than he to [in the eyes of] the Queen."

Cetshwayo, also, himself sent a written report through Mr. Fynn, which the latter translates in these words:—

"I report (or appeal) to the Government of Natal that Mr. J. W. Shepstone who is just insulting me, saying I am an insignificant mad one [*sic*]. I have not yet done wrong from the time I arrived. I am silent and seated. Those laws that were given to me I have not yet skipped; I continue to respect those laws; as I therefore respect [i. e. it is because I respect] those laws [that] these troubles, which are very great, [have come] upon me, by reason of there being no land sufficient for the people, I am this day entered with [by] terror, viz. that of my affliction [persecution], when I see my people that they are injured, bleeding blood, [when I see this state of things] superseding the [action of the] English [in] returning me with a kind heart, it is to-day I no longer perceive if it be plain that this my return is done with a kind heart? \* When I see that I am being deprived of my people, it is said that they are not to come to me, I do not perceive, and also my being deprived of food, the cattle of mine, by the people Uzibebu, Dunn, Hamu, and the chiefs about me (referring more to the appointed chiefs), the word of the Government not coming to them to say they are to give me my cattle. How shall I do? Starvation is finishing me. How, have you returned me that I should have this great trouble? The country is becoming spoilt by what is being done across the Umhlatuzi (river) and Pongolo by the Boers and at Zibebu's.

"I ask (plead) for kindness from the Government that they for me (put right) rectify this matter of the land, let it be that the

---

\* A knowledge of the Zulu language enables one to infuse a certain amount of sense into Mr. Fynn's confused phrases, by the addition of the portions between square brackets, the others being Mr. Fynn's own. But the note of interrogation after "kind heart" is quite beyond the present writer's interpretation.

land be rectified, that it be as at first. I look to the Queen that she rectify it for me, that the Queen's Minister of State help me. (The Queen) who overpowered the Zulus for ever, who (have not) will not repeat the spilling of blood of a person that is white or (with a) black person. Let the country return to the extent of boundaries of at first the Tugela, it (the country) be aided that the people rest nicely and be happy nicely.

"The house of Zulu let it not be rejected. It has become the Queen's for ever, and I also (the Queen's for ever). I have great faith (hope) that the Government will aid me kindly to this land, and the matter in regard thereto."

In Mr. Fynn's covering despatch [3616, p. 114], he says that he encloses Cetshwayo's appeal to His Excellency "in his Zulu words," as well as his (Mr. Fynn's) translation of the same, and it is to be regretted that, on receiving so palpably incorrect an English version, with a copy of the King's actual words in Zulu, Sir Henry Bulwer did not set some competent interpreter to make a better translation of the latter.\*

\* A translation by the Bishop of Natal of part of one of Cetshwayo's letters to him will show at once how much they suffered from *official* interpretation. On March 16th the King wrote, by the hand of an educated native who had accompanied him from the Cape, after speaking of the "beating" of his people at the meeting with Mr. Shepstone—

"But I ask now, 'Such a law as this, is it an English law? Did it come from over the sea? Has ever a thing been done among yourselves such as this which is done to me?' I say, I ask you of your grace to answer me whether it can be so done that a person should be stripped of his land and his cattle, and his people, while his cattle are left in the possession of people who are under him? . . . . . Ask for me, I pray, the country in which I am to live—where is it? For my people are wandering about (homeless) with me. They are homeless, and why? Because, whereas it was said that they do not wish for me, they are now without a place to live in through wishing for me. What now, is the meaning of this? Speak for me! Come to

It is palpable from all his despatches that Mr. Fynn was totally incapable of writing his own tongue correctly, still less of expressing Cetshwayo's sentiments in suitable language, nevertheless these oddly translated phrases give a distinct account of the charges brought against Mr. J. Shepstone, and it is a singular fact that with so much evidence before him, Sir Henry Bulwer should have made no further inquiry than that of sending [3705, p. 27] "these papers to Mr. Shepstone for his information and

---

my help quickly! The country is being ruined! . . . . In what, then, have I offended so much? since both I and the Zulu people gave thanks for the Queen's exercise of power, and for your kindness, you who have befriended me."

And again, later on, when troubles were thickening about him, he wrote to the Bishop, more urgently still:—

"ULUNDI, ZULULAND, *May 4, 1883.*

"My Father,—I am writing to you, and to you, Nkosazana, [Miss Colenso], saying, O my friends! help me with my letters, make haste to send them over the sea. Say that I ask them to make peace for me, as I am being killed. I ask, What wrong, then, have I done before them (the English Government) that I should be so killed as I am now by so much of my country being taken away, in order that I might be killed? My country has been taken away and given to my dogs, in order that they might kill me. I was trusting, thinking that I was restored by the Queen, together with Mr. Gladstone and Lord Kimberley, and the Parliament, and all the headmen. They all said, 'We release you, we say Return to your country!' . . . But if I am only to be killed it amazes me.

"I ask you to pray for help for me from Lord Derby, who has entered on the office of Lord Kimberley, that he would help me so that my country may be restored to me, and my people, and this stabbing one another among the people may cease. . . . For my part I do not believe that he (Lord Derby) knows how I am being killed, and that is why I ask that he may be told, that he may know of it, he, and the whole Council [Parliament]."

report," and that, although aware of the importance attached by the Zulu King and people to the allegations that had been made against the Resident Commissioner, the Governor immediately and unreservedly accepted his denials.

Mr. Fynn's written reports having been brought down to Maritzburg by Shingana and his companions (see p. 178), Sir Henry Bulwer received the four principal men, viz. the Prince, and the chiefs Sihayo, Sicolo and Majumba, on April 4th, and they related to the Bishop of Natal the substance of what passed at the interview, as follows :—

"The Governor, through the interpreter, asked 'How was it that they had come down so many, when Mr. Fynn's paper, which they had brought, mentioned thirteen only?' They replied that those named by Mr. Fynn were the headmen sent, and the others were their baggage-carriers (*udibi*), making thirty-five in all. The Governor said that 'They must not come down again in this way. It is not convenient that a party should come down. Different members of the party go here and there\* and talk, and we hear versions different from those that have been given to us. In old days, he (the Governor) was aware, verbal messages used to be sent; but they must be sent no longer, now that the Resident was there, who was the eye, and the hand, and the mouth of the Governor. The King should speak to Mr. Fynn, who would write down his words, and send them in a sealed envelope to the Governor. The letter should be brought by one man, or perhaps by two men, messengers only, who should not even know its contents. And the Governor would reply by a letter in the same way. Let there be an end of sending down parties with verbal messages to the Governor! †

\* i. e. to Bishopstowe!

† This, and almost every other sentence (i. e. except those referring to the accusations definitely denied by the person accused), of the Zulu report, is corroborated by official despatches in Blu Book [3616, p. 100], and elsewhere.

“ ‘As for the present message, the Governor had heard it all. Mr. Symonds had reported carefully all their words. There was no answer for them to take back, as it had already been sent to the Resident, from whom they would hear it. They were to greet Cetshwayo kindly from him (the Governor).’

“ Sicoto spoke in reply, saying that ‘They (the Zulus) did not understand reading and writing. They would always require to come down together with any such letter, to bear witness with it, and to bring back witness to the reply. They did not see how this new plan would answer at all.’

“ The Governor asked the speaker’s name.

“ Majumba said, ‘The Zulus do not understand this division of the country, that one piece should be called the Governor’s, and another Cetshwayo’s, and a third Zibebu’s. They thought that the whole country belonged to the English, together with Cetshwayo, who is now, the Zulus say, the son of the Queen, not of Mpande only.’

“ This speaker’s name too the Governor asked.

“ Shingana said, ‘There are men with us now, Sir, of those who have been praying for Cetshwayo all along, before his return as well as now, men from south of the Umhlatuze, those who have been beaten. They have not yet been allowed to speak their message, because Mr. Symonds got up and left them in the act to speak.’

“ The Governor said, ‘These men do not belong to your party, they are separate’ [= ‘they live in the Reserve’].

“ Shingana replied, ‘Indeed, Sir, they are of our party, and the letter was written specially on account of them. I was there when Mr. Fynn was writing down their story, and all the witnesses to it were named, and those injured, and the nature of their hurts. They are just the head and front of the affair.’

“ The Governor said that ‘Mr. Fynn had not reported one word of all that—that it was not his office to do so, as he was appointed to attend to the land given to Cetshwayo only, and Mr. Osborn was appointed to attend to the Reserve.’\*

---

\* The Prince and his party had themselves brought Mr. Fynn’s report [3616, pp. 115 and 116], so that the Governor’s words must here have been very incorrectly interpreted to the Zulus, as it can hardly be supposed that what was intended was that as (in

“The Prince said ‘Cetshwayo would be much taken aback to hear that Mr. Fynn had reported nothing of this matter, since the men had been beaten, on being sent to Mr. J. Shepstone by the King in obedience to a message from himself (Mr. Fynn), and this was what the King had asked him to report, and what, it had been fully understood, he had reported.’ (Shingana here said to the Bishop that they had not mentioned to the Governor what was, however, a fact, namely, that Cetshwayo had proposed to Mr. Fynn to send first to Mr. Jan himself to ask an explanation, before reporting him to the Governor, but that Mr. Fynn, being very angry, had said, ‘Did Mr. Jan tell me that he was going to do this? Am I to send men to him to be beaten? I shall not communicate with him, but shall report it directly to the Governor, and let him tell me if I am wrong in doing so.’\* ”

---

H.E.’s opinion) Mr. Fynn had *no business to write*, therefore his letter could not be spoken of as received. As there is no official report of this conversation, we have only what the interpreter said in Zulu, and not what Sir Henry Bulwer said in English, to go upon. The Zulu account is, however, incidentally confirmed on various points by official documents.

\* And this is precisely what the Governor did. On the 24th March he wrote a despatch [3616, p. 100] to Mr. Fynn, every line of which evinces intense disapproval of the Resident’s action. “. . . . I may remark, for your future guidance,” writes Sir Henry Bulwer, “that it would have been well had you consulted me before you allowed a deputation from Cetshwayo to come into Natal.” Such a tone of hostility towards the Zulu King as this, actually going so far as to impose restrictions on his free communication with the British Government, was altogether out of keeping with the kindly intentions of the Home Authorities. This letter to Mr. Fynn, alone, would have justified Cetshwayo’s observation to the Bishop, when asking the latter to speak for him, “to the great men of the Council over the sea (because, you know that I am not much in favour in Natal).” This is, however, in reply to the first message [see p. 432] sent by Umnyamana and Cetshwayo’s councillors (or as Sir H. Bulwer remarks “*as they themselves say*, from Cetshwayo and his councillors,” which, however, comes to precisely the same thing), and it makes no mention



“The Governor replied that all these matters should be reported to Mr. Osborn.\* ‘Let Cetshwayo not interfere in any way with anything across the Umhlatuze, and attend only to the country given to him. Cetshwayo must not be hankering after this thing and that, which used to be his. †

“‘He had been conquered and his Kingship taken away. He came back now by the grace of the Authorities, and to the land of the Authorities, to the portion which they had appointed him to rule, and there was an end of it. Cetshwayo should bear in mind the words spoken by the great men over the sea, and take care that none of them were broken.’

“The Governor then took leave and left the room. They were asked also if, when they got home, they should report that they had been received and fed by the Government. They replied that they should. ‡

“Early next morning a messenger came to say that Mr. Jan had sent him to call the Prince back, as there remained a word to be spoken; but he was not to bring the others. So Shingana

---

of Shingana’s message, or of Mr. Fynn’s report [3616, p. 117] received two days before about the beating. These are answered in a later despatch of March 29th, written in the same tone, and commenting on the report thus: “I have received no information to show me that such occurrences took place as they are described” [*ibid.*, p. 118], and the Governor volunteers the opinion, “I am quite certain that Mr. Shepstone did not use the expressions regarding Cetshwayo which he was reported to have used.”

\* Mr. Osborn was not there, in fact they found him still in Maritzburg (though he had started to replace Mr. Shepstone in the Reserve before these words of the Governor were spoken); so they had gone to Mr. Fynn, as they could hardly have reported Mr. Shepstone to himself.

† e. g. cattle which Lord Kimberley had said [3466, p. 129] ought to be collected for him, or a substitute provided for his maintenance according to his station.

‡ They had received about 3s. worth of meat daily, shinbone or similar pieces, i. e. not quite 3d. a day for each of the thirteen headmen, or 1d. a day for each of the whole party of thirty-five, and nothing else, e. g. no mealie-meal for their men.

took only Sicoto to be his witness, and the two eye-witnesses who would describe the beating, in case there might arise a chance for them to speak. For he asked the messenger, 'Is it not about the beating that we are called back?'—who replied that it might well be so, and that he had spoken about that affair with a young man of Mr. Jan's, who had just come down with him from Zululand, and that this young man had affirmed that Mr. Jan had not beaten the Zulus, he had merely 'startled them with a switch.' The messenger told Shingana to make all haste to come in. They did so, but were kept waiting till sun-down,—in the morning at the S.N.A. Office, in the afternoon outside Government House—the interpreter who brought them up having gone in, and Mr. Jan also entering in the course of the afternoon. They found these two with the Governor when, at last, Shingana and Sicoto were taken in.\*

"They were told 'The Governor has sent for you to say "Go

---

\* From Mr. Shepstone's own account it seems that, although present at this meeting, and well aware of the charges brought against him, he took so little interest in what passed that, six months later, he could not, under cross-examination, answer a single question on the subject with any degree of certainty. He said he believed His Excellency's reply was verbal; he did not know its nature, and did not think he could repeat a single sentence; he was in the same room, but did not interpret, and had nothing whatever to do with it. On being asked "Was any reference made at this interview at which you were present to the message which Cetshwayo sent down" [i. e. the accusation against the person questioned], Mr. Shepstone replied, "There may or may not. I do not remember. I told you I did not remember what was said. I had had quite enough to do with Zulu affairs without wanting to know what they had said."

Q. "Do I understand that you know nothing of what transpired at this meeting at which you were present?"

A. "I did not trouble my head about it. It may have been about me, but I do not remember. I did not pay any attention. I distinctly say, my Lord, I don't remember anything that did take place. I simply sat by." (Report of Action, *Natal Witness*, Sept. 17th, 1883.)

pleasantly," and that you should greet the King much from him. And tell him to bear in mind the words spoken by the great men over the sea and take care that none of them are broken. Let him not be deceived by other people, telling him falsely. The words (conditions) which were spoken over the sea, and which he knows, are the truth, and they are final, and will never be altered. If the King keeps firmly to all those words of the great men and of the Governor [i. e. the conditions told him in England and those told him at the Cape], the Governor too will support him. He is not speaking in anger but in kindness.' In fact, there were no new words at all, only the same that had been spoken the day before, reiterated and enforced.

"Shingana replied, 'It is just in pursuance of those conditions that we have come down. And we are sent by the Heads of the Zulu people [not by Cetshwayo alone]. For the King was told in England that only a little bit of land, where Dunn was, would be cut off, and at the Restoration it was said that this [cutting off] would be done on account of those who did not wish to be under Cetshwayo. And the Zulus then claimed that those who did not wish for Cetshwayo should be produced; but not a single one appeared or was named.\* So the Zulus protested against this law, and prayed Sir T. Shepstone to forward all their words of protest. And he promised to do so, and said that, if the great men at home agreed to their prayer, he too should be glad, and, if they did not, he would forward the answer. For all the principal chiefs from south of the Umhlatuze protested before Sir T. Shepstone that day, saying, "Is it not we who have been praying for him?" Mavumengwana said that "He himself and others who had held down their heads [submitted to Dunn] had only behaved like women who marry again, because they believe that their own husband is dead. But, should their husband rise from the dead, will they not return at once to him, having been mistaken? The King, Sirs (*Makosi*)," said Mavumengwana, "is our husband, and, since you have brought him back to us, we shall cleave to him."

"'I meant,' said Shingana, 'to have gone on, and given the speeches of the other men south of the Umhlatuze, e. g. of Mayepu, when he said that "he would rather cut his throat than

---

\* See remarks about Siunguza and Umgitshwa, pp. 388-91.

leave his daughters in the hands of dogs," and then to have spoken about the beating. But [one] now spoke to the Governor, and I had to break off. The Governor repeated that "Matters south of the Umhlatuze must be reported to Mr. Osborn, who alone was responsible there." And the Governor left the room.

"So we came away grievously disappointed. For we are as good as rejected, being sent back without a message, and without being allowed to report the men who were beaten, or even to hear our own words as Mr. Symonds had reported them, so as to be sure that the Governor had heard our message aright. We complain greatly of this arrangement. We see that a wall is to be built up round us, through which our cries cannot be heard.'

"The Bishop pointed out to them that those in the Reserve were allowed to report their troubles, including the beating, through Mr. Osborn. But they replied, 'We cannot do that; for it would immediately be taken to signify that we had recognized Mr. Osborn, and given up Cetshwayo.'

And, indeed, since they might not come down to state their grievances themselves, and Mr. Fynn was forbidden to report them on paper, a "wall" through which their cries could not be heard was truly built around them, as they said, and, a little later, when they had lost their best friend in the Bishop of Natal, after which official measures were taken to prevent their communicating with the family at Bishopstowe, they had no help left but in their own right arms. The persistence yet moderation with which they have used their strength as against Europeans generally, and British subjects in particular, forms a striking page in the history of a savage race. It shows plainly enough the influence which that remarkable man, whom we British have prevented from bringing about the salvation and

civilisation of his nation—Cetshwayo, had obtained over his people, who might under his reign have advanced far upon the road to civilisation and prosperity, had England assisted his naturally wise and humane inclination in the management of the Zulus with her strength and knowledge, instead of allowing the Natal Government to trample him under foot.

All these Zulu accounts, undoubtedly given in good faith, certainly represent a very different state of things from any anticipated or intended by the Home Government. Blue Book [3616] is, to a great extent, a record of the manner in which an appearance of considerable opposition to Cetshwayo was produced. Time and space fail us to unravel all the equivocations and misrepresentations by which this effect was achieved, but it might easily be done, could the reading public reasonably be expected to wade through the result. A few instances must therefore suffice, and any one who cares to study the subject thoroughly for themselves may easily learn that the cases given are but a fair sample of the whole. It may safely be inferred that, had the Home Government known—while the fate of Zululand still lay in England's hands—what Mr. J. Shepstone's despatches between January and March 1883 would unfold of the difficulty he found in procuring decisions against Cetshwayo, and the dilatory and uncertain nature of such decisions when made, they never would have consented to Sir Henry Bulwer's plan for a "Reserve" at all.

Mr. W. Y. Campbell, acting as special correspondent to the *Natal Advertiser* in September 1883, writes as follows:—

“ Whatever the professions of enmity to and fear of the King made by the Zulus in the Reserve prior to his return, the subsequent current of events has completely falsified those professions. The Reserve natives, though ordered not to go to the King, wilfully and persistently disregarded these orders on all hands, and the majority of the kraals in the Reserve sent a messenger with congratulatory messages of welcome to the King after his return. These men had to evade the police, and cross the Umhlatuze secretly. They went knowing that they would be fined for contempt of orders. But go they did. They risked all solely to see the King. At one time, shortly after his return, the King had something like 1500 men of the Reserve paying court to him at Ondini [Ulundi]. There was a constant stream passing backwards and forwards. A deal of night work had to be done to evade Malemate’s [Mr. Osborn’s] police, and the spies of the few chiefs inimical to the King. So the young men used to leave their kraals by night, and cross the boundary in the dark. The old men, the headmen, were wishful to go. But they being more conspicuous than their sons, could not be absent from their kraals without their absence being spotted and reported; and then followed the heavy fine or eating up. A few reckless old fellows chose to be eaten up rather than not have a look at the resurrected King. They had their look and were eaten up.\*” — ‘With Cetshwayo in the Inkandhla,’ p. 46.

This account is given by an Englishman who travelled through the country in September 1883 with two objects, as he states himself, “ 1st, to find out the truth about the King; 2nd, to find out the feeling of the Reserve.”

Mr. Campbell gives the “ Reserve ” Zulus’ own

\* Amongst these “ reckless old fellows ” were Qetuka, Godide, Nobiya, &c., some of the most powerful chiefs in the Reserve.

account of how they were treated, from which the following passage may be extracted:—

“We heard he [Cetshwayo] was come, and we wanted to go and see him. We were told, however, ‘No, lie down, stay where you are, do not upset the country by running about.’ We wondered at this command.\* Some of us listened to it, and stayed. We lay down, holding our mouths. Others would not listen to it. They said, ‘No, the King is returned to us; why should we be kept from him? We will go to see him. There can be no wrong in this.’ And they went. They got through the police, and saw their King. On their return, however, they were fined. And so the thing began, and so the thing continued. To-day [the end of September] any Zulu in the Reserve who thinks of Cetshwayo with favour does so at his peril. He is watched by Government police that come from Natal.† He is watched by Dunn and his friends, and his spies that are everywhere.”

\* The command, it will be remembered, reached them from Cetshwayo himself, as well as from Mr. Shepstone.

† On Feb. 13th, Mr. J. Shepstone reports [3616, p. 37] to Sir Henry Bulwer that “several chiefs and headmen living on and near the River Umhlatuze, which is the boundary of the Reserve, have begged me to place Government men at the different drifts and crossings of the border river; they say that it will afford them greater security against their own people on the opposite side, and will also for the present, while the existing feeling of distrust lasts, relieve them from turning informers against those who until lately were one with them, and who might resent any such action on their part, while if done by strangers no trouble would ensue.

“I consider that it is not only advisable to do this, but that it is indispensable. Some check should be placed upon the indiscriminate crossing and recrossing; it will prevent trouble and unpleasantness, and even should the pass system not be established, the Border guard should be the parties to whom each party crossing must report him or herself and their mission.” Sir H. Bulwer replied that he saw “No objection to this arrangement, provided it does not involve any expense, and that it will not interfere with the legitimate intercourse for peaceful purposes between the two Territories” [3616, p. 38], amongst which purposes visits to Cetshwayo were plainly not included.

This was the account, says Mr. Campbell, not

“of one man, nor of twenty men, nor of a hundred, but of fully three-fourths of those natives, in the Reserve, for whose protection and preservation the Reserve was annexed.”

Those who had been frightened into denying their King, explained their conduct thus:—

“We could see our King was not liked by the Government [which had conquered them a few years before]. The face of the Government never turned to him pleasantly. The Government heart never seemed to care for him. And not only this. We noticed that Zibebu was allowed to do all manner of things unrebuked. We knew that Dunn was pulling against the King, and with great weight. We saw also that Zibebu was undoubtedly the Government favourite. . . . On top of all this we were told not to move; to lie quite still. We lay quite still. We kept our faces on the ground, and if we glanced upwards we saw a [Natal] native policeman or spy with an uplifted assegai over us. If we looked up on the other side we saw the muzzle of a policeman’s gun. What could we do in a case like that? Why, lie still of course.”

“And so, turn where one will,” writes Mr. Campbell, after recording special instances of oppression, “the repressing influence is everywhere apparent. The natives are thus compulsorily made good subjects in accordance with Blue Book wishes. They are not allowed to have any opinion of their own. To any one who sees below the surface, the evidence there is plain. The natives are coerced into an attitude foreign to their wish and their instincts.”

How Blue Book appearances were kept up the writer describes, from his own personal investigations, thus:—

“He [Dunn] is the centre of the anti-King opposition,—the valued adviser of all who are against the King. . . He hears rumours in the Reserve. He sends them to Misjan [Mr. J. Shepstone], who in passing them on to Sir Henry Bulwer, forgets



to see if they have any foundation in fact. In turn they are passed on as enclosures, in long covering despatches, to Lord Derby, and as reprimands to the King."

"Misjan's" reign in the Reserve came to an end about the end of March, when Mr. Osborn was deputed to take his place, and the former returned to Pietermaritzburg and took up again his long held office of *acting* Secretary for Native Affairs. Meanwhile the accusations brought against him of ill-treating the Zulu chiefs were too serious, and the inquiries from home too urgent, to admit of the matter being allowed to drop. An action for libel was brought in Mr. Shepstone's name, nominally against the proprietors of the *Witness*, but practically against Mr. Statham, in respect of these accusations, and the *personal* nature of the attack is clearly shown by the fact that an offer was privately made by the plaintiff to the defendants to *withdraw the action if Mr. Statham were summarily dismissed* ['The Zulu Iniquity,' p. 30].

The offer was not accepted, but the fact of its having been made is a remarkable one. Mr. Statham was far too acute an observer, and too dangerous an opponent to be disregarded, now that he had seen through the tactics, and denounced the action of the officials [*ibid.*].

"Two things were essential for the safety of the 'official clique,'" writes Mr. Statham himself, "first that I should be discredited, and next, that the *Daily News* should be provided with a correspondent who would act in the official interest, and keep the public in England in the dark as to the real bearing of what was passing in Zululand. The only way in which this could be done was by a personal attack on me."

Towards the fulfilment of these objects Sir Henry Bulwer's despatch [3616, p. 88] impugning Mr. Statham's veracity, would naturally go a long way, and the latter was deprived of his position as correspondent to the *Daily News*, that paper being, he says ['Zulu Iniquity,' pp. 14 and 15] "supplied with a substitute of the 'official clique's' own choosing."

In addition to this, a cowardly attempt was made to injure Mr. Statham's personal character and prospects, and, so, possibly, drive him from the country, or at least from his influential position as editor of the *Witness*. In his youth he had been the victim of painful circumstances which had brought disastrous consequences in their train.\* But, having retained the sympathy and respect of many worthy people, he had subsequently succeeded in shaking off the shadow of his early troubles, and making a career for himself. But *seventeen years later*, in 1882, an accident brought a breath of the old story to Natal.

"It seemed desirable," writes Mr. Statham, "to take legal advice on the situation, and thus, under the seal of professional confidence, the facts relating to my earlier life passed into the possession of one member of the 'official clique.'"<sup>†</sup> [*Ibid.*, p. 26.]

---

\* Mr. E. W. Bird, described as "the leading partner in the oldest legal firm" in Liverpool, wrote that he regarded Mr. Statham "as the victim of circumstances over which he had no possible control." ['Zulu Iniquity,' p. 22.]

† Mr. Statham explains his own use of the term "official clique" thus—"The head of the 'official clique' in Natal is Sir Theophilus Shepstone, and the clique consists, besides a few

Some time after, the political collision between Natal officialism and Mr. Statham having meanwhile taken place, he heard from a friend in London that

“The matter of which you speak in the letter received to-day has become common to everybody. When Merriman was here it seems to have been his policy to tell the story. . . . But nothing was heard of it till Merriman came.”—*Ibid.*, p. 15.

This was written in July 1883, and Mr. Statham traces the connection between this and his political and official opponents in Natal by the words [*ibid.*, p. 15], “When Sir Theophilus Shepstone went to England [in May 1883], he was accompanied from Cape Town by Mr. J. X. Merriman, a prominent member of the Cape Ministry,” who had “been for some years the Cape Town correspondent of the *Daily News*,” and “had been in intimate communication with Sir Theo. Shepstone during the voyage to England” [*ibid.*, p. 27].

Mr. Statham’s dismissal from his post of correspondent to the *Daily News* followed [*ibid.*, p. 14] without any reason whatever being assigned.

Immediately upon this secret undermining of his reputation came the action for libel, on the part of Mr. J. Shepstone, which was tried in Maritzburg in September 1883. The nominal defendants in the case were altogether out of sympathy with the Zulus,

---

outlying officials, mainly of members and connections of his family. By keeping close control over all native matters, this clique practically governs Natal, insomuch that no Governor has ever succeeded in getting behind its power.”—‘Zulu Iniquity,’ p. 9.

and with Mr. Statham's action. The political views of the colonial public, also, were wholly opposed to any point being made of Zulu loyalty to Cetshwayo, or of undue coercion on the part of Natal Government officials in the Reserve, in fact to any hypothesis likely to interfere with Sir Henry Bulwer's admirable scheme for neutralising the good effects of England's action. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising to find that the case was never defended upon its merits at all. The defendants took their stand on "privilege," and the matter tried was not whether Mr. J. Shepstone did, or did not act as the Zulus said that he did, but whether the *Witness* had a right or not to publish the story. This latter point was decided in favour of Mr. Shepstone, with damages 500*l.*, but it is not easy to see how the decision of the case *as it was tried*, had any result in his favour beyond the 500*l.*

It is not, indeed, easy for the "lay" mind to understand the precise bearings of this trial. The judge and the lawyers appear to have differed considerably in the mere legal technicalities of the matter. The counsel for the plaintiff having produced a native witness (one of Mr. J. Shepstone's party)—

"Mr. Morcom submitted that, in the pleadings, the question of the truth or falsity of the alleged libel did not arise. He contended that the question of the publication of occurrences in Zululand was one of privilege, and the truth or falsity of the statements did not arise."—*Times of Natal*, Sept. 15th, 1883.

This point was argued out in Court, the counsel for the plaintiff declining to admit it, and the ques-

tion finally turning upon whether Mr. Morcom had put in his objection at the beginning, or in the middle, or at the end of the evidence of the first native witness on Mr. Shepstone's side. As it is quite plain that Mr. Morcom never intended to defend the case except upon the point of "privilege," the judge's remark that it was "a pity if counsel, in some technical point, put himself in a false position either with the Court or the jury" seems justified.

In summing up, his Lordship said that

"In this case the plaintiff claimed the sum of 5000*l.* damages in that the defendants had maliciously libelled him in the paper of which they were the publishers and proprietors. In the first place, the libel was stated to be in the report of certain messengers from Cetshwayo,\* and secondly, in certain articles on those reports. . . . If the jury were satisfied as to the publication, the jury would then have to consider the second question, that of privilege. . . . If it were admitted in the pleadings that the matters appertaining to the reports were for the public good [? if the accused person admitted the facts stated against him], it might be his duty to tell them what their finding should be; but the plaintiff denied the accuracy of the report.† He stated that the report was not an accurate one, and that the King did not send the messengers.‡ The jury would have to consider whether

\* Mr. Morcom said that "The matter complained of as libellous . . . was . . . privileged because practically a publication of the same charges against the plaintiff was to be found in the Imperial Blue Book published subsequently in England for the information of both Houses of Parliament, and accessible to the public, because offered for sale to the public."—*Times of Natal*, Sept. 18th, 1883.

† Otherwise it is hard to see how the plaintiff could justly raise a complaint.

‡ This is a curious defence, in face of the King's complaint, forwarded by Mr. Fynn, and printed in the Blue Book [3616, p. 115].

the statements were of vital importance to Natal,\* and then whether the natives did come, and also whether the interpretation was a right one,† and, whether, taking into consideration all these things, the articles were *per se* justifiable, so as to make the publication a privileged one. As to the question of privilege in England, it had been held that a full and accurate report of parliamentary proceedings is privileged, and also the reports in a Court of Justice. He was, however, not aware that it went any further than that. Coming to this country, it appeared to him that it would be a very difficult thing for the jury to say that such publication was privileged apart from the truth of the report. If the jury found that the report was true, then the publication would be true,‡ and the jury would then have to consider whether the comments on the report were justifiable, otherwise the jury would still have to find for the plaintiff, but if they found that the comments were justified, then they would have to find for the defendants.§ In the third place the jury would have to consider whether the reports from Zululand were correct. § He did not intend to go into that question, as a great deal of evidence had been given on that point. || If they

---

\* Was a jury of Natalians likely to think anything *purely Zulu* "of vital importance to Natal," and ought any such selfish considerations to have been introduced into this case?

† The Bishop of Natal had vouched for the fact that "the natives did come" (i. e. from Zululand, by Cetshwayo's orders), and the interpretation was made, under the Bishop's supervision, by Miss Colenso, with the assistance of two honest and intelligent natives.

‡ The following passages show that the words "that the report was true" meant only that the *Witness* newspaper correctly reported the statements of the Zulus, not that those statements were true.

§ Of this the jury had no possible means of judging. A number of Mr. Shepstone's witnesses had given evidence, but the counsel for defendants taking his stand on "privilege" only, declined to cross-examine them, and had not prepared his own case from that point of view at all.

|| Entirely on one side, with the sole exception of Shingana's evidence, introduced at the last moment (see p. 486).

considered that the facts were true, the plaintiff could not complain that they were published in the paper; but the jury would still have to deal with the comments. If the comments were justified by such accounts, the jury must find for the defendants,\* but if the meeting at Mr. Oftebro's house was as stated by the plaintiff and his witnesses, then the jury must find for the plaintiff.† If they found that the plaintiff's character had been damaged by the publication of the libel, they must bring in a verdict for the plaintiff."—*Times of Natal*, Sept. 18th, 1883.

A unanimous verdict ‡ was given for the plaintiff, damages 500*l.* But the counsel for the defendants had previously stated some of the difficulties of his case as follows. Having said that "it was impossible to suppose that Bishop Colenso was not fulfilling a moral duty in anything that he did," he pointed out that

"No proper enquiry could be held in this matter without Sir Henry Bulwer attending and giving evidence. But he might have refused to attend if served with a subpoena, and there was no power in the Court to compel his attendance; the same applied to

---

\* That is to say that, supposing the facts alleged against Mr. Shepstone, of assault upon certain native chiefs on account of their loyalty to their King, to be true, this jury of twelve Natalians were to consider whether *in their opinion*, such treatment of the Zulus deserved Mr. Statham's indignant comments. It is to be feared that British and Colonial opinion might differ upon this point. Shortly after the first publication of the story in the *Witness*, a Natalian was heard to declare, in a public vehicle with warm approval, that "It was just what John Shepstone would do. *He was the right man to manage the natives.*"

† This—to the lay mind—is a puzzling sentence. If "the meeting at Mr. Oftebro's house was as stated by plaintiff," the facts alleged against the latter were *not* true, but the confusing connection between this and the former part of the sentence may very possibly be due to a defective report.

‡ The unanimity of a jury in a civil case not being essential in Natal.

Mr. Osborn, and others in Zululand, a country to which the jurisdiction of the Court did not extend, and from whence, therefore, it was impossible for the defendants to obtain witnesses. Had the defendants been able to call these witnesses they would have been able to prove that the Government here not only refused to direct that passes should be granted to men coming to repeat that story,\* but refused to give an answer to the messengers themselves; whilst the defendants would have been able to show that Mr. Fynn acted up to his instructions by refusing to give passes to natives to come in with complaints on the same head."

It is not apparent, on the whole—i. e. to the lay mind—whether the case was supposed to have been decided on its merits or not, but one thing is very plain, namely that it was not *defended* on its merits. The case as between Mr. Shepstone and the *Witness* was decided in favour of the former, but the case as between him and the Zulus was practically ignored, and has never been tried unto this day.

This double attack had seriously shaken Mr. Statham's position, but by a bold stroke he checkmated the more underhand manœuvres of his enemies, and exposed some of their political tricks. By the publication of a pamphlet entitled 'The Zulu Iniquity,'† he related, in a short and plain manner, the sad story, garbled editions of which were being used against him, and also the history of his telegrams to the *Daily News* on Zulu matters,

\* " . . . I cannot give permission to these people to come in for the purpose of repeating this distorted story."—Sir H. Bulwer to Mr. Fynn, May 9th, 1883 [3705, p. 60].

† "The Zulu Iniquity, by F. Reginald Statham, the Unjustly-discredited Natal Correspondent of the *Daily News*, with an Appendix. William Ridgway, Publisher, 169, Piccadilly."



and the manner in which he had been discredited as Natal correspondent to that paper. This latter subject has already been discussed in these pages, and for a full account of the former it is enough to refer our readers to Mr. Statham's own pamphlet, the perusal of which can hardly fail to inspire any intelligent reader with respect for the writer, and sympathy with his troubles, past and present.

It must be acknowledged that there were some undeniable excuses for the backwardness of the defendants in the matter of providing that the case should be tried upon its merits. Two events which had occurred since the publication of the accusations against Mr. Shepstone had greatly added to the difficulty which at any time would have existed in procuring native evidence in a case in which a Natal Government official, a Shepstone, and the head of the office for Native Affairs, was concerned. The first of these events was the death of the Bishop of Natal, whose very presence would have given the Zulus courage to speak the truth, whatever that might be, and whose influence both with them and with their King would have helped to ensure the appearance of the requisite witnesses. The second event was the sack of Ulundi by Zibebu, of whom Mr. Campbell speaks as "rushing unprovoked on the Ondini Kraal [Ulundi] and massacring all and sundry," [*Cetshwayo in the Inkandhla*, p. 38], but who, although certainly not provoked by the Zulu King and his people, was undoubtedly incited by his white advisers to commit the crime in question.

Amongst those slaughtered on this occasion was Hozana, one of the principal witnesses in the beating affair, while the others were scattered far and wide.

A faint effort was made to procure their attendance. A Zulu messenger named Kukula had come down to bring the news that the King himself had escaped from the murderous hands of Zibebu and his white men. He reported it to the Government at the S.N.A. Office, and he also told Miss Colenso, who telegraphed it to England. She had been asked, on behalf of the defendants in the approaching libel case, if she could not use the influence of her name to bring down the Zulu witnesses whom they should require. On Kukula's return to Zululand, therefore, Miss Colenso gave him a message to the King to say that

“Mr. J. Shepstone is bringing an action against the people who published the account of the beating, and says that the words are thoroughly false. He claims 5,000*l.* damages.”

And that she had been asked on behalf of these publishers

“to request the Zulu witnesses whom they require, to come down. These witnesses are Shingana and one who was with him at Government House: Mfunzi and one who was with him when he told Sir Theo. Shepstone about the beating: and several of those who were actually assaulted, especially Hozana and Muntompofu if still alive. They should start with the New Moon to be down in good time for Sept. 14.’”

But Miss Colenso at the same time advised the defendants to procure a “pass” from the S.N.A. Office, and to send it by a messenger of their own as well,

as a precaution against the delays and difficulties otherwise sure to be officially placed in the way of any Zulus seeking to enter Natal on such an errand. Her advice in this respect was disregarded, and the sequel showed how necessary it was. Hitherto no restrictions had been placed upon Zulus visiting Natal on private business, but first at this time, i. e. since Cetshwayo's return, a new departure was made in this matter.

On receiving Miss Colenso's message, the King sent down Shingana as requested, accompanied by his brother Dabulamanzi and several others, and followed immediately by five of the beaten men. The Princes bore a message to the Government from Cetshwayo about his own affairs as well, and their party got across the Tugela, though they found new regulations in force, the drifts being all closed, i. e. guarded, and no one allowed to cross without certain formalities. The Natal chief in charge, indeed, could not allow even the Princes to pass on their way, but took them to the nearest magistrate, at Greytown, where they were treated more like prisoners than visitors of rank. Finding themselves detained, and that they would probably be too late to give evidence, they contrived to send down a messenger to let Miss Colenso know the facts. In reply to the magistrate's inquiries they had only mentioned the one half of their errand, and, whether through lack of opportunity, or uncertainty as to what they ought to do, they said nothing about the action. But the names of the five beaten men, of

whom they spoke as just behind, and belonging to their party, were quite enough to let both the magistrate, and the Governor (to whom he reported the matter while he kept the Princes waiting), know upon what business they were coming. Miss Colenso sent back a message bidding them keep back nothing, but speak out and tell the magistrate that they were sent for as witnesses in the action, and also bidding them lose no time if they were allowed to start for Maritzburg. They followed her instructions, when, upon the following day, the magistrate sent for them, and, having now received his orders from Government, bade them return home at once. Their communication, however, made no difference. From their own account it appears that, after making it, they were still told to "be off at once," and that they would be seen across the Tugela (i. e. under police surveillance). Mtokwane \* had passed on, into Zululand, the day before, to hurry up the beaten men, on hearing which, say the Zulus, the magistrate ordered his policeman to go and warn all those watching the drifts that if that fellow Mtokwane comes back, with the rest, they were to arrest (bopa) them, and bring them to him. "It was afternoon and drizzling, but we were started and hurried on, although we objected, because we were so very cold."

Meanwhile Mr. W. B. Morcom, counsel for the proprietors of the *Witness*, having seen Shingana's

\* The well-known and trusty Zulu messenger often mentioned in these volumes.

name in the *Times of Natal*, as one of a party who had been ordered back to Zululand, applied for him at the S.N.A. Office, as a witness in the impending case. By this means Shingana did actually reach Maritzburg on the last day of the trial, and by considerable exertions on the part of his friends, and in spite of various petty official obstacles, he reached the court in custody of a policeman, ten minutes before it opened. His story would have been very important, though not direct evidence (as he was not present at the beating) had the case been tried upon its merits at all.

The Zulus say that when, in consequence of Mr. Morcom's application, Shingana (and one of the others) were officially sent for, at last, the magistrate at Greytown told them

“It is your own fault [that you have been detained], because you concealed your business. We [Government officials] do not interfere with a witness in a case.”

And next morning he sent them down to Maritzburg in custody of the policeman who had brought the summons.

This was all very well, but it must be observed that, as mentioned before, the names of the beaten men made it plain what their errand must be; that on the previous day the Princes told the magistrate what it was, who, knowing it, still ordered them to return to Zululand at once; and that there was time enough after the Princes first reached Greytown, and gave the names of the rest of the

party (i.e. the beaten men, who were following them), for the Government to hear of their arrival, and to send for them to give their evidence in Maritzburg, had it really been desired that they should be allowed to do so. In fact, although it was easy enough, by strictly enforcing new-made rules, and by doing everything in a very leisurely fashion, to prevent these witnesses being in time, it would have been equally easy for the officials to bring them down had there been any wish amongst them to have the matter sifted. A touch of burlesque was added to the conduct of the officials in this matter, by a note sent from the Office of the Secretary for Native Affairs on October 1st, *a fortnight after the verdict*, to ask the defendants' legal adviser whether he required "any more witnesses in the libel case,"—the beaten men in fact, who, having been sent back to their homes in Zululand by the orders of the magistrate, and having been fetched back again by the indefatigable Mtokwane, were now waiting at Greytown for leave to come down. Mr. Morcom replied that

"The jury trial being now over, all the defendants' witnesses from Zululand having been stopped at the border, or prevented from coming on to Pietermaritzburg by the officers of the Government, these witnesses are no longer necessary for the purposes of the trial.

"But I ought to remark that the fact of these witnesses being sent forward seems a proof of the *bona fides* of the complaint of Cetshwayo [against Mr. Shepstone], and his desire that the matter should still be inquired into.

"It also shows how hard it was upon the proprietors of the

*Natal Witness* to attempt to throw upon them the onus of proving the truth of an alleged libel forming the subject of a communication or complaint from Cetshwayo to H.M. Special Commissioner for Zululand Affairs, but which His Excellency did not see fit to call upon Cetshwayo to support by proof, or to hear such evidence and witnesses as he (Cetshwayo) was desirous of forwarding, and actually did forward."

Sir Henry Bulwer's own despatches amply prove that he did not wish or intend to sift the matter, but was determined to take his stand simply and solely on the mere word of the accused person. Some time before the action (in May) was brought, Cetshwayo sent two messengers to Mr. Fynn to ask [3705, p. 59] "for a pass for witnesses to go into Natal in order to give evidence against Mr. Shepstone." One of these messengers, Makeu, had lately been at Bishopstowe, and had been sent from thence by Mtokwane to hasten the coming of the beaten men whom the King had previously expressed his intention of sending down to Mtokwane's care. Mtokwane sent Makeu on his own account, and without the knowledge of the Bishop, or of any one at Bishopstowe, but it is quite possible that Makeu took for granted that he had the Bishop's authority to do so. Makeu, however, was of a weak character, and not altogether to be relied upon, as is shown by the fact that, knowing how little attention a Natal official was likely to pay to a message from either the Bishop or the King, he "told Mr. Fynn that it was Hulumeni (i.e. "the Governor" or "the Government") who had told him to go and get these witnesses" [*ibid.*]. He meant to ensure their being

sent, but his untruth did no good to the Zulus, and only gave Sir H. Bulwer apparent grounds for a renewed attack upon the Bishop, Makeu having acknowledged under pressure what he apparently believed, although mistakenly, that it was "Sobantu," and not "Hulumeni" who had sent him. Mr. Fynn refused to give the pass, and wrote to Sir Henry Bulwer:—

"My reply to Cetshwayo [was], I will take down any statement or message, and forward to his Excellency, but I cannot send or give a pass, or give leave to go to Natal to give evidence, without his Excellency's authority; he objects . . . .

"Cetshwayo replies, Sobantu is my friend or relation, it was he who kept \* me when in trouble, and I cannot abstain from telling my relation my troubles, but Makeu has done wrong in concealing Sobantu; I am not asking for the witnesses to go to Sobantu, but to his Excellency to give evidence by word of mouth, and [I] wished them to have a pass for that purpose; [but] that Hozana is, by reason of the injuries then received, rendered unable to proceed to Pietermaritzburg to give evidence [3705, p. 60].†

The above request was made on April 24th, and on May 9th, Sir Henry Bulwer replied to it. He says [*ibid.*]:—

". . . . I referred, as I promised to do, the representations forwarded in your previous despatch of the 3rd of March ‡ to

---

\* Mr. Fynn may have meant "helped" here, or he may have coined the word from "Kipa," to deliver out of, to take out, &c.

† It is said that Cetshwayo wept over Hozana, when he was brought back to him severely injured, on this occasion. The King felt that he had sent his faithful subject out to be thus ill-treated.

‡ 3616, p. 114, &c. (see p. 460 *supra*).



Mr. Shepstone. As I had anticipated, there was no truth whatsoever in the allegation made that Mr. Shepstone had struck some person, and there was no foundation either for the statement that he had made use of certain injurious expressions regarding Cetshwayo. . . . I am perfectly satisfied that Mr. Shepstone did no such thing as strike any one, nor tell any one with him to do so, and that, on the contrary, he interposed to stop the fight that was just beginning.

“Under these circumstances I cannot give permission to these people to come in for the purpose of repeating this distorted story, I cannot consent to countenance, or encourage a wilful attempt to advance an unfounded charge. It is apparent, also, from your despatch . . . that the proposal of Cetshwayo to send these men is due to a suggestion received from Natal,\* and that his object in sending them in would not be to send them to me (except ostensibly), but really that they may go and supply evidence to others in order that a case may be made out against Mr. Shepstone.† No doubt, whether I give the permission or not, some one will be sent in because of the suggestion received by Cetshwayo, but I cannot myself give any encouragement to such a proceeding.”

In fact the Governor was “perfectly satisfied,” simply on the word of the accused person that he “did no such thing.” He, therefore, refused to examine into the case, to hear any evidence, or to

---

\* This is in allusion to Makeu's mistaken statement [3705, p. 59], that he had been sent by the Bishop to fetch the witnesses. But that statement was made on the 24th April, and Cetshwayo's first reports to the Natal Government upon the subject are dated by Mr. Fynn, 26th and 27th February [3616, pp. 115 and 116], before the Bishop could possibly have known anything about it.

† How is this “apparent”? Cetshwayo had done his best to bring these complaints to the Governor's notice nearly two months previously, and had received nothing but cold rebuffs in return. What means would Sir Henry Bulwer have approved of his taking in order to obtain a full and just inquiry into the facts?

allow Cetshwayo to communicate with him upon the matter.

Can it possibly be believed that the Home Government ever intended that the Zulu King should be thus debarred from free communication with the Natal Government, or that he should be forbidden to send down to Maritzburg the people whom he desired should carry both his and their own complaints?

How absurd in Cetshwayo's eyes were these decisions of a case on the word of the accused may be gathered from Mr. Fynn's despatch to Sir H. Bulwer of May 31st. He writes [3864, p. 9] that:—

“In explaining to Cetshwayo the subject contained in your Excellency's despatch of May 9th,\* Cetshwayo went into a fit of apparently uncontrollable laughter. I, however, did my best to impress upon him with seriousness, that your Excellency found no truth whatsoever in the allegations made against Mr. J. Shepstone that he had struck any one, or made use of certain injurious expressions regarding Cetshwayo, or that he had caused his police to beat any of the people alleged to have been beaten by them. I explained to Cetshwayo thoroughly the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs of your Excellency's despatch of May 9th, but he ridiculed the matter, and persisted in his arguments that all that had been said against Mr. Shepstone was true.”

---

OWING to the causes explained in the Introduction, the detailed history of the ruin of Zululand must break off here, leaving the facts briefly summarised in these last pages, as well as the latest and worst result of British mistakes in that country—the

\* 3705, p. 60.

irruption of the Boers—to be fully worked out in a supplementary volume.

It has yet to be told how effectual proved the official plan for creating disturbance between Zibebu and the Sutus by fixing three different boundaries between them, and how the Sutu women and children, quietly occupying the homes which they had been officially told were to be their own, found themselves ordered off, and their crops seized by Zibebu's men, Zibebu having also been officially told that the land was his. Now, either under the impression, or else to give the impression, that a great many Zulus would be anxious to quit Cetshwayo's territory, great stress had been officially laid upon the necessity of all those who wished to remove, being allowed to do so without undue hurry, and especially on their being permitted to remain where they were until they had harvested their season's crops. This arrangement must, of course, be taken to have referred equally to the Sutus, of whom Sir Henry Bulwer, having sanctioned their return to their old homesteads, writes to Lord Kimberley, in October 1882—"Their kraals are still standing, and all they have to do will be to remove there, and commence their planting."\* Zibebu, however, was well

\* It is plain that Sir H. Bulwer intended that these lands should henceforth belong to the Sutus, and form part of Cetshwayo's kingdom, but he was so ill-informed by his subordinates who knew the country, as to be unaware at the time, that they fell on Zibebu's side of the boundary announced to him. Yet even so, Zibebu should have been obliged, equally with Cetshwayo, to respect the growing crops. But, as the *Times of*

aware that laws were for Cetshwayo, and licence for him, so he paid no attention to the former, but speedily sent his men to take possession of the Sutu crops, planted under the Governor's sanction. The few owners on the spot \* naturally resisted this outrage, and a collision ensued, which was predicted by the *Times of Natal* for March 13th in the following words:—

“ . . . . Zibebu is represented as taking action which may be attended with disturbance. He wishes to have his slice of territory free of subjects of doubtful loyalty, and has warned the Masipula tribe who live at the foot of the Lebombo range, and who are located just within Zibebu's ground to move, an order which has led the intruders to arm.” †

Meanwhile there were ample grounds for suspicion that mischief was brewing against Cetshwayo, and the *Natal Mercury* of March 17th, gave a report that “Hamu and Zibebu were going to unite to attack the King,” while the *Times* correspondent, on March 27th, said that “The people wait anxiously to hear what Mr. J. Shepstone will have to say to the

---

*Natal*, though always opposed to Cetshwayo, reports, on the authority of a correspondent at Isandhlwana, writing on April 9th, 1883, of the fight referred to *infra*: “It seems that Zibebu had cut down all Ndabuko's crops, and driven the people away out of his territory. . . . Since then the fight took place. . . .”

\* Most of the principal men were still at Ulundi, paying their respects to the King.

† “Zibebu's ground,” according to the latest of the officially shifted boundaries. Masipula's tribe had been there at least as long as that of Mapita (Zibebu's father) i.e. since Dingane's days, so they could only be *officially* termed “intruders.”

proposed offensive and defensive alliance with Zibebu and Hamu.”

The full account has yet to be given of how the Sutu headmen, who were gathered around the King at Ulundi, hearing of the ill-treatment of their families by Zibebu, hurried off to protect them, without military organisation or practised leader, and consequently, meeting Zibebu's trained and mounted bands suddenly, were routed and put to flight.\*

The King, indeed, had forbidden the Sutu princes and chiefs to go, wishing to avoid all chance of giving offence to the British Government, and seeing that no good could follow any collision with the Government protégé, Zibebu, although much misery must result from British encouragement of that chief-

\* Sir Henry Bulwer reports [3616, p. 136] that the Usutus numbered “from 4000 to 6000 men,” or “some 80 companies,” and Zibebu's party “between 1500 and 2000 men,” or “20 companies of foot, and one of mounted men.” He attributes the result to the fact (?) that “Zibebu's men were fighting in their own country, and in the cause of their homes, and for the life of their chieftain against an invading force,” and the Sutus “in a bad cause.” Precisely the contrary, however, was the actual state of the case, except so far that the Sutus themselves say that they were disheartened because they “were not sent by Cetshwayo” [3616, p. 159]. The Sutus do not appear even to have been drawn up in battle array when they met Zibebu's force, and the simple fact mentioned by Sir Henry Bulwer that “The loss sustained by Zibebu, so far as is known, appears to have been but slight, but that of the attacking Usutu force must have been considerable, even the mat-carriers being killed in the retreat,” proves that this disaster resulted from no fair trial of strength.

tain's ambition. He bade the Sutus wait, with what patience they might, while he applied to the Natal Government through his resident, Mr. Fynn, as he had been required to do in such matters by the conditions of his restoration, which gave ample time for his enemies to attack and destroy him and his people piecemeal, while he sent to ask leave to defend them and himself, with the reasonable expectation of eventually receiving in reply admonitions on no account to raise an armed force, and assurances that, in the opinion of Government, no danger was to be apprehended from Zibebu. Under these circumstances it is no wonder that even the most dutiful amongst them disobeyed, and slipped away, as they did, without Cetshwayo's permission, or even knowledge. Yet in Natal, and officially, it was declared that, while pretending to restrain the Usutus, the King had privately encouraged them to attack Zibebu, and that the latter's country had been wantonly invaded by them. It is easy to understand how, after this first collision, upon the disputed border line, reprisals followed on either side, but the King and his adherents were too heavily handicapped for any hopes of their success. The promises extorted from their King, and which he kept with scrupulous fidelity from first to last, hung heavily upon the loyal Zulus, and hampered Cetshwayo in his every effort to restore order. His men immensely outnumbered those whom Zibebu could command, but that chief was encouraged and assisted by a parcel of European

vagabonds,\* who drilled his troops, helped him to mount them, buying horses for him in Natal, and led them in their most sanguinary actions, while Cetshwayo was bound by his conditions to organise no impi, and to repress and discourage every attempt on the part of his people to hold their own like men. No better means could have been devised for lessening Cetshwayo's influence over his people than that of obliging him, on pain of England's displeasure, to require them to endure wrong and insult without raising a hand in defence of themselves, their families, their cattle, and their lands. Nevertheless they flocked together from all quarters, after the first alarm, to protect the King. Many left their homes and families in questionable security, others—from the Reserve—knew that they were risking displeasure and punishment from the British Resident there, while all had equally to find food and shelter for themselves, since Cetshwayo had no means to provide for them. "The King," said some of his men, "will not send out an impi. He says 'When they come in sight of Ulundi, I will then give you

\* On June 24th, 1882, the Editor, *Times of Natal*, wrote that Zibebu had his "men drilled, and an organisation more or less perfected." It would seem that Zibebu was allowed to arm and prepare his men, under Sir H. Bulwer as High Commissioner, for ten months before the Restoration, whereas Cetshwayo was forbidden "to establish any military kraal or military system. Zibebu had also command of firearms and ammunition, having, as his supporter of the *Times of Natal* reported, "means to obtain firearms; and many of his followers already not only possess firearms, but know how to use them." This was an advantage not permitted to Cetshwayo.

leave to fight, since they are coming here to kill me.'” He had, however, no easy task to prevent their avenging their own and their sovereign’s wrongs, and their forced inaction under the circumstances disheartened them as much as it inspired their enemies.

Before long, Zibebu threw aside all pretence of keeping within bounds, and openly announced his intention to attack and kill the King.\* His threats were carried to Cetshwayo, who reported them to the Natal Government, which did nothing to help him, but merely advised him to remain quiet, and told him that he was in no danger, or that, if he was, it was his own fault. All his representations were treated as pretences, his assurances of his own quiescence as falsehoods. Truly did he himself complain that Zibebu was “befriended by the Government, and he was rejected, and his views or words of the circumstances were not listened to,” † for Sir Henry Bulwer did not scruple to assert that “the attack upon Zibebu seems to have been utterly unprovoked. . . .,” and that “There can be no doubt that it was devised and carried out with the

\* The pre-arranged scheme of Zibebu and Hamu for the invasion of Cetshwayo’s territory and attack on Ulundi, was spoken of by Hamu’s white man in a letter to the *Times of Natal*, dated March 31st, and April 1st, and published in the issue of that paper for April 28th.

† Mr. Fynn’s (always inadequate) translation of Cetshwayo’s words [3705, p. 52].



knowledge of Cetshwayo, and, I fear we must conclude, with his sanction" [3705, p. 2].\*

Within a few days of the date of this despatch Cetshwayo sent down a messenger to the Bishop of Natal, and the Zulu, after recapitulating the miseries which had followed upon Sir Garnet Wolseley's "settlement," spoke for the people as follows:—

"Yes! there is no mistake, O English! as to how you are treating us. We fought with you, and you overcame us: we know that you fought with the French also, and overcame them, but you did not give their Kingship to their dogs. Our Kingship—Cetshwayo's Kingship—you are giving to our dogs. What you are doing to us, O English! is amazing to us Zulus. Is there then another sovereign besides the Queen? Do you work with two different hands [the one cursing, while the other blesses]? With the Queen, Cetshwayo ate food prepared for him! here, through you, he eats water only. Make it known in all the lands, O English! how you are treating Cetshwayo this year. Cetshwayo's dogs are given his Kingship, and are making sport of it in the public road!

"It is now five years that your hands have been sprinkling Zulu blood, O English! Have you, then, indeed been working with two different hands? Does Unkulunkulu [the Almighty] approve of what you are doing in Zululand? Does the Queen approve of what you are doing to Cetshwayo? Does she know that you are killing him? Report this to the Queen! Do not steal him from her by stealth! Would you eat up from him his country, which the Queen herself gave back to him? . . . Yes! we Zulus honour and reverence the Queen; she is an exalted and mighty chief. But we reverence also Cetshwayo. . . . Where, O English, shall we find another such a King, if you kill this our King who is so good? Where shall we Zulus pay allegiance, since we thought

---

\* This assertion is made on the most inadequate grounds. "Mr. Fynn's reports [read 'vague opinions'], the information given by Zibebu (!), and the inherent probabilities of the case," i. e. Sir H. Bulwer's own fixed idea of Cetshwayo's worthlessness, "unquestionably lead," he says, "to this conclusion."

that this our King was being brought back by you? This is a theft, it is stealing his people and his country, which the Queen gave him! How is such an act regarded among yourselves, O English! Is it approved? Let the Parliament of England answer! Is Cetshwayo to be killed? Let the council at the Cape reply! Is the Queen's word to be broken? Let the men of London reply, and the whole of the Queen's Kingdom!

"So say we, all of us, and we pray Sobantu to send on these our words."

Zibebu, or, rather, the white men with him, lost no time in taking advantage of the absence of any real check upon Cetshwayo's foes, and made a sudden dash at Ulundi. The truth of the King's assertion, that he did not keep the men who came up for his defence in fighting array, was proved upon the spot. Zibebu's small, but well-armed and trained band, led by savage whites, fell upon the great crowd who, employed in building the new royal kraal, were not prepared for the attack, and slaughtered them without mercy. But few of the headmen survived, and the death-roll is heavy with the names of chiefs of the highest rank, and most unswerving loyalty, and sad with those of women and children.\* Cetshwayo's own escape was due partly to the cupidity of the white leaders, who were too much occupied in securing the lion's share of all the king's English

\* "The sun was just up, and large parties of the men were away, some having gone to their wood-cutting, some to the river to wash, others to fetch water, some were escorting home the parties of girls who had come bringing food to the royal kraal, while those who remained were not kept in any particular order; while the kraal was full of women too who were preparing the thatch for the huts [besides the King's family]."—*Zulu account given at Bishopstowe.*