

At the Annual Meeting of the Aborigines' Protection Society, on May 17th, 1893, Miss Colenso was asked to move the following Resolution : 'That this meeting, while welcoming the evidence of a growing desire on the part of Her Majesty's Government to deal justly with the native races under its rule, is of opinion that greatly increased watchfulness and energy are needed to protect the aborigines of Africa from injury by the present extension of European influence in various parts of the continent, alike under British and under other auspices'.

Contributors

Colenso, Harriette Emily, 1847-1932.
Simon, Sir John, 1816-1904
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

London : A. Bonner, printer, [1893]

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/tabggmsp>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E.library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

At the Annual Meeting of the Aborigines' Protection Society, on May 17th, 1893, Miss Colenso was asked to move the following Resolution :—

“ That this meeting, while welcoming the evidence of
“ a growing desire on the part of Her Majesty's Govern-
“ ment to deal justly with the native races under its rule,
“ is of opinion that greatly increased watchfulness and
“ energy are needed to protect the aborigines of Africa
“ from injury by the present extension of European
“ influence in various parts of the continent, alike under
“ British and under other auspices.”

Miss COLENSO said: That is the resolution. It is based on a knowledge wider than my own; on greater experience than I possess of the affairs of the many different races, to all of whom our nation owes the duty of the strong towards the weak, and to some of whom she owes also the fulfilment of the tremendous responsibilities undertaken by a conqueror. That is our position towards the one people with whose affairs I am familiar, the Zulus, on whose behalf I have been now for more than three years in England; and I believe that I can best support and emphasise this resolution by laying before you certain points which have come to light within the last twelvemonth bearing on the present position in Zulu affairs, by showing how that position, rightly handled, affords us yet one more opportunity, not only to establish British authority on a sure foundation in that fragment of the Zulu country which is now a British colony, but even to repair to some extent our true prestige, the good name for honesty and upright dealing which now suffers so grievously wherever the Zulus and their story penetrate among other African tribes; and, finally, by indicating to you some forms of mischief which lie in wait for such an attempt, and, unless detected and promptly foiled, may easily produce a wreck as disastrous to all concerned as that which attended Cetshwayo's mock restoration ten years ago.

The first point to be noticed is the publication, last June, of the Report of a Commission appointed in 1891 to arrange inter-tribal boundaries in the northern part of British Zululand. The Zulu chiefs had been exiled on the ground that they had caused disturbance and resistance to British authority, especially in that part of the country. They had brought in vain the counter-charge that British authority, for a political purpose, had expelled over 3,000 people from their homes, and had thus itself caused the disturbance. The statement was met by an explicit official denial, and the chiefs were condemned for cunning falsehood as well as rebellion.

Yet the Report, published as an Imperial Blue Book within the last twelvemonth, supplies full official proof of the expulsion, at the time in question,—not only of 3,000 people, but of 4,800, and more; and justifies completely the claim of Dinuzulu's counsel, that, had the facts, as now admitted, been made known at the time to Her Majesty's Government, the young chief and his guardian, instead of being condemned for high treason, would have been thanked in the name of the Queen for maintaining order amongst their people, in the face of wanton and wicked persecution.

The truth of the counter-charge brought by the Zulus being thus proved up to the hilt, the wholesale deception practised in the attempt to conceal that truth is equally admitted.

After this it is not surprising that the Colonial Office has found it necessary to give "most careful attention to the whole of the "Zululand questions," as was stated to the House of Commons on the second of this month.

What course will now be taken has not yet been made public; and it has been explained that "it is not likely that an early "decision will be taken," and that "one reason for delay is that "Mr. Osborn, the British Commissioner in Zululand is about to "retire on a pension, and that it is desirable to have the opinion "of his successor before taking action."

Mr. Osborn's friends have spoken more than once of late years of a wish on his part to withdraw from the cares of office, and this step may have been hastened by the recent death of his eldest son, a grief with which we can all sympathise.

But Mr. Osborn, throughout the many years that he has held office in Zululand, has identified himself with the mischievous, the unworthy policy of breaking up the Zulu nation by dividing it against itself. One originator of this policy has explained that he "did not believe the Zulus had contemplated hostilities against "this country" (the British colony of Natal), but that "it was "thought advisable that the Zulu nation should be broken up, "because, once we had invaded the Zulu country" the Zulus "would have far less cause to be well-disposed towards us than "they had before the war took place, and would be far more "dangerous than before to the public peace." That expectation the Zulus have repeatedly put to shame, under the influence, especially, of those chiefs for whom, so far, Her Majesty's Government has found no better use and no higher reward than first a shameful imprisonment, and even yet, a heart-breaking exile.

If Africa were smaller; if race distinctions were less strong between Europeans on the one hand, and African tribes on the other, the breaking-up policy, however wicked, might be practicable. As it is, the beginnings of disorder, a state of insecurity, the result of depriving African tribes—a huge majority of the population, keen-witted people, accustomed to manage their own affairs—of the democratic checks inherent in their own organizations, while they are unable to take part in ours;—this state of things is already significantly described in Natal and other parts of South Africa as "the native difficulty".

The recognition of a difficulty is a step towards its removal. The colony of Natal is now celebrating its jubilee by undertaking the solemn responsibilities of self-government, and among Natal colonists there is, I believe, a growing feeling that the interests of white and of black are not antagonistic, but the same, and that all Natal's inhabitants must work together, willingly and intelligently, for the good of one another and of their common country if that country is to prosper; while fifty years of contact have given colonists and natives some understanding of one another.

These Natal natives are Zulus by descent, and still, to a considerable degree, by feeling; and when Natal has set her own house in order it may be that she will be given also charge over the pitiful fragment of country now called British Zululand. At

present, however, that is separate, a Crown colony, the bulk of whose inhabitants are thoroughly Zulus at heart, very superficially affected by five years' administration of the system devised to carry out the fatuous policy of breaking up the Zulus.

It is because no modification of this policy and system was possible under Mr. Osborn's auspices that his withdrawal must be welcomed as a good omen. Another omen, of deeper significance, lies in the recent declaration of the Prime Minister of England as reported in the *Daily News*, that: "We are of opinion that it is impossible to govern a country in the interests of law and order without some regard to the sympathies and convictions and traditions of the people."

Of the bulk of the inhabitants of British Zululand it has been amply shown that their sympathies are with the exiled chiefs who, they believe, are suffering for having, as they say, "brought to the notice of Government acts oppressive against the people of the Government"—for having faithfully borne "the heavy burden which is theirs whose duty it is to speak for the people."

The convictions of the Zulus are those of Dinuzulu's counsel, Mr. Harry Escombe, himself a Natal colonist, that to these exiled chiefs are still due the thanks of Her Majesty's Government, and that our Queen has no subjects more loyal.

The strongest traditions of the Zulus are those of loyalty to these their hereditary chiefs. That these possess some powerful, some wide-reaching influence is implied by the conditions of their exile. On the nature of that influence we have the words of Sir Th. Shepstone, whose opinion has often been held authoritative on such matters. He has recently declared that "If there is one truth more necessary to be known than another by a South African statesman, it is the impossibility of effectually abolishing hereditary chieftainship. Hereditary chiefs may be officially deposed by the paramount power, may be refused recognition, may be sent into exile, or placed under personal disabilities. These are the means which civilised Governments generally use, and which have been used in South Africa; but they have succeeded only in making martyrs: in augmenting the power of the chiefs concerned for mischief, and in clothing with greater reverence their persons and their utterances. The effect is to inflame the tribal sentiment, and to strengthen attachment to its representative members."

It is claimed that the influence of the exiles should now be enlisted on behalf of British authority by making Cetshwayo's son a British official.

The exiles' "martyrdom"—it is Sir Th. Shepstone's word—has absolved them from the duty of further protest as to the partition of the people and their country between the Dutch and the English. That wrong is one which will not be set right by their return, and it is a wrong which Mr. Escombe has described as "Solomon's judgment carried out." But if their return be used to indicate sympathy with Zulu feelings, a wish to gather the Zulus instead of breaking them, the effect, even on the discarded Zulus, will be a measure of conciliation, so strong is the feeling described by Sir Th. Shepstone, and (while not at variance with Transvaal policy in Zulu matters) to substitute for Dutch patronage of Dinuzulu that of the Queen.

In natural history the magnanimity of the lion is now generally held to be an exploded fallacy. Certainly in the case of the British lion that quality seldom rises to the height of apologising, and on behalf of the Zulus no one suggests that he should do so. An act of grace is all that is asked of him: and thereafter an honest attempt to let bygones be bygones, is all that will be needed as between British authority and the Zulu chiefs and people. The good omens already discernible hold such promise of reform that the Zulus and their friends may well be hopeful and patient.

The plan of sending back young Dinuzulu alone before his uncles may surely be dismissed as absolutely stultifying any act of grace. It is in fact condemned by the very fact that it has been entertained by those bent on crushing the Zulus. But worse even than that the chiefs should die in exile would it be to send them back without reform, to watch the people, for whom they have suffered so much, being crushed under the very evils in protest against which they, the chiefs, had risked their lives and lost their liberty.

Yet further proof of the need of such reform may be found in the complaints now reported as made by white inhabitants of British Zululand. "We are informed," says a Natal paper, not three months old, that "the most profound dissatisfaction prevails amongst the European residents in British Zululand with the administration of justice in that territory." The allegations are said to be "of such a grave nature as to demand the most rigorous and searching inquiry," and it is added that a petition to the Secretary of State on this subject is in course of preparation. The white inhabitants appear to have come to the conclusion which the Zulus arrived at five years ago.

But though we may be patient there is another side to the picture which must not be lost sight of. Before the change of administration in England, the case of the exiled chiefs had been for a whole twelvemonth under consideration with a view to the remission of sentence. Ten months of Liberal administration have followed, and they are still in exile, though all delay is to be deprecated, as having at least the appearance of committing the present Ministry to past blunders.

Moreover, their position, and the climate of St. Helena has already so far affected the health of the exiles that it has been thought desirable to move them to a warmer part of the island, and to provide two fresh attendants from Zululand, in place of two invalided home. But such alleviations, thankfully as we may receive them, do not alter the fact that these innocent people are being killed, if more slowly, yet as surely as by gallows or by gun. For the sake of all concerned, therefore, may there be no undue delay!

I have necessarily left much unsaid, but what I have said will, I hope, lead you to watch Zulu affairs during the next few months with special interest.

We ourselves, my mother, and my sister, and myself, begin to hope that the object of our mission to England is, at last, in course of accomplishment, when we may return to continue some part of my father's work in our African home; and in that hope I bid you now goodbye.

1879. England conquered the Zulus.

For seven years after, instead of protecting them, she, by her agents—

(A) Further broke down their strength by fomenting civil war among them.

(B) Permitted them, thus weakened, to be overcome by European adventurers from the two neighbouring Dutch States, and from the colony of Natal.

1886. Professing to intervene, and that the right to do so had "been fully and continuously maintained," England became a party to an admittedly "fraudulent compact," whereby she gave half Zululand to the Boers. England then annexed the remainder, announcing that the Zulus would submit.

Dec., 1887. To suppress Zulu complaints at being thus dismembered and cut off from English protection, England sent among the "uSutu," or followers of Cetshwayo, a chief Zibebu who had been beaten by them, and who was officially asserted to intend "frightful retaliation." Zibebu led 1,100 fighting men, officially described as "a real and effective coercive force."

1887. } England used Zibebu as above described, beginning by driving out from their homes with floggings and
1888. } shootings, peaceful Zulus. We can prove that over 3,000 were evicted; the officials admit 816.

The principal Zulu chiefs proved their loyalty and that of their people to England, by so controlling their people that during eleven months of the treatment above described (from July, 1887, to June 2nd, 1888) only one instance of retaliation occurred, the killing of three men by two who had been evicted for them.

To account for the utter confusion at last produced by their own acts, England's Representatives attacked the uSutu chiefs, and (when these impeached their persecutors, and came in, claiming inquiry) put them through a mock trial, and condemned them, for High Treason, to exile in St. Helena, where they now are, for terms of 10, 12 and 15 years respectively.

The evidence received against the chiefs was hearsay, sometimes two and three deep.

Documentary evidence in their favour, including despatches from the impeached officials, was shut out.

The Judge, in sentencing Ndabuko, after full disclosure of the above stated condition of the country by witnesses on both sides, used the words, "you skilfully used the restoration of Zibebu to his tribal lands" to bring about "resistance to the Queen's authority."

For complicity in this imaginary rebellion, ten other chiefs, and four common Zulus, are in gaol at Etshowe, in Zululand. Two of these chiefs, were arrested at their homes, on April 5th, 1890, *i.e.*, more than a year after the conclusion of the other trials; their trial and sentence is not yet known.

Hope of legal redress seems vain. There is no appeal in criminal cases from the Colonies to the Privy Council on the facts. Appeal on technical issues has been refused, on the ground that the will of the conqueror is law in a territory circumstanced as Zululand now is,—that in such a country the Governor is equal to King, Lords and Commons combined. The Lord Chancellor replied in the words "What is there to prevent him?" to the proposition that such a Governor might order that a man be hanged first, and tried afterwards.

The exile of the chiefs, it is known, was decided on before they were sentenced.

Before appointing the Special Court for their trial, the Governor had expressed the opinion that they must be exiled as a political necessity. The trials, therefore, were an empty form. The facts disclosed at the trials, especially by the Crown witnesses, prove the political necessity to have been a fiction.

H. E. COLENSO.

July 23, 1890. 21, Cavendish Road West, London, N.W.

[For proof of the above statements, see

The Parliamentary Blue Books, especially C-5,892, pp. 256-320. Nos. 170-2., with enclosures.]
H. E. C.

Publications on the Native Question in Natal and Zululand.

HISTORY OF THE ZULU WAR (1879), by Frances Ellen Colenso, and Lieut.-Col. E. Durnford.

My Chief and I (1873), by Frances Ellen Colenso (Atherton Wylde).
Chapman & Hall, 12s.

A Soldier's Life in South Africa (1872-9), by Lieut.-Col. E. Durnford.
Chapman & Hall, 14s.

Cetshwayo's Dutchman (1879), Edited by Bishop Colenso.
Sampson Low.

THE RUIN OF ZULULAND (1880-83), by Frances Ellen Colenso. 2 vols.
Longmans.

The Zulu Iniquity (1883-4), by F. R. Statham, corresp. *Daily News*.
Ridgway, £1 1s.

LIFE OF BISHOP COLENSO, by Rev. Sir G. W. Cox, Bart. 2 vols, 7s. 6d.
Ridgway, 1s.
(Second half of second volume) procurable from F. E. Colenso,

A Remonstrance on behalf of the Zulu Chiefs (1888-9), by Harry Escombe and F. C. Dumat.
21, Cavendish Road West, N.W.

The Story of Dinuzulu, by H. E. Colenso and H. R. Fox-Bourne.
P. S. King & Son, 1s.

3d. *Zulu Defence Committee*, 3, Broadway Chambers, Westminster.