

course that would be disastrous both for themselves and humanity. The Zulus' own good sense, said Osborn, saved them from plunging into the pit.⁵⁶ Hurt but haughty, Harriette spurned the accusation that she was among those who were evidently encouraging armed resistance, but she would not deny to the Zulu people the right to die for their country. She replied to Chesson that hers was a restraining influence. The Zulus did not need her or anyone to tell them that they had been shamelessly treated. They and every other chiefdom in South Africa realised this, and would remain aware of it long after she was no longer there to remind them.⁵⁷

Frequent protests were lodged against the actions of the Boers and the October 1886 agreement. The Zulu leaders appealed to the authorities in Zululand. They sent deputations and messages to Pietermaritzburg. They wished to appeal to the Queen and the idea of a deputation to London lingered.⁵⁸ Indeed, there was the possibility that Ndabuko, who had visited Durban and Pietermaritzburg in 1886, and Dinuzulu might come to Pietermaritzburg and perhaps proceed to London.⁵⁹ But if a deputation was impossible, either because of the expense or because permission was denied, at least messages might be sent to London.⁶⁰ In April 1888 the Zulu deputation that arrived in Pietermaritzburg was committed to 'entering an action' against the Boers in the Natal law courts to ask why they had 'swindled' them.⁶¹ By October 1887 the old protests against partition fused with protests against annexation and the consequent loss of authority.⁶²

Harriette believed, with Chesson the Secretary of the A.P.S., that so long as uSuthu protests were sustained, there would be a chance of amendment.⁶³ She wanted the uSuthu to be heard, accurately comprehended, and heeded. She mocked when protests

56. C.4980, p.136, enclosure in no.63: Osborn to Havelock, 16 Nov.1886.

57. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/64: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 20 Apr.1887; C.130/84: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 18 Mar.1887.

58. C.4980, p.150, no.72: Havelock to Stanhope, telegram, 8 Jan.1887; p.160, no.81: Havelock to Stanhope, 21 Dec.1886; and p.171, no.89: Holland to Havelock, 31 Jan.1887.

59. C.4913, p.77, no.50: Havelock to Granville, 23 May 1886, with notes of interviews.

60. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/41: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 23 Nov.1886; C.131/44: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 14 Dec.1886; C.4980, p.160, no.81: Havelock to Stanhope, 21 Dec.1886; C.5143, p.37, enclosure in no.15: extract from *Times of Natal*, 19 Mar.1887, reprinting letter of F.W. Chesson in *The Times*, 15 Feb.1887.

61. C.5143, p.39, no.18: Havelock to Holland, telegram, 5 May 1887.

62. *Ibid.*, p.61, enclosure in no.39: Report by M. Osborn, 4 June 1887.

63. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 9 Dec.1886. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.311, col.457: question by Mr Channing on Zululand boundary commission, 24 Feb.1887.

were impeded and did her best to protect the Zulus from misrepresentations and distortion. Because this was what the Zulus wanted, she believed herself entitled to open, read, and amend the translation of messages between the Zulus and the government officials, however sanctimoniously shocked the Secretary for Native Affairs and the Governor might claim to be.⁶⁴ She was concerned to protect the Zulus from exploitation, whether from a black scribe and intermediary, whose integrity she suspected, or a white adviser and concession-seeker, whose disinterestedness was clearly very questionable. To Harriette, neither Martin Luthuli, the black mission-education secretary to Dinuzulu, nor J. McLaren, a white trader-adventurer in Zululand, were worthy of the Zulus' trust. McLaren was a concession-seeker; Luthuli, educated at the Umvoti mission and formerly Grant's assistant, was, in Harriette's view, the 'instrument of much mischief'.⁶⁵

Perhaps on the strength of what McLaren told her, Harriette claimed that Zulu protests were blocked and that they did not willingly acquiesce in the proposed arrangements.⁶⁶ She had some justification for thinking this. Article 3 of the Convention of October 1886 stipulated that a commission of British, Boer, and Zulu representatives should mark off the boundary, but Zulu participation was, at best, sporadic and unwilling.⁶⁷ Havelock refused to receive a deputation until the demarcation was done. Osborn told this to an impressive gathering of uSuthu leaders who protested to him at Dlebe.⁶⁸ Chesson later accused Osborn of gagging the Zulu; but he withdrew the complaint when Osborn explained the situation.⁶⁹ In London, Holland, the Secretary of State for the Colonies (1887-1892), received a deputation of MPs who supported the A.P.S. on 23 February 1887. He answered questions put to him in parliament on 24 February 1887.⁷⁰

64. R.H.L., Br. Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/45: S.N.A., H.C. Shepstone, to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1886; H.E. Colenso to S.N.A., 30 Nov.1886; C.131/51: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 11 Jan.1887; C.130/73: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 15 Jan.1887.

65. *Ibid.*, C.131/58: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 15 Feb.1887 and C.131/59: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 1 Mar.1887; C.131/179: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 8 Feb.1887. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

66. N.A., Col.Coll: J. McLaren to H.E. Colenso, 29 Jan.1887.

67. C.4980, p.61, enclosure in no.42: memorandum of the Terms of Settlement, article 3, 22 Oct.1886. Signed by Havelock and representatives of the New Republic; C.5143, pp.11-25, enclosure in no.7: Journal of Boundary Commissioners, F. Cardew and M. Osborn, 17 Jan.1887, see especially entries for 4, 12, 14, 16 and 21 Dec.1886.

68. *Ibid.*, p.20: entry for 3 Jan.1887.

69. C.5143, pp.37-39, no.15: Havelock to Holland, with enclosures, 25 Mar.1887.

70. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.311, col.1457: question by Mr Channing, 24 Feb.1887; N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to Fr.El. Colenso, 24 and 25 Feb.1887.

At a time when a good deal of attention was - ostensibly, at least - being given to Zulu wishes, it seemed important to determine whether or not the uSuthu had sent a representative to the demarcation commission. Harriette warned the Zulus that, if they wanted to protest against partition, they should not touch the demarcation.⁷¹ Campbell approved her advice.⁷² In contrast to what was stated both in the Natal legislative council and the British parliament, Harriette stoutly denied that the Zulu leaders had sent an authorised representative to participate in the actual demarcation of the boundary line. If Zulu men had been present, they had been merely observers; they had not participated.⁷³ Harriette held Martin Luthuli responsible for misunderstanding on this point, in that he had not made it clear to the uSuthu how the British would regard the presence of any Zulu nominee when beacons were placed to denote the boundary.⁷⁴ In the middle of this contretemps, Henrique Shepstone, the Secretary for Native Affairs, reproved Harriette for opening correspondence addressed not to her but to Luthuli. Harriette replied that she had been authorised by Shingana, one of the *abaNtwana*, to open correspondence.⁷⁵ Havelock tried to disabuse Harriette of her suspicions of Luthuli. He pointed out that his information about the presence of Zulu representatives at the demarcation did not come only from Luthuli.⁷⁶ Harriette was not convinced, but like so many issues that were temporarily the pivot of dispute between these officials and the Colensos, the question of Zulu representation at the commission and of Luthuli's reliability as an intermediary were overtaken by other events and were lost to sight.

One of Harriette's concerns in this matter was with British public opinion. She did not want to discourage whatever British opposition to current policy in Zululand there might be. Any report of Zulu representation at the demarcation might indicate that the Zulu themselves had accepted their position, and this would suggest strongly to British

71. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to Miss Colenso, 29 Jan.1887.

72. *Ibid.*, W.Y. Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 20 Nov.1886.

73. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to R.C.A. Samuelson, 29 Apr.1887.

74. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, copy, 1 Mar.1887; R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/59: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 1 Mar.1887.

75. *Ibid.*, C.131/45: H.C. Shepstone to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1886; C.130/87: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 12 Mar.1887. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to R.C.A. Samuelson, 29 Apr.1887; to McLaren, 16 May 1887; W.Y. Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 25 Nov.1886.

76. *Ibid.*, Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 26 Feb.1887; H.E. Colenso to Samuelson, 1 May 1887; to ? (unidentified correspondent, possibly Secretary of State for the Colonies), 23 Mar.1887. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 5 (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.980-1001: correspondence and comment on Zulu attitudes and the role of M. Luthuli.

sympathisers that they too should acquiesce, both in the partition of October 1886 and in the subsequent annexation.

In fact, the question of whether or not the Zulu people consented to come under British rule was frequently tossed about in the House of Commons in the early months of 1887.⁷⁷ Great enthusiasm was hardly to be expected, and no-one seems to have considered how Zulu opinion was to be gauged. To Frances Ellen it was clear that the only way the Zulus had acquiesced was by not fighting.⁷⁸ But there were frequent questions about Zulu attitudes, and Holland, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, was somewhat hardpressed. At first he said that the Zulus consented, in the negative sense that they accepted a *fait accompli*. The MPs who questioned him were not satisfied. He cited telegrams local officials sent and he claimed that these indicated a more positive attitude on the part of the Zulus. Harriette, her brother, and their A.P.S. allies at least forced the Colonial Office into justifying their actions in terms of Zulu wishes and expectations. Then, a few days after the formal annexation of Zululand, Henry Labouchere, the radical trouble-stirrer of British politics, strode to the fore in the parliamentary debate. He demanded that the House adjourn to discuss the issue of the annexation of Zululand. Forty MPs rose to support him, and this was enough to compel a debate. The motion for adjournment was discussed and defeated. Though the debate could not do much to help the Zulus in the short term, Harriette was pleased to know that the attention of parliament had been called to the Zulu issue.⁷⁹

Parliamentary concern reflected uneasy suspicions that the uSuthu opposed both partition and annexation. Yet neither the questions in parliament nor the Zulu protests could gain much advantage for the uSuthu. As Harriette realised, the only thing that could really have saved the Zulu was the strength to defy both Boers and British, and this clearly they did not have.

77. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.312, col.729: question by R. Fowler, 18 Mar.1887; vol.314, cols 1813-14: questions by McArthur and Campbell, 13 May 1887; vol.315, col.68: questions by H. Labouchere and W. Redmond, 17 May 1888; vol.315, col.254: question by R. Temple, 19 May 1887; vol.315, col.501: questions by Dr Clark and Osborne Morgan, 17 May 1887; vol.315, cols 508-09: questions by W. Redmond and J. Morley and vol.315, cols 525-36: Labouchere's motion to adjourn the House, 19 May 1887.

78. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/84: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 18 Mar.1887.

79. See above fn.77.

In her efforts to help the Zulu, Harriette turned for help to others. Perhaps because the messenger, Siziba, and others who were in Pietermaritzburg at the end of April with £100 to pay for legal help, spoke of 'entering an action', Harriette turned, once again, to Campbell ('Kambula'), lawyer and journalist for the *Natal Advertiser* of Durban.⁸⁰ He heard the Zulu envoys. He went with them to see the Governor and he advised them. They must, he said, accept the fact of partition. They must, also, accept the fact of annexation which was announced while they were in Pietermaritzburg. They must give up ideas of an independent kingdom.⁸¹ All they could do was plead for some modification of the terms of the partition. Here attention was called to the royal graves in the emaKhosini district and to the question of buying land in the Proviso B district or in the area of the New Republic. They might offer to buy the farms, but they must act as one people. They should, however, petition the Governor to be allowed to live under Zulu law, not Natal native law. Campbell informed the Governor - and the A.P.S. - of the advice he had given.⁸² In a later letter of 7 June Campbell observed that the uSuthu were alarmed about Zibhebhu's restoration. He suggested the Governor allay their fears.⁸³ In Britain, Chesson, on hearing of the deputation of April, urged that it was 'idle' to continue to protest against the partition.⁸⁴

Harriette had raised the issue of the emaKhosini area of the royal graves in an earlier communication. She believed that this was an area which had very great symbolic significance, as it represented the core of the nation. She reminded Havelock that he had once assured Zulu envoys that the line of partition would be so drawn as to ensure that the Zulu grave sites fell within the Zulu area. In fact, the ancient grave sites were placed within Republican territory. Harriette regretted the Governor's lack of topographical knowledge. She argued that his earlier words would have meant to the Zulu an assurance that the 'might and the will' of England would be used on their behalf.⁸⁵ That was too

-
80. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. C.5143: p.45, enclosure in no.27: message of principal Zulu chiefs, 29 Apr.1887.
81. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell's advice to the Zulu deputation, 12 May 1887. C.5143, pp.55-57, no.33: Havelock to Holland, 30 May 1887, with enclosures.
82. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell to Havelock, 16 May 1887; to Chesson, 18 May 1887.
83. *Ibid.*, Campbell to Havelock, 7 June 1887.
84. *Ibid.*, Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 2 and 9 June 1887.
85. C.4980, pp.134-35, enclosure in no.63: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 13 Nov.1887; C.5143, p.49, enclosure in no.27: H.C. Shepstone's reply to Zulu messengers, 11 May 1887; cf. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso Memorandum on the emaKhosini district, printed, n.d., probably submitted to the Beaumont Commission of 1916.

extreme, but Havelock was concerned. He responded sympathetically to the complaint. The boundary commission inspected the area.⁸⁶ For its part, the Colonial Office gave attention to the appeal of the A.P.S. which was based on the submissions made by Campbell and Dumat.⁸⁷ There were, however, other opinions on the emaKhosini region that undermined the views of Harriette and her allies. Theophilus Shepstone argued that, since the graves in the emaKhosini district were of pre-Shakan chiefs, they had little significance for the people who had been coerced into a common rule by Shaka.⁸⁸ Osborn took the same view but conceded that the graves were treated with respect as a matter of etiquette.⁸⁹ Havelock accepted these views. He reduced his aim and negotiated not for the restitution of the district but for the proper maintenance of the graves. In the end, all that was accomplished was a face-saving agreement that was included as an article in the Supplementary Convention of June 1888. The government of the South African Republic, which, in terms of that Convention, absorbed the New Republic, undertook to exert a measure of moral persuasion on the local farmers to allow the erection of stone walls to protect the burial sites and to allow free access to them. The South African Republic was absolved from any financial responsibility.⁹⁰ To Harriette and the uSuthu leaders the question of the royal graves remained important. It was raised again in 1897 and subsequently. For Harriette, to insist on the importance to the whole Zulu people of the Zulu graves was a way of insisting that the Zulu had a right to be recognised as a nation: that the uSuthu were 'the national party'.⁹¹

The suggestion that farms for the Zulu should be purchased in the Proviso B district was not acted upon. Campbell and Dumat had suggested a special tax to raise the necessary funds,⁹² but Theophilus Shepstone disputed the justice of imposing such a tax on all the

-
- 86. C.5143, pp.10-11, enclosure in no.7: Osborn to Havelock, 17 Jan.1887 (with sketch maps); p.12: Journal of Boundary Commission, entry for 5 Dec.1886; pp.18-19: entry for 29 Dec.1896.
 - 87. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 18 May 1887; Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 7 July 1887. C.5143, pp.50-53, no.29: Chesson to Holland, 16 June 1887, with enclosures.
 - 88. C.5331, pp.30-31, enclosure in no.13: memorandum by T. Shepstone, 12 Aug.1887. For Harriette's indignant repudiation of T. Shepstone's views, see R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 31 May 1888.
 - 89. C.5143, pp.43-44, enclosure in no.26: Osborn to Havelock, 2 May 1887.
 - 90. C.5892, p.74, Article 4 of Supplementary Convention of 1888, published in Cape Government Gazette, 21 Sept.1888.
 - 91. C.8782, p.17, enclosure in no.27: Dinuzulu and his fellow exiles to Chamberlain, 4 Sept.1897. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso, Memorandum on the emaKhosini district, printed, n.d., probably intended for submission to the Beaumont Commission.
 - 92. C.5143, p.52, enclosure in no.29: Counsel's opinion to the Zulu messengers, 12 May 1887.

Zulu people for the benefit of only a few.⁹³ Knutsford made it plain that he would not look to the British taxpayer to advance the purchase price.⁹⁴ Chesson, too, felt the matter was a pious hope. When he sent to Campbell the Blue Book containing the A.P.S. correspondence with the Colonial Office, he suggested that perhaps the Zulu people would be able to raise the funds and perhaps not all the farms would be taken up by whites.⁹⁵

It was a great pity for the Zulu people that the suggestion of buying farms in the 'white' areas was not acted upon in 1887. It would have been difficult for those who wielded power at the time of the 1902-1904 partition of Zululand to ignore the precedent by prohibiting, as they did, Zulu purchase of land in areas 'released' for white farms.⁹⁶ But, in the short perspective, the difficulty of the local government has to be appreciated. The loyalty of white claimants to land in the Proviso B district was, at best, suspect. To erode concessions made to white claimants in October 1886 by purchasing land for the Zulu might well have stirred trouble for the government from the whites.⁹⁷ In previous negotiations Boer representatives had expressed their objections to locations for the 'natives'.

Partly for the sake of the Zulu people and partly for the Church of England, Harriette raised again the question of kwaMagwaza, the mission station in Zululand granted to Colenso by Mpande which had passed into the control of the Church of the Province of South Africa in the 1860s, when Revd Robertson, the missionary, defected from Colenso.⁹⁸ It lay within the Proviso B area. Earlier Harriette had put her arguments to Sir Henry Bulwer in 1885. He had refused to decide between the two claimants, Harriette and Bishop McKenzie of the Church of the Province of South Africa, who was eager to

93. *Ibid.*, p.58, no.35: J. Bramston to A.P.S., 30 June 1887.

94. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 7 July 1887, enclosing Knutsford to Chesson, 30 June 1887.

95. *Ibid.*, Chesson to Campbell, 25 Aug.1887.

96. *Zululand. Land Delimitation Commission (1902-1904). Reports of the Joint Imperial and Colonial Commissioners, with annexures and map* (Pietermaritzburg, 1905), p.306, Annexure H; S. Marks, *Reluctant Rebellion, the 1906-08 Disturbances in Natal* (Oxford, 1970), p.127.

97. *Ibid.*, p.127. N.A., Col.Coll: G. Browne to Campbell, 20 June 1887, enclosing report by M. Osborn on rumours of unrest in Proviso B district, 16 June 1887. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.317, col.344: question by R.N. Fowler, 11 July 1887.

98. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/80: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 17 Feb.1887; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 4, *Case of the Mission Station of the Church of England at Kwamagwaza* (sic). Feb-Oct.1885 and 12 and 15 Feb.1887.

bring the mission into more vigorous life after the upheavals of the civil war. Bulwer had, however, told Harriette that he did not think her claim was one that could be entertained and he certainly did not wish to support it.⁹⁹ After the partition of October 1886 a government notice invited those who had land claims in the Proviso B area to bring them before the authorities. Harriette tried again. She wrote both to the resident magistrate in the Entonjaneni area, J.L. Knight, and to Havelock, the Governor.¹⁰⁰ McKenzie, whose alleged statement that the destruction of Bishopstowe by fire was divine judgment, had angered Harriette, claimed the land on the strength of a Boer title he had secured.¹⁰¹ Harriette and her mother claimed as the heirs of Bishop Colenso to whom the land had been granted by Mpande, to be held in trust for the Zulu people.¹⁰² Harriette sought the backing of Zulu leaders for her claim.¹⁰³ Once Britain had asserted sovereignty over the area, Havelock, unlike Bulwer, could not evade the issue indefinitely. He told Harriette that he saw no reason to dissent from the views of Bulwer and eventually kwaMagwaza was assigned to the Church of the Province of South Africa.¹⁰⁴ Harriette's tenacious arguments, her zealous production of printed sheets, and even her willingness to live in kwaMagwaza were all unavailing.¹⁰⁵

Harriette was, it seems, too distressed at uSuthu losses ever to acknowledge explicitly what was positive about direct British rule in Zululand. The main feature here was that the British government intended to keep the land outside the Proviso B area for the Zulu people and to block further white infiltration, at least for the foreseeable future.¹⁰⁶ This was not the attitude of Natal politicians. Harriette knew, although she seems to have lost sight of this later, that the Natal criticism of imperial inertia over Zululand was prompted

-
99. C.4587, pp.31, no.36: Bulwer to Earl Derby, 17 Feb.1885, with enclosures; p.90, no.38: Derby to Bulwer 21 Mar.1885; pp.35-41, no.39; Bulwer to Derby, 21 Feb.1885, with enclosures. C.4645, p.49, no.31: Bulwer to F.A. Stanley, 22 Sept.1888.
 100. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 12 Feb.1887, and official acknowledgement, 15 Feb.1887; H.E. Colenso to J.L. Knight, 10 Oct. and 15 Dec.1887.
 101. C. Lewis and G. Edwards, *Historical Records of the Church of the Province of South Africa* (London, 1934), pp.687-89.
 102. R.H.L. Fr.El. Colenso Papers: E.D. Cree to Editor, *Guardian* (copy), 16 Sept.1885. C.4645, p.50, enclosure in no.31: H.E. Colenso to Bishop McKenzie, 18 Mar.1885. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 4.
 103. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/43: H.E. Colenso to Bulwer, 9 Feb.1885 (copy). C.4645, pp.50-51, enclosure in no.31: H.E. Colenso message to the Great Chiefs, 22 Mar.1885.
 104. See above, fn.101.
 105. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to Fr.El. Colenso, 21 Apr.1885 (possibly 1884).
 106. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.324, cols 257-58, question by G. Clark, 26 Mar.1888; C.5331, p.20, no.4: Holland to Havelock, 4 Aug.1887.

by the desire of colonists for more land. Until the middle of 1888, when she welcomed the support of Escombe with great eagerness, Harriette was suspicious of Natal politicians, even Escombe.¹⁰⁷ W.Y. Campbell thought she was far too suspicious. Harriette, for her part, warned Campbell when she told him of a conversation she had had with the Governor, that she confided in him for the sake of the Zulu, not for the sake of the Natal press, with which Campbell had strong links.¹⁰⁸ Harriette was prepared to cooperate with Henry Binns up to a point,¹⁰⁹ but she was hostile to John Robinson, even though the A.P.S. gave him a hearing. In 1887 Harriette did not support the idea of the annexation of Zululand to Natal. She knew Natal control of Zululand would endanger the Zulu hold on land.¹¹⁰

Grievances over loss of land feature very strongly in all the uSuthu representations to the authorities in 1887; but the issue of authority became more and more insistent after May 1887.

Annexation and the Loss of Authority

The Zulu envoys who were in Pietermaritzburg at the time of the annexation and who consulted Campbell on the issues of the loss of land did not gain much from the Governor, but Havelock was clearly concerned. He had accounts of the embassy printed and circulated to the magistrates. The Governor wanted the opinion of his subordinates.¹¹¹ Osborn, predictably, did not think much of the embassy. He dismissed it as the result of Ndabuko's personal ambition. According to Osborn, the embassy had been instigated by Ndabuko to serve his own ends: that of perpetuating the Zulu dynasty in his own person.¹¹² Why Osborn thought this, is not clear. Harriette was contemptuous of such official attitudes. Havelock's answer to the embassy was that the issues of partition were 'closed and sealed'. He would not discuss these matters with Ndabuko and Dinuzulu, but was prepared to see them, if they came to Pietermaritzburg, and to discuss other concerns

107. J.J. Guy, *Destruction of the Zulu Kingdom* (London, 1979), p.237, citing H.E. Colenso to Jorissen, 27 Mar.1886; N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Prof. Kuenen, 7 Nov.1886.

108. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 9 Nov.1888.

109. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to H. Binns, n.d.

110. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/44: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 14 Dec.1888; N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 14 Apr. and 26 May 1887.

111. C.5143, pp.44-45, no.27: Havelock to Holland, 11 May 1887.

112. *Ibid.*, pp.61-62, enclosure in no.39: Osborn's report on the message of Siziba, 4 June 1887.

with them.¹¹³

Zulu complaints were still voiced both to Osborn and to Havelock. Martin Luthuli and Mlilwane came to Campbell on 17 June to complain of the confusion that prevailed. Harriette was with them and she asked Campbell to give particular attention to the specific accusation that was being made against the uSuthu; that they continued to exercise authority to which they were no longer entitled.¹¹⁴ Osborn, erroneously, cited Dinuzulu's pre-annexation retaliatory attack on Mfokazana as an example of this. Mfokazana had angered the uSuthu by taking action against Mankulumana, already a prominent uSuthu supporter, in the guise of smelling out witches.¹¹⁵ What concerned Havelock more were the reports of Dinuzulu's alleged negotiations with the Boers when he entered territory, now part of the New Republic, where his ardent supporters, the abaQulusi, lived.¹¹⁶

In October 1887 Havelock rode out to Bishopstowe in indignant mood. At the time the statement of a Zulu embassy in Pietermaritzburg seemed to portend that a crisis of authority was looming.¹¹⁷ Earlier optimistic pronouncements of the willingness of the uSuthu to accept British authority were challenged by the complaints of Siziba and his companions. Loss of land certainly featured in what they had to say; for they complained that the partition had deprived Dinuzulu of his inheritance and left him 'naked'. In addition, perhaps significantly, they lamented the loss of authority. Osborn, they complained, had usurped the authority of Dinuzulu. Siziba and his colleagues feared that they would not be able to get along with the magistrates.¹¹⁸ Here indeed was a challenge to authority that could not be brushed aside. A number of officials gave thought to what the reply should be, which, when made, insisted on submission.¹¹⁹ Having received reports that the uSuthu had again visited the Boers in republican territory,¹²⁰

113. *Ibid.*, pp.46-48, enclosure in no.27: Governor's message, 3 May 1887.

114. N.A., Col.Coll: pencilled mss., 1 June 1887, statement of the Zulu messengers who complained of the loss of land - the land was 'dead', 'killed by the Boers' and of the imposition of taxes.

115. H. Escombe & F.C. Dumat, *A Remonstrance on Behalf of the Zulu Chiefs* (London, 1889, reprinted Pietermaritzburg, 1908 and 1989), p.8; Laband, *Rope*, p.383.

116. *Ibid.*, p.384.

117. C.5331, pp.42-43, enclosure in no.26: Osborn to Havelock, 21 Sept.1887. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 1 Oct.1887; to Campbell, 17 Oct.1887.

118. See above, fn.19.

119. C.5331, pp.46-47: Havelock's reply to the message of the Zulu chiefs, 18 Oct.1887.

120. *Ibid.*, pp.42-43, enclosure in no.26: Osborn to Havelock, 21 Sept.1887.

Havelock decided that he must intimidate the uSuthu, and - tragically - that Zibhebhu should be returned to the Ndwandwe district.¹²¹ It was plain to Havelock that the question of authority had reached a point where decisive action was needed.

Such a crisis of authority had threatened from the moment Zululand was annexed to Britain. The October partition had deprived Dinuzulu of authority over the abaQulusi; the May annexation subjected him to the sovereignty Britain exercised in Zululand through Melmoth Osborn and the resident magistrates who were appointed to serve under him. Osborn's authority was not absolute; but his antagonism towards the uSuthu was of longstanding. A trial of strength developed early.

What Cardew reported in February 1887¹²² and what was said to H.C. Shepstone in April 1887 showed that the Zulu, in pleading for intervention, were not prepared for the loss of independence. Cardew said they wanted to avoid taxation and were thinking of employing their own Resident. The terms of the Zulu message of 30 April show that, in pleading for intervention, they hoped to secure more land and avoid subjection.¹²³ The Zulu people evidently attached little importance to Osborn's declaration of a protectorate. They were clearly not prepared for all the implications of the assertion of British sovereignty. Dinuzulu found himself harassed by Osborn and impatient of the restrictions imposed on him. Shortly after annexation Osborn fined Dinuzulu for the attack on Mfokazana. Harriette knew Osborn was *ultra vires* and said so.¹²⁴

It was a tall order to expect Dinuzulu and the uSuthu to submit to the administrative structure created in Zululand. Osborn was at the apex. Below him were the resident magistrates. Havelock had some qualms about the competence of all his agents in Zululand, Osborn and the resident magistrates; but there they were.¹²⁵ All the magistrates confronted a difficult solution; some were ill-suited to the task; many were identified with earlier anti-uSuthu dispensations. They were appointed to enforce unpopular

121. Laband, *Rope*, p.388.

122. C.5143, pp.26-27, enclosure in no.18: F. Cardew, memorandum, 3 Feb.1887.

123. *Ibid.*, pp.48-49, enclosures in no.27: statement of Zulu messengers to H.C. Shepstone, 30 Apr.1887 and his reply, 11 May 1887.

124. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso's notes of interview with Havelock, Oct.1887; H.E. Colenso, (no title) *Letter to Lord Knutsford* (printed, London, 1891), paragraph 7 citing evidence of Yamela at the Court of Special Commissioners, p.337.

125. Laband, *Rope*, p.380.

laws like the pass laws and to collect the hut tax. This levy may well have been a more important factor in truculent turbulence than has hitherto been realised. It fell due in May 1888.¹²⁶ In addition, magistrates claimed the right to levy cattle fines on the grounds that they were representatives of the Supreme Chief. It was not surprising that Siziba remarked that the uSuthu were afraid they would not get along with the magistrates.¹²⁷

While she watched the new structure of government taking shape in Zululand, Harriette repeated the Colenso criticisms of the character of Natal administration. The Native Laws Amendment Act simply perpetuated the faults of the past, and she objected to the continued arbitrary powers of the Supreme Chief.¹²⁸ Both in Natal and Zululand the Colensos recognised the prevalence of Shepstonism. That family's influence was certainly strong. Theophilus advised the Governor; his son, Henrique, was Secretary for Native Affairs; his protégé, Osborn, was the Resident Commissioner and Chief Magistrate in Zululand. The Colenso view was that the influence of such men would favour the establishment of a cruel and arbitrary despotism which worked against, not with, the influence of indigenous rulers. Harriette had feared this kind of dispensation for many months and for this reason she had not enthused about British annexation. As Frances Ellen put it, 'a Shepstone or Osborn rule is intolerable'.¹²⁹

Once annexation was proclaimed, Harriette would not encourage the uSuthu to be defiant, but she did try to persuade the Governor that British rule could be established securely, only if the uSuthu were conciliated, not antagonised. She wanted to counter Havelock's suspicions when it was reported that the uSuthu had visited Republican territory. She was always clear that the necessary first step towards stability through conciliation was the removal of Osborn, but she welcomed palliative measures such as the payment of stipends.¹³⁰

126. *Ibid.*, p.383.

127. N.A., Col.Coll: Statement of Dinuzulu and the Heads of the Zulu nation, 11 Oct.1887.

128. *Ibid.*, Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 25 Aug.1887.

129. References are numerous. See, for example, N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to D. Pollock, 26 Sept.1908; and R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/64: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, Nov.1886; C.130/72: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, Thurs., n.d. (Dec.1886, int.ev.); C.130/161: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 7 Oct.1886; C.130/164: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 9 Nov.1886. See, also, Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

130. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Campbell, 12 Aug.1888; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 30 Oct.1887; H.E. Colenso, *Letter to Lord Knutsford, June 1891* and *Mr Commissioner Osborn as One Cause of Confusion in Zulu Affairs* (London, 1892).

When, in October 1887, Havelock rode out to Bishopstowe for a brisk conversation with Harriette, both realised that the situation was serious. Both knew of the complaints of Siziba. It would have been clear to Harriette that, although the uSuthu had escaped annexation to Natal, they could not easily survive a structure of government which recognised no special place for the uSuthu leadership. Havelock, who received continued reports from Osborn of uSuthu truculence, realised that vigorous measures were necessary to avert the disintegration of the 'settlement' of Zulu affairs of which he was the main architect. He intended to visit Zululand, not to overrule the officials of whom the uSuthu complained, but to intimidate the uSuthu and to announce the repatriation of Zibhebhu. He had drawn even closer to the Shepstonian view of the nature of Zulu society and of what constituted right policy.

Before he left for Zululand, Havelock decided to call on Harriette at Bishopstowe. Her close associations with uSuthu leaders and with humanitarian circles in Britain were too strong to be ignored. This was not his first visit. Since his arrival in Natal in February 1886 the Colensos had tried to maintain cordial relations with him. After all, he was then a new man and might bring new measures.¹³¹ Frances Ellen sent him a copy of *The Ruin of Zululand*;¹³² with Harriette, she lunched at Government House. Social pleasantries were exchanged with Lady Havelock, and Harriette seems to have attended a ball at Government House.¹³³

The Colensos were grateful to Havelock for the release of Langalibalele, who was now senile and helpless. In a time of drought the Governor bantered with Harriette about needing the services of the old rainmaker and he congratulated himself that, at least in one matter, he had been able to meet the wishes of Sobantu and his friends.¹³⁴ In London, a question by L.L. Dillwyn, MP for Swansea, an associate of Colenso, elicited from

-
131. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 16 Dec.1886 (re Havelock) and 27 Jan.1887 (re Holland).
 132. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/7: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 6 Apr.1886.
 133. *Ibid.*, A.S.P. C.131/8: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 13 Apr.1886 and C.131/14: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 8 June 1886. N.A., Col.Coll: G. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 31 May (1886, int.ev.); Lady Havelock to S.F. Colenso and H.E. Colenso, various letters dated only by the day of the week; Rees, *Colenso Letters*, p.407, S.F. Colenso to K. Lyell, 18 Sept.1886; p.409, S.F. Colenso to Fr.El. Colenso, n.d. and p.414, S.F. Colenso to Fr.El. Colenso, 7 Feb.1887.
 134. N.A., Col.Coll: Havelock to S.F. Colenso, 2 Apr.1888.

Holland a statement of what was being arranged for Langalibalele.¹³⁵ When the old Hlubi chief did return, he was placed in the Swartkops location. The Colensos succoured him as best they could and found Havelock ready to grant requests. Langalibalele was eager to visit Bishopstowe, where some of his family were located. He was allowed to do so, and the Colensos celebrated with a dinner party. Agnes baked him apple turnovers. Later, since his fatal illness coincided with Harriette's absence in Eshowe, it was left to Agnes to cheer his last days. He died of gangrene in January 1889.¹³⁶

Harriette, in the meanwhile, was fully committed to the uSuthu cause and to challenging official policy. Even when she criticised Havelock's decisions, however, she did not wish to alienate him. But there was anger and indignation at the meeting of October 1887. Harriette concluded, sadly, that Havelock had identified himself with the Osborn-Shepstone party.¹³⁷

As before, Harriette was very involved in the affairs of the uSuthu deputation of October 1887. She knew they were down (*i.e.* in Pietermaritzburg) by 1 October 1887 and that they expected not only to deliver a message to the Governor, but to see herself and Campbell. She paid off the debt which the uSuthu owed Campbell. She offered him a fee of £100 to go to Eshowe to represent the Zulu and to deal with some legal cases that seemed to be pending against Dinuzulu and his followers.¹³⁸ But the Governor refused to have Campbell at Eshowe.¹³⁹ To add to the growing differences, Harriette was critical of the way H.C. Shepstone had recorded the uSuthu representations. She conceded, however, that Shepstone had been ill at the time.¹⁴⁰

Anxious and angry about events in Zululand, Havelock, at his own suggestion, called to see Harriette at Bishopstowe on 24 October. It was not a friendly encounter. Harriette,

135. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.312, col.11: 11 Mar.1887 and see vol.318, col.1522: 8 Aug.1887.

136. N.A., Col.Coll: Agnes Colenso, diary for 1887, entries for 21 and 27 May 1887. *Natal Advertiser*, 24 Jan.1889.

137. C.5331, pp.44-47, no.30.: Havelock to Holland, 20 Oct.1887 with enclosures; pp.47-49, no.31: Havelock to Holland, 26 Oct.1887, with enclosures.

138. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 22 Oct.1888, (copy).

139. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell to Secretary for Zululand and reply, telegrams, 26 Oct.1887.

140. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/78: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 2 Nov.1887.

while agreeing to his visit, had regretted that he had waited until the messengers had gone.¹⁴¹ The Governor came in an indignant mood. Harriette wondered whether he expected her to convey his threats against Dinuzulu to the uSuthu *via* the mythical network of constant communication which was attributed to her. She found the Governor much too quick to accuse Dinuzulu of treason and to speak of hangings. She did not find it reassuring that he brushed aside the questions at issue between Osborn and the uSuthu.

Harriette apparently held her own during the interview. By her own account, she forced the Governor to admit that the Mfokozana affair had taken place before the annexation, and to evade her question whether the Zulus understood the difference between protection and annexation. The Governor had shown uncalled-for indignation. Harriette was self-controlled and dignified, her mother told Frank. She had grown taller by the minute but was otherwise as firm as a rock.¹⁴²

There was another Zulu appeal. Mlilwane and Luthuli came from Ndabuko. They sought counsel and complained:

‘We speak of our Country partitioned and our people torn
asunder, so that we know not where we are, or to whom we
are responsible, or for whom.’

Harriette went with the messengers to see Campbell and ask advice on what they were to do. She directed attention to specific issues where officials blamed the uSuthu. These were: the Mfokazana affair, the arrest of Ndhlovu (maternal uncle of Dinuzulu), the faction fighting between the sons of Mango, and the uSuthu visit to Vryheid.¹⁴³

On the general point Campbell was clear, on the specific issues he was guarded. The old Zululand, he told them, was gone. He thus re-iterated his advice of several months previously, that they should abandon any hope of establishing an independent dynasty. He

141. N.A., Col.Coll: Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 22 Oct.1887, and H.E. Colenso to Havelock, n.d., presumably 22 Oct.1887. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 7, p.1017, H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 22 Oct.1887.

142. N.A., Col.Coll: Agnes Colenso diary for 1887, entry for 24 Oct.1887. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/85: Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 22 Oct.1887 and H.E. Colenso to Havelock, n.d. For account of interview, see C.131/94: H.E. Colenso to Campbell, copy, 24 Oct.1887; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, Oct.1887.

143. N.A., Col.Coll: Record of statement of Mlilwane and Luthuli, sent by Ndabuko and Dinuzulu. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/78: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 2 Nov.1887; C.131/79: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 9 Nov.1887.

insisted that they must obey Mr Osborn. On the specific issues he doubted whether the British could claim jurisdiction over the Mfokazana affair, which had occurred before annexation; but he thought the British did have jurisdiction over the Ndhlovu case. He nevertheless indicated that it was possible that Dinuzulu had some jurisdiction over his own followers.¹⁴⁴ Chesson, to whom Harriette sent a copy of the memorandum, endorsed fully the advice of submission which Campbell had given. He warned that Dinuzulu's consultations with the Boers and his general restlessness would do him no good.¹⁴⁵

In the next few months there was a period of delay in which the threat of confrontation loomed darker.

Hesitation and the Threat of Confrontation

Havelock intended his meeting with the uSuthu leaders at Eshowe in November 1887 to be a decisive event. It was something of an achievement, to which Harriette had contributed,¹⁴⁶ that the Governor and the uSuthu leaders met face to face at Eshowe; but the personal encounter certainly did not produce the kind of result for which Harriette hoped.

The November 1887 interviews clarified the issues, at least to the extent that accusations were formulated and denials given. But Havelock had little to offer. If the uSuthu leaders obeyed the magistrates, they could expect the Governor's friendship, the payment of stipends, and a good reception when they came to Pietermaritzburg. But, the gap between what the uSuthu wanted and what the Governor was prepared to give was too great to be easily bridged. Even under the best of circumstances, amicable relations would probably not have survived very long; but any such prospect was destroyed by the Governor's announcing that he intended to allow the repatriation of Zibhebhu.¹⁴⁷ In making this announcement Havelock followed the advice of Theophilus Shepstone. Always hostile to the pretensions of the uSuthu, Shepstone urged the return of Zibhebhu to the Ndwandwe,

144. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell's advice to Mlilwane and Luthuli, 3 Nov.1887.

145. *Ibid.*, Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 24 Nov. and 16 Dec.1887.

146. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/77: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 26 Oct.1887.

147. C.5331, p.44, no.26: Havelock to Holland, telegram, 16 Nov.1887; p.50, no.33: Havelock to Holland, 1 Nov.1887; pp.51-56, no.35: Havelock to Holland, 18 Nov.1887 with enclosures.

on the grounds that this would throw the balance of power into the hands of the white authorities and avoid pitting white against black in South Africa.¹⁴⁸ The Colenso view was essentially different. Harriette was the unwearied advocate of a policy of conciliating the uSuthu; for she saw this as the crucial point in a policy of just dealing that would, in itself, obviate the danger of a race war.¹⁴⁹

The Colensos were not impressed by the reports of Havelock's November Eshowe *indabas*. Harriette scoffed that the Governor had fined Ndabuko and Dinuzulu fifty head of cattle each for being 'afraid of Mr Osborn'. But she was appalled at the news of the restoration of Zibhebhu. She could not bear to think of what was coming.¹⁵⁰ Months before she had warned Chesson against the possibility of the restoration of Zibhebhu. He had conveyed her warning to others and elicited an assurance from Holland in parliament that Zibhebhu was not to be restored.¹⁵¹ Harriette repeated her misgivings to others in the intervening months. In London Frank was as distressed as his sister at the news. He declined an invitation to an A.P.S. function; he could not bear public discussion of South African affairs. He expressed his concern in a letter to Holland and wanted to ensure that there was a reference in the *Life of Bishop Colenso* to Bulwer's dealings with Zibhebhu.¹⁵² The Colenso role in regard to the restoration of Zibhebhu was initially to warn well in advance of the ill-effects; subsequently, they condemned with vigour the actions of the local officials in regard to Zibhebhu.

In agreeing to the return of Zibhebhu to the Ndwandwe district, Governor and Secretary of State had an exaggerated confidence in the wisdom of the local officials who approved their course. In their turn, local officials appear, in retrospect, to have had an exaggerated idea of the loyalty of Zibhebhu and to have failed to recognise the intensity of the

148. *Ibid.*, p.19, enclosure in no.2: Theophilus Shepstone's memorandum, 23 Apr.1887; pp.27-29, enclosure in no.9: Theophilus Shepstone's memorandum on the policy of allowing Zibhebhu to return to his own country and people, 31 July 1887; pp.30-31, enclosure in no.13: Theophilus Shepstone's memorandum, 12 Aug.1887; and p.41, no.26: Havelock to Holland, 8 Oct.1887.

149. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/67: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 11 May 1887; cf. C.131/83: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 22 Feb.1888.

150. *Ibid.*, C.131/81: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 17 Nov.1887; C.131/83: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 23 Nov.1887.

151. *Ibid.*, C.131/19: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 16 June 1886; C.131/70: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 1 June 1887. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 26 May, 7 and 14 July 1887 and other letters dated simply Tuesday and Wednesday (Oct.1887, int.ev.).

152. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/173: F.E. Colenso to Chesson, 9 Dec.1887; N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 22 Dec.1887.

Mandlakazi-uSuthu conflict.¹⁵³ Though loyalties of individuals wavered, and allegiances changed, there was by the late 1880s a core of remembered hatred so intense that it made the wishes of white magistrates irrelevant in black eyes.

Two leaders and their followings duly moved out of their temporary resting places; Zibhebhu and the Mandlakazi, and Sokwetshatha and the Mthethwa. Zibhebhu and his several hundred warriors headed for the Ndwandwe; Sokwetshatha to the Lower Mfolozi. In the Ndwandwe area Zibhebhu was reinforced by Sikizane, a loyal adherent who, in 1884, had been expelled to Swaziland. In both areas their presence provoked pro-uSuthu resentment; yet the magistrates expected the anti-uSuthu group to support magisterial authority, not to strain it.¹⁵⁴

Havelock did not realise how enmeshed and confused were the competing claims to land in the Ndwandwe district. The Colensos did. The Governor underestimated the dangers of the restoration of Zibhebhu. The Colensos did not. Havelock speedily regretted his decision.¹⁵⁵

In January 1888 major confrontation threatened when Mandlakazi and uSuthu gathered menacingly, and Richard Addison, the magistrate in the hot seat at Ndwandwe, believing his position endangered, resorted to illegal floggings.¹⁵⁶ As reports of disturbance came in from the Ndwandwe district, Havelock criticised his subordinates. He urged them to bestir themselves to prevent Mandlakazi/uSuthu conflicts and to be impartial in their dealings with the Mandlakazi and uSuthu.¹⁵⁷ Already Sir R.N. Fowler, an A.P.S. man, had asked in parliament about Zibhebhu's aggressiveness, and there was demand that papers be presented to parliament.¹⁵⁸

153. C.5331, pp.40-42, no.26: Havelock to Holland, 8 Oct.1887; Laband, *Rope*, pp.397 and 407.

154. *Ibid.*, p.75, no.46: Havelock to Holland, 27 Dec.1887, with enclosures. Laband, *Rope*, Chapter 31, pp.391-413. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

155. C.5331, p.74, no.44: Havelock to Holland, telegram received 10 Jan.1888; pp.80-81, no.48: Havelock to Holland, 3 Jan.1888, and pp.84-85, no.53: 18 Jan.1888 with enclosures.

156. C.5892, pp.292-94, no.171: Havelock to Knutsford with enclosures, 4 June 1889, including letter of George Burgess to *Natal Advertiser*, 16 May 1889, and report from Addison, 23 May 1889.

157. Laband, *Rope*, p.397; C.5331, pp.84-85, no.53: Havelock to Holland, 18 Jan.1888.

158. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.322, col.1005: question by R.N. Fowler, 21 Feb.1888 and vol.323, col.168: question by Colonel Duncan, 5 Mar.1888.

Unmistakeably, the restoration of Zibhebhu had compounded confusion in the Ndwandwe district and aggravated criticism of Havelock. By March 1888 the harassed Governor was willing to take steps to appease the uSuthu. In that month another uSuthu embassy arrived in Pietermaritzburg.

March 1888 was also a month of peak activity for Harriette. When the uSuthu messengers, Mtokwane and Soni and others, arrived in Pietermaritzburg, Harriette received them, heard them, questioned them, and wrote down their statement. Then, as before, she used her Bishopstowe press on their behalf. To their statement she added her own explanatory glosses and she printed the whole for the benefit of officials, and for the advantage of the uSuthu.¹⁵⁹ Harriette thus did her best to be a successful intermediary.

In the meanwhile, the S.N.A. forwarded to the Governor the statement made by the messengers in his office. Clearly, what was uppermost in the uSuthu minds at this point was not their old grievances against partition and annexation but the new and immediate grievances against Zibhebhu. The uSuthu dilemma of 1883 had re-appeared. Effective retaliation against the Mandlakazi would jeopardise good relations with the British authorities, but successful appeal to the British authorities was certain to be slow and unlikely to be successful.¹⁶⁰

The uSuthu statement of March 1888 complained that Zibhebhu was taking too much land and despoiling them of their crops. He was claiming land assigned to him in 1883, not merely land which had been his in 1879. Mtokwane and Soni called attention to the predicament of men who were staunchly pro-uSuthu but who were now being threatened with eviction for the benefit of Zibhebhu. They named Fokhothi kaMaphitha, Msutshwana and Mthumbu among such men. In a moving and much quoted sentence they prophesied that, in time to come, men would regard as a fairy tale the story of how Zibhebhu had been allowed to eat the food of Dinuzulu. In an interesting sentence, which did not appear in the version which Harriette printed, they had Dinuzulu complain that it was the black

159. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, 18 Mar. to 15 July 1888.

160. C.5522, pp.11-20, no.6: Havelock to Knutsford with enclosures, i.e. statement of Mtokwane and Soni to Osborn at Eshowe, Havelock to Osborn, 22 Mar.1888; message as recorded by H.C. Shepstone; Bishopstowe version of the statement, reply of Governor to the Deputation; Havelock to Osborn, 24 Mar.1888; Osborn to Havelock, 25 Mar.1888. Laband, *Rope*, p.397.

people who were destroying him.

Havelock's reply to the Zulu messengers of March 1888 was conciliatory. Grievances would be investigated, boundaries rectified, and losses of grain compensated. The uSuthu would not be allowed to harvest the grain growing in the fields from which they were evicted, but they would receive compensation. For the rest, he repeated old offers but with more emphasis. Ndabuko and Dinuzulu would be welcome to see him in Pietermaritzburg and they were entitled to stipends.¹⁶¹ When Havelock replied to the March 1888 deputation he knew that even Osborn conceded that the boundaries which Addison had belatedly assigned to the Mandlakazi were excessive.¹⁶²

The March 1888 deputation to Pietermaritzburg prompted an amicable exchange between Harriette and Havelock. Harriette sent the Governor copies of the statement which the Zulu messengers had made to her at Bishopstowe, and her record was published in the subsequent Blue Book. She wished in this way to prepare him for his own interview with the messengers. Havelock was appreciative. He asked for more copies. Praising her accuracy, he told Harriette that he would make official use of her version and he accepted her suggestion about compensation for grain. Harriette recommended that compensation should be paid, and that it be paid in kind, not coin. This would be a more visible gesture and there would be less danger of theft. Harriette and Havelock both hoped at this point that Ndabuko and Dinuzulu would come to Pietermaritzburg to see the Governor. Indeed, Havelock asked Harriette, so she believed, to use her influence to persuade Dinuzulu to accept an invitation to Pietermaritzburg, and she suggested to Havelock that he should himself pay the uSuthu leaders their stipends when they visited him. She realised that payment would be more dignified and more acceptable from the hands of the Governor than from hands of a court messenger.¹⁶³ Havelock was friendly. He sent Mrs Colenso

161. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 21 Mar.1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 26 Mar.1888. C.5522, pp.11-20, no.6: Havelock to Knutsford with enclosures, 30 Mar.1888. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.329, col.935: Knutsford on the question of compensation; Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*, pp.11 and 16.

162. C.5522, p.11, no.6: Havelock to Holland, 30 Mar.1888; Laband, *Rope*, pp.397-98.

163. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 23 Mar.1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 26 Mar.1888; H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 21 Mar.1888. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 1 May 1888. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/185: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 26 Mar.1888, with enclosures. C.5522, pp.16-18, enclosure in no.6: statement of Zulu messengers at Bishopstowe, 11 Mar.1888 with annotations by H.E. Colenso.

a copy of a review of the *Life*. He wrote appreciatively and affably to Harriette and passed on information about Zululand.¹⁶⁴

Havelock was at this point a worried but not an angry man. He acknowledged to Harriette that things had been done in Zululand of which he could not approve.¹⁶⁵ He admitted to Stabb, the officer commanding troops, that he believed the partisans of Zibhebhu were seeking again to 'force us to adopt a violent course of action against Dinuzulu'.¹⁶⁶ In England, Chesson at the A.P.S. welcomed the indications of Havelock's change of view as a 'gleam of light'. He advised Harriette to pass on to the Governor pieces of information she might obtain. 'A man in authority is often conciliated by such a display of confidence in his desire to do right,' Chesson observed.¹⁶⁷ This was one of the last pieces of advice Harriette received from Chesson. Harriette later stated her conviction that the Governor, in approaching her in March, had 'used' the influence of Bishop Colenso and explained that she had no influence with the Zulus in her own right, but only that of Sobantu as his daughter.¹⁶⁸ She believed the Governor had invited her assistance in persuading Dinuzulu and Ndabuko to come to Pietermaritzburg to see him.

But though Havelock wished to be conciliatory, he was not prepared to compromise on the issue of British authority. Grievances against Zibhebhu might be adjusted, but magistrates must be obeyed.¹⁶⁹ Yet those magistrates could not genuinely implement a policy of fostering uSuthu trust. When Havelock ordered a revision of the boundary, he told Osborn to accompany Knight to the Ndwandwe district. Knight was to carry out the revision with Osborn at hand so that Knight could consult immediately with him on contested points.¹⁷⁰ Osborn's presence was not likely to inspire uSuthu trust; but they, anyway, were not putting their whole reliance on the Governor's pledges of conciliation. When the messengers reached the Ndwandwe to report the Governor's response, Dinuzulu

164. N.A., Col.Coll: Havelock to S.F. Colenso, 2 Apr.1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 26 Mar., 12 and 27 Apr. and 14 May 1888. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 14 Mar.1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8 (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.1028-31.

165. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 14 Mar.1888.

166. Stabb Papers, vol.4, 2/2/20: Havelock to Stabb, 25 Mar.1888.

167. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 18 Apr.1888

168. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 9, (K.C.A.L. pagination), p.1049.

169. Laband, *Rope*, p.397.

170. *Ibid.*, p.398.

was already across the Phongola.¹⁷¹

In England Chesson's death was a blow to Harriette Colenso. For some months she was uncertain to whom she should direct her appeals to British public opinion.¹⁷² Charles Hancock, whom Frank considered less able than Chesson but well intentioned, served as Secretary to the A.P.S. after Chesson, and did his vigorous best to support Harriette.¹⁷³ He gave place to H.R. Fox Bourne in 1889. Like Chesson a newspaper man, Fox Bourne was to prove a long-serving secretary of the A.P.S.¹⁷⁴

Confrontations and the Attempts at Conciliation

During the period of confrontations Harriette continued to consult with Havelock and to send messages to Zululand, but this was not enough to avert the tragedy and suffering of 1888. Each fracas or clash in Zululand made it harder for Harriette to persuade Havelock that her views - the pro-uSuthu views - should guide his decisions, while in the chaos of Zululand it became less and less likely that the uSuthu would benefit from whatever signs of goodwill she was able to secure. Efforts at conciliation were, thus, thwarted by confrontation. For Harriette, however, each confrontation made it more urgent that she should continue to argue for conciliation.

After reports of Dinuzulu's activities in republican territory, which seemed to presage an attack on Zibhebhu, Havelock told Harriette that Ndabuko's resistance to the serving of warrants on 26 April had 'much complicated matters'.¹⁷⁵ Harriette's response was to continue to communicate with the Governor and to send messages to the uSuthu. She explained to Havelock the reasons for uSuthu mistrust and suggested that they might be recovering cattle rather than raiding. She vigorously reasserted the Colenso contention that there was a Zulu nation held together by the royal house.¹⁷⁶ She sent messages to the

171. *Ibid.*, p.399.

172. N.A., Col.Coll: Sophie Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 17 May 1888.

173. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: Hancock to H.E. Colenso, 10 Sept. and 22 Nov.1888.

174. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

175. N.A., Col.Coll: Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 14 May 1888. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), p.1031.

176. *Ibid.*, pp.1031-40 for communications and messages of May and June 1888 especially H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 3, 20 and 25 June 1888. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/221: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 26 May and 13 June 1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 14 June 1888.

uSuthu urging that the Governor might yet be willing to receive them in Pietermaritzburg but added the warning that her words were written in ignorance of events in Zululand.¹⁷⁷

In fact her peace efforts in 1888 were thwarted by clashes in Zululand. The affair of the uSuthu *umuzi* on 26 April destroyed the co-operation which Harriette won from Havelock in March. The confrontation at Ceza in early June came just after Harriette had sent another party of messengers to Zululand. They reached Ceza on 15 June.¹⁷⁸

Realising that the conciliatory reply to the uSuthu message of March 1888 had not defused the situation, Harriette decided at the end of May 1888 to send messages of her own. She chose as her emissaries Mubi Nondenisa and Twaisa Mabaso, both Bishopstowe men of long-standing and experienced messengers. Havelock knew of their departure and of the message they carried. He told Harriette her message was full of good counsel and he hoped that it would be effective. He instructed Osborn to allow her messengers to pass through safely.¹⁷⁹ In the event, they were too late to prevent the confrontation, but their arrival gave the uSuthu another opportunity to state their own case. Mubi and Twaisa reached Ceza a few days after the advance of police, troops, and native allies and the *melée* that followed.¹⁸⁰ Subsequently, in bitter weather, they recorded the statement of the uSuthu chiefs and headmen. In addition, the uSuthu decided to send their own messengers, Sifo and Soni, to return to Pietermaritzburg and Bishopstowe with Harriette's men. They claimed that they accompanied the Bishopstowe men for safety's sake. Harriette, who believed that by her actions she had allowed the uSuthu to speak, was also concerned that they should be heard. She wrote frequently to Havelock.¹⁸¹

177. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 12 May, 3, 20 and 25 June 1888; R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/221: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 26 May 1888. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.1031-40.

178. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/186: H.E. Colenso to Editor, *Times of Natal*, (copy), 15 Aug.1888; Laband, *Rope*, pp.401 and 404-05.

179. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 27 Apr. and 12 May 1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 14 June 1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.1034-39 for record of correspondence with Havelock and messages to Zululand. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

180. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Campbell, 12 Aug.1888.

181. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination). p.1034 *et seq.* H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 20 and 25 June, 3 and 4 July 1888; especially p.134 for H.E. Colenso's comments on the way her peace initiatives intended to promote conciliation, were blocked by acts of authority; p.1044 for record of uSuthu statements (a) by the chiefs to her messengers at Ceza, 17 June 1888 and (b) by uSuthu messengers at Bishopstowe.

Unfortunately it was again much too late. Messengers travelled slowly. There were delays. By the time a Zulu response to her message was known, Msutshwana had been murdered and the Mandlakazi had been routed at Ivuna.¹⁸² Early in July Harriette implored the Governor to suspend hostilities until he heard what the messengers had to say, but Havelock, though reluctant to surrender all control to the military, had already decided on a policy of subjugation and did not attach much importance to the message.¹⁸³ Lieutenant-General H.A. Smyth arrived from Cape Town and called for more reinforcements. In Zululand Addison and Stabb dislodged Shingana from Hlophekhulu on 2 July 1888, and three weeks later Major McKean marched through the Lower Mfolozi putting *imizi* to the torch and then thrust on to the Ndwandwe.¹⁸⁴

Early in July Harriette Colenso, still working for peace and conciliation, sent in to the Governor the statement of Sifo and Soni in several parts. On 15 July he acknowledged the statement and promised a reply on the following day. After she had heard a Zulu account of that reply, Harriette wanted to be quite sure that the Governor's words had been correctly conveyed: *viz.* that he understood that the Zulu envoys impeached Mr Osborn, but he, the Governor, could not enquire into such things, nor give an answer to them about the arrest of Qethuka, the influential uSuthu chief in the Entonjaneni district, until they had surrendered. Qethuka's arrest had occasioned bloodshed.¹⁸⁵ Harriette was disquieted by the tone of Havelock's reply. She told Havelock that the messengers were disappointed that they carried back a message 'written all in red, as though in blood'. She assured Havelock that the uSuthu were confident they could answer the charges against them. She requested permission to see the Governor and was granted an interview at Government House on the 22 July.¹⁸⁶

-
- 182. Laband, *Rope*, p.407 and pp.408-13. C.5522, p.69, no.47: Havelock to Knutsford, telegram, 20 July 1888.
 - 183. N.A., Col.Coll: Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 14 July 1888; H.E. Colenso to G. Browne, 4 July 1888. C.5522, p.69, no.47: Havelock to Knutsford, telegram, 20 July 1888.
 - 184. Laband, *Rope*, pp.416, 417-19 and 421.
 - 185. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 18 July 1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.1040-44, correspondence and comment of July 1888; Laband, *Rope*, p.416.
 - 186. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 12 July 1888; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 15 July 1888; H.E. Colenso to G. Browne, letters written between 15 and 22 July; H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 3 July 1888 and 18 July 1888, copy in A.M. Colenso's script; Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 22 July 1888.

Harriette did not find the interview comforting. She urged upon the Governor her view that, if it was in fact the case that the uSuthu were dispersing from Ceza, this showed them involved in the same kind of 'terrified running away' that had been characteristic of Langalibalele.¹⁸⁷ In retrospect, she believed that her arguments and the statements of Sifo and Soni had obliged the authorities to abandon the charges of cattle stealing against Dinuzulu, but the only firm assurance she had from the Governor was that the uSuthu, once they had surrendered, would have a fair trial. He warned her, too, that even if the uSuthu leaders did surrender, he doubted whether he would be able to keep them in Zululand.

For her part Harriette put her own point of view. She was quite certain that the uSuthu could not be induced to surrender to Osborn. Havelock, who was not uncritical of the local officials in Zululand, agreed to Harriette's request that the uSuthu should be given the opportunity to surrender to the military, and that military men should take the initial depositions.¹⁸⁸ Havelock gathered from the interview that 'Dinuzulu and Co. (sic) are in a sorry plight and anxious to surrender'. Havelock wanted Colonel Stabb to receive the expected surrender, but this Smyth would not sanction. On his arrival from the Cape, Smyth was in charge of military operations. Havelock hoped nevertheless that Stabb would keep his ears open to any representations he might receive.¹⁸⁹ The reply which Havelock therefore sent back to the uSuthu leaders through Sifo and Soni was that he could not consider the complaints while Dinuzulu was still in arms. Harriette claimed later, that it was on receiving this message, which implied that there would be full enquiry after surrender, that the uSuthu dispersed from Ceza.¹⁹⁰

After her interview with Havelock Harriette evidently believed there remained three ways in which she could help the uSuthu. She could give the uSuthu side of the events in Zululand as much publicity as possible. She could encourage the uSuthu to end confrontations and suffering by submission. Thirdly, she could do everything possible to ensure that they were given a fair trial.

187. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso's record of interview at Government House on 22 July 1888.

188. *Ibid.*, R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 24 July 1888.

189. Stabb Papers, vol.5, 2/2/34: Havelock to Stabb, private and confidential, 23 July 1888; 2/2/35: Havelock to Stabb, private and confidential, 25 July 1888.

190. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 15 Oct.1888.

In publicising the uSuthu standpoint Harriette found a sympathetic ally in the editor of the *Natal Witness*. She provided the paper with the necessary materials: a translation of the statement which the uSuthu leaders had made to her own messengers, as they recorded it, together with the English translation of the statement of Sifo and Soni, as made and recorded in Pietermaritzburg. On 23 July the *Natal Witness* devoted a full page to reporting the experiences of Mubi and Twaisa and displayed these statements in full. There was strong editorial comment. Here was a composite indictment of officials which drew attention to the official favouritism towards Zibhebhu and presented the uSuthu account of the experience at Ceza. It was this statement, for example, that called attention to the alleged stabbing of uSuthu envoys, one of whom was killed. The publication of the uSuthu version encouraged favourable attention to the uSuthu cause and the uSuthu experience.¹⁹¹ That was gratifying, but it is also evident that the *Natal Witness* wanted to tilt at Havelock rather than help the uSuthu. A little later the *Natal Witness* seemed to take the side of the military against the Governor when it blamed Havelock for the delay in military operations. Harriette remonstrated that the criticism was unfair: the situation had been one of parley for which the Governor should be given credit.¹⁹²

The deputation of Sifo and Soni, who accompanied Mubi and Twaisa on their return to Pietermaritzburg, did not achieve the pacification by negotiation for which Harriette hoped, but her intervention at least secured publicity for the uSuthu standpoint. Havelock telegraphed to London the news of the arrival of the envoys. Anxious to be able to refute uSuthu allegations, Havelock did not send the full statement of Sifo and Soni to London until September, when the rebellion had been crushed. He then wrote a very substantial despatch and included a number of lengthy memoranda from local officials to deny claims made by the uSuthu envoys. The documentation dealt with a host of separate issues and disputes. Different perceptions of the same event are evident, as well as confusion, genuine misunderstanding, and possible misinformation. Misunderstanding may well have arisen from the problems of translating idiomatic language, but there is the possibility of deliberate misrepresentation about the siting of the important *umuzi*, the Gqikazi, which had been located at different places at different times. The crux, however, was that neither

191. *Ibid.*, Sutcliffe, editor of *Natal Witness*, to H.E. Colenso, 18 and 21 July 1888 and *Natal Witness*, 23 July 1888.

192. *Natal Witness*, 13 Oct. 1888, and letter of H.E. Colenso published 17 Oct. 1888.

the uSuthu nor the officials were capable of empathising with the point of view of the other. What the Governor wrote in his covering despatch showed that he had already concluded that the uSuthu were guilty of rebellion.¹⁹³

Harriette did not send again to the uSuthu until she had some reason to hope that they would be given a fair trial. She was in a familiar situation: in order to help the uSuthu she had herself to obtain help. Meanwhile, Campbell had left Natal for the Transvaal during 1888. Harriette, therefore, set aside her misgivings about Harry Escombe and was glad to approach him for advice. She urged that Dinuzulu was already in as much need of legal care as if he had already been arrested.¹⁹⁴ Escombe had been associated with the Colensos before on political matters and in regard to more personal issues, such as Robert's financial affairs and the army enquiry of 1886, by which Offy Shepstone had reputedly cleared his name.¹⁹⁵ Like Campbell earlier, he counselled submission. More crucial was the fact that Harriette obtained from him a promise that he would defend the uSuthu chiefs, if they surrendered.¹⁹⁶

Escombe's motives in giving the promise are discussed later. What mattered to Harriette was that it encouraged her to send a message of condolence and counsel to the uSuthu. Once more Mubi Nondenisa was her messenger but he was accompanied now by a younger man than Twaisa Mabaso, namely Mbulawu, son of Langalibalele. The Natal government issued safe conducts for them, and both the Governor and the Secretary of State received copies of her message.¹⁹⁷

The message they carried was not a joyful promise. It was a sombre explanation. It was carefully drafted and carefully translated. Characteristically, Harriette did not rely only on her own skill but applied to R.C.A. Samuelson for his expertise as well.¹⁹⁸ She told

193. C.5892, p.50 *et seq.*, no.34: Havelock to Knutsford, 10 Sept.1888, with enclosures.

194. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to mother, 4 June 1888; H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 12 July 1888.

195. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 11 May 1886. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Goodricke, Dec.1887; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 2 May 1888.

196. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Campbell, 12 Aug.1888; H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 25 Aug.1888. H.E. Colenso, *The Present Position among the Zulus with Some Suggestions for the Future* (London, 1893), p.21 fn. quoting Escombe's own comment.

197. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 26 July 1888; G. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 27 July 1888. C.5892, pp.3-6, no.3: Havelock to Knutsford, 5 Aug.1888 with enclosures *viz.* H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 1 Aug.1888 and H.E. Colenso to Heads of the Zulu nation, 31 July 1888.

198. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to Samuelson, 28 July 1888. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

the uSuthu leaders that the words were bitter to her and that she wrote them with a heavy heart. She formulated harsh words of explanation and of counsel. She wrote them, she claimed, according to the spirit of her father, who would show up the truth however hard and uncomfortable it might be. She explained that the uSuthu options were limited. What she did offer was the choice between continued opposition or surrender. To her, to continue the opposition would be tantamount to 'dying on a heap'. Submission at least offered the opportunity that they might turn against their oppressors and perhaps precipitate an enquiry which would, in the end, vindicate the uSuthu. Clearly she favoured submission; but, though this was later to provoke an adverse comment from Knutsford, she would not blame them if they decided to continue the conflict.¹⁹⁹ She wrote to Colonel Stabb of the possibility of surrender and gave her messengers a letter which they were to present to him, if Ndabuko and Dinuzulu opted for surrender and accompanied them to the Colonel.²⁰⁰ Meanwhile she wrote to W.Y. Campbell asking him to write to the press on behalf of the Zulu and mooted the possibility of an official Transvaal protest.²⁰¹

What would have happened if these messengers had arrived at Ceza before the dispersal of the uSuthu can never be known. In fact the uSuthu had abandoned the Ceza position. Her messengers caught up with the uSuthu leaders only beyond the Mkhuze. On their return they reported to Harriette and, through Harriette, to the Governor that they had found the uSuthu in 'all the confusion of a hurried start', afraid of being caught between the advancing British troops and a Boer commando. They claimed that Ndabuko wished to surrender, and Harriette believed that her advice would have been acted upon, but for the way in which the uSuthu were being harried.²⁰²

Harriette summed up the uSuthu view as her messengers claimed to have apprehended it:

'It was plain to them, however, that the suggestion of surrender to the English on the grounds & [sic] in the manner specified in my message,

199. Z.G.H.713/511/1888: H.E. Colenso to Governor, 1 Aug.1888 enclosing copy of her message to the Zulu chiefs. C.5892, pp.3-6, no.3: Havelock to Knutsford, 6 Aug.1888 with enclosures; p.21, no.14: Knutsford to Havelock, 13 Sept.1888.

200. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Col Stabb, 31 July 1888.

201. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to Campbell, 12 Aug.1888.

202. *Ibid.*, John Emmett to H.E. Colenso, 12 Aug.1888. C.5892, pp.34-35, no.25: Havelock to Knutsford, 29 Aug.1888 enclosing H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 25 Aug.1888; cf. *Natal Witness*, 17 Oct.1888, letter of H.E. Colenso, 15 Oct.1888.

with the assurance that I was permitted to convey that Mr Advocate Escombe, MLC would then be willing to defend the Chiefs, was gratefully and favourably received, & [sic] would surely have been acted upon even now, if the Zulus were only allowed breathing space.²⁰³

In Natal, the Governor was concerned enough about the messengers to call at Bishopstowe on 17 September 1888.²⁰⁴ But, it seems, that, because the chiefs surrendered, he drew back from association with Harriette. He denied that he had ever made use of the Bishop's posthumous influence and, when she reminded him of the interview of 15 March, responded that the invitation he had then extended to Dinuzulu had been cancelled by the subsequent reports of Dinuzulu's dealings with the Boers of the New Republic. He denied her contention that the disturbances had been caused by the return of Zibhebhu and dealt curtly with later messages. In a private letter to the Colonial Office in February 1890 Havelock repudiated any suggestion that he had offered 'inducements' to Dinuzulu to effect his capture.²⁰⁵

Confrontations and controversies in Natal continued to arouse some interest in London. On 5 June Knutsford announced that he had telegraphed to Havelock to 'use all means' to crush the insurrection.²⁰⁶ Later he announced the clash at Ivuna.²⁰⁷ In the House of Commons, de Worms put the blame firmly on Dinuzulu,²⁰⁸ but there were MPs like G.B. Clark, the 'hard-headed' Scots radical who had visited South Africa in 1887, and Osborne Morgan, a Welsh Liberal MP and former Under-Secretary for Colonies, who were ready with questions, some of which suggest Colenso coaching.²⁰⁹ Though grieved over events in Zululand and attitudes in England, Frank Colenso did his 'wretched best'. He wrote a letter to *The Times* on 16 July and appealed to W.E. Gladstone.²¹⁰

203. C.5892, pp.34-35, no.25: Havelock to Knutsford, 29 Aug.1888 enclosing H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 25 Aug.1888, see especially p.35.

204. N.A., Col.Coll: G. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 16 and 17 Sept.1888; Mss account in H.E. Colenso's script of interview with Governor at Bishopstowe on 12 Sept.1888.

205. *Ibid.*, Havelock to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct.1888; G. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 12 Nov.1888. CO.427/3/25685: Havelock to C.O., private, 2 Feb.1890.

206. British *Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.326, col.1150: statement by Knutsford and cols 1182-83: statement by de Worms, 5 June 1888.

207. *Ibid.*, vol.327, col.1255: statement by Knutsford, 26 June 1888.

208. *Ibid.*, col.1566: question by W. Redmond, answered by de Worms, 28 June 1888.

209. *Ibid.*, cols 1556-57: question by Clark, 28 June 1888; vol.328, cols 57-58: questions by Clark, 2 July 1888; vol.328, cols 432-33: questions by Osborne Morgan, 5 July 1888. The questions by Clark and Osborne Morgan were answered by Sir John Gorst. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

210. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 12 July 1888; Sophie Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 5 July 1888.

The Liberal leader acknowledged this by postcard and may have passed Frank's letter on to Lord Granville, a former Secretary of State who had admired Bishop Colenso.²¹¹ Granville asked for information in the House of Lords.²¹² Frank saw Clark frequently at the House of Commons, lent him a copy of the *Life of Bishop Colenso*, and waited eagerly for the short debate which Clark precipitated, when he moved to reduce the colonial vote on the 23 July. True to Colenso coaching, Clark, in the discussion that followed, asked for a commission of enquiry and blamed local officials.²¹³ A little later, uSuthu information supplied by Frank led Clark astray, when he asked whether Addison had been one of Zibhebhu's whitemen. This imputation was easily refuted in the Commons; for, although Addison had served in the Reserve as a carbineer, was anti-uSuthu and favoured Zibhebhu, he had not been one of Zibhebhu's white freebooter allies in the Zulu civil war of the 1880s. Harriette was obliged to concede the point, at least temporarily.²¹⁴

Clark's earlier initiative was more effective. On 23 July, the day when the *Natal Witness* publicised the statement of Sifo and Soni and while McKean continued his 'pacification' in Zululand,²¹⁵ the House of Commons spent a little time discussing the question of Zululand. Although Clark withdrew his motion and did not divide the House, at least attention was given to Zulu issues.

One of the most interesting contributions to this debate came from Joseph Chamberlain. He supported the Conservative government but he had only recently abandoned the Gladstonian Liberal party, and it was known that there were those who wished to win him back. His words, therefore, carried special weight when he criticised the local officials. At the time he was associated with people like John Mackenzie of Bechuanaland and F.W. Chesson, the secretary of the A.P.S., as advocates of a policy of humanitarian imperialism in which 'native' chiefdoms and races would be placed under the authority and protection

211. *Ibid.*, Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 29 Apr.1886.

212. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.328, cols 684-86: 9 July 1888.

213. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 12 July 1888; *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.329, cols 215-41: 23 July 1888. *The Times*, 24 July 1888.

214. N.A., Col.Coll: G.B. Clark to F.E. Colenso, 19 Aug.1888; H.E. Colenso's record of interview with Havelock, 17 Sept.1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), p.1043 fn. and p.1044.

215. C.5892, pp.6-10, no.4: Havelock to Knutsford, 7 Aug.1888 with enclosures and see fn.206.

of an effective imperial official.²¹⁶ Later on, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, he found it necessary to conciliate white colonial opinion at the expense of the black races, but that lay in the future.²¹⁷ What Natal opinion alleged was that Chamberlain advocated 'restoring' Dinuzulu to a position of secure overall authority.²¹⁸ He had certainly criticised local officials and the policies they pursued.²¹⁹

Parliamentary interest of this kind helped Harriette in the next phase of her endeavour: that of securing a fair trial for the uSuthu leaders. If ministers like Knutsford had blamed the uSuthu from the beginning, other MPs had expressed the Colenso point of view. Harriette drew particular attention to Joseph Chamberlain's criticism of officials in her letter of August in which she counselled submission. While Escombe was in England, Frank hoped to arrange an introduction for him to Chamberlain - an aunt of Chamberlain was a 'connection' of Frank's wife Sophie.²²⁰ Some months later the leader-writer in the *Natal Witness* of 24 November 1888 hoped that Mr Chamberlain would bring his powerful influence to bear to stop the trials.²²¹

Surrender and the Preparation of Defence

Harriette thought that Ndabuko would speedily give himself up to Colonel Stabb, and she later claimed that it was her messages to the chiefs that did in fact induce them to surrender.²²² Believing this, she felt even more responsible for them, but it is impossible to say how important her intervention was. While the chiefs did not rush to surrender, their choices narrowed. Ndabuko abandoned ideas of Tongaland.²²³ The Natal authorities ensured the hostility of the Swazi king towards them, and Dinuzulu found himself under pressure in the South African Republic.²²⁴ Campbell advised that Dinuzulu should surrender in Zululand, if indemnity could be obtained.²²⁵ Addison

-
- 216. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: Chesson to Fr.El. Colenso, 9 Oct.1886. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.326, col.1016: question by J. Chamberlain, 4 June 1888.
 - 217. See below, Chapter Eight.
 - 218. *Natal Witness*, leader, 25 Aug.1888.
 - 219. H.E. Colenso, *Mr Chamberlain on the Zulu Question in 1888*, leaflet, issued in London, 1895.
 - 220. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, Wed. morning (1888, int.ev.).
 - 221. *Natal Witness*, 24 Nov.1888.
 - 222. This is implied in *Women's Penny Paper*, 20 July 1889, letter from H.E. Colenso dated 18 June 1889.
 - 223. C.5892, p.11. no.7: Havelock to Knutsford, telegram, 11 Sept.1888; p.28, no.19: Havelock to Knutsford, telegram, 19 Sept.1888.
 - 224. *Ibid.*, pp.2-3, no.2: Havelock to Knutsford, 5 Aug.1888 with enclosures.
 - 225. N.A., Col.Coll: Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 24 Oct.1888.

refused to give such indemnity. In the end, Dinuzulu's choice lay between presenting himself to the Governor in Pietermaritzburg or exile among Boer farmers. He decided to travel to Pietermaritzburg and surprised Agnes Colenso, her mother, and Katie Giles in the early hours of 15 November 1888.²²⁶

The surrender of Ndaduko and Dinuzulu may have been due more to Escombe than simply to Harriette's message. He had insisted that his willingness to defend the uSuthu was conditional on their voluntary surrender. Travelling via the South African Republic, he had a brief interview with President Kruger while *en route* to Britain, and he may have discussed Dinuzulu as well as customs dues with the President.²²⁷ Professor van Wyk points to Escombe's links with Jim Henderson, the former attorney-general of the New Republic. Henderson rode out to Bishopstowe a few days before Dinuzulu arrived, and his son-in-law accompanied the young uSuthu leader and his *izinduna*. Harriette was herself in touch with J. Emmett, an associate of Henderson. The Zulu party expected to find Henderson in Pietermaritzburg. Apparently Agnes was contemptuous of Henderson.²²⁸ It is not easy to interpret those snippets of information. It seems that many wheels were turning, although their tracks are difficult to discern or interpret. It may also be very significant that in September 1888 the High Commissioner published in Cape Town the Supplementary Convention by which Britain accepted the wish for Union of the South African and the New Republics.²²⁹ The *Natal Mercury* had perceptively called the uSuthu chiefs the 'white elephants of diplomacy'.²³⁰

Dinuzulu was the last prominent uSuthu to be taken prisoner. Ndaduko surrendered to the military at the Mona camp in September.²³¹ Shingana returned to the vicinity of Hlophekhulu where he was captured.²³² Early in August Knutsford announced in the House of Lords the surrender of Somkhele, the prominent coastal chief.²³³ Other

-
226. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso, manuscript account of the surrender. *Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand* (London, 1890), p.995 *et seq.*, Appendix R (re appeal to Privy Council).
 227. *Natal Advertiser*, 'Natal and Transvaal: Mr Escombe in Pretoria', 20 Oct.1888.
 228. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Nov.1888; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 5 Sept.1888. A.J. van Wyk, Dinuzulu en die Usutu-opstand van 1888, *AYB* 1979 (Pretoria, 1983), pp.119-20, citing C.S.C.Z. pp.930-31.
 229. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.326, col.144: question by Osborne Morgan, 14 May 1888.
 230. *Natal Mercury*, leader, 15 Sept.1888.
 231. Laband, *Rope*, p.424.
 232. *Ibid.*, p.425.
 233. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.329, col.1195: 2 Aug.1888.

wanted men were arrested.²³⁴ The immediate Colenso endeavour was now to provide for the defence of the uSuthu prisoners, while continuing to endorse uSuthu messages to the Governor.²³⁵

In July the Governor promised Harriette that the uSuthu should have a fair trial. Harriette wanted to be sure that the tribunal would be fair and that the prisoners should have effective legal defence. She thought that a general commission of enquiry into the affairs of Zululand would be much more appropriate than a 'trial' of the uSuthu. There was some local support for a wider enquiry,²³⁶ but the days of any kind of 'truth and reconciliation commission' lay far in the future.

In June 1888 Harriette had suggested to Havelock that Osborn be given six months leave prior to the enquiry²³⁷ and she was not alone in her belief that the judicial investigation should not be entrusted to local officials. Both the Governor and the Colonial Office realised that this would outrage humanitarian opinion.²³⁸ Besides, Havelock's trust in Osborn had been undermined during the events of 1888. He had confided his misgivings to Stabb, and received from the colonel corroboration of grounds for misgiving.²³⁹ By the end of 1888 and early 1889 Osborn's retirement was being spoken of and discussed, but there were pension difficulties, so he stayed on.²⁴⁰ At one point Havelock seems to have thought of appointing Colonel Stabb to investigate the disturbances. But the idea hardly got off the ground, as Colonel Stabb died of a heart attack.²⁴¹ What mattered was whether or not the trial of cases arising out of the disturbances was to be entrusted to the already existing courts or to a specially constituted tribunal. There was confusion on this issue. Knutsford indicated that 'a Special Commissioner' would be appointed for the trial of 'Dinuzulu and others'.²⁴² The resident magistrates were instructed to suspend hearing cases arising out of the disturbances. On the other hand, Osborn, as Chief

234. C.5892, p.15, no.9: Havelock to Knutsford, 14 Aug.1888 with enclosures.

235. K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 9, (K.C.A.L. pagination), p.1049.

236. *Natal Advertiser*, leader, 9 Aug.1888.

237. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 13 June 1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, (K.C.A.L. pagination), p.1036.

238. C.5892, pp.32-34, no.24: Havelock to Knutsford, 29 Aug.1888, enclosing report by Michael Gallwey; cf. p.29, no.20: Knutsford to Havelock, telegram, 21 Sept.1888.

239. Laband, *Rope*, p.416.

240. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Campbell, 12 Aug.1888.

241. Stabb Papers, vol.5, 2/2/34: Havelock to Stabb, private and confidential, 23 July 1888.

242. C.5892, p.29, no.20: Knutsford to Havelock, telegram, 21 Sept.1888.

Magistrate, held sessions of the Chief Magistrate's Court where he was assisted by resident magistrates to deal with some cases of friction between uSuthu and Mandlakazi. Garbled newspaper reports of these cases appalled Harriette, so her representations to the authorities were strong.²⁴³

There was some truth in the newspaper reports and justification for Harriette's concern. Men were executed in Eshowe in November 1888.²⁴⁴ One of the hanged men - Nkhowana - had been found guilty on a charge of murder arising from Mandlakazi-uSuthu friction. It seems therefore that Havelock was disingenuous when he gave a total denial of the allegations that men had been hanged in Eshowe.²⁴⁵ On the other hand, the newspapers were wrong in claiming that the murderers of a white man had been executed and in regard to the number of executions. Osborn may have decided to proceed with some of these cases in the belief that the Court of the Special Commissioners would hear only the cases against uSuthu leaders.

On 8 October Knutsford telegraphed instructions that a Court of Special Commissioners should be appointed. Following the suggestion of Gallwey in regard to personnel, he endorsed the selection of Wragg (President) assisted by Fannin and Rudolph.²⁴⁶ Some of Harriette's criticisms of the Court of Special Commissioners anticipated the actual appointment of the special tribunal. During an earlier interview she had told Havelock that she doubted the 'fairness' of any judicial tribunal when 'everyone was on the same side.'²⁴⁷ When Proclamation IV of 16 October 1888 was published, her condemnation of its provisions was rapid. Harriette consulted with her lawyer associates, Campbell and Escombe, and then submitted her objections to the Governor. She made the core criticisms

243. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 20 Oct.1888; G. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct. and 12 Nov.1888; K.C.A.L., H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Digest*, Series 9, (K.C.A.L. pagination), pp.1048-50, correspondence of H.E. Colenso and G. Browne (private secretary to the Governor), Oct.1888.

244. CO.427/3/24974, no.168: Havelock to Knutsford, 16 Nov.1888, and minute by Fairfield, 27 Dec.1888; CO.427/3/24975, no.169: Havelock to Knutsford, 17 Nov.1888; CO.427/3/24976, no.170: Havelock to Knutsford, 18 Nov.1888.

245. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*, pp.11 and 78. C.O.427/3/23660: parliamentary question to be posed by Dr Clark, 27 Nov.1888; and C.O.427/3/23777: Havelock to C.O., telegram, 2 Dec.1888, denying truth of newspaper reports that 5 men had been executed, and impugning the reliability of all Natal newspapers, except *Mercury*.

246. Laband, *Rope*, p.425.

247. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 145): notes of an interview, n.d. and fragmentary (Sept.1888? int.ev.).

of the Court of the Special Commissioners: it should not have been appointed by Havelock; it should not have denied the accused the benefit of a jury; it should not be held in Eshowe; and it should not be conducted with such speed as to make impossible an adequate defence.²⁴⁸ These criticisms of the Court of the Special Commissioners were repeated over and over again by the uSuthu defence and the uSuthu friends.²⁴⁹ They did not carry much impact. Havelock probably felt, in October 1888, that he had done his best in the circumstances in which he was placed. In effect, he had by now identified with his officials and he had received instructions from the Secretary of State.

One of Harriette's main contributions to the defence of the uSuthu was that she secured the services of a legal team. The key figure here was Harry Escombe, a man of standing in the colonial community, however much the Colonial Office might carp at him.²⁵⁰ She consulted him in July 1888 and believed she had from him a firm promise that he would defend the uSuthu chiefs;²⁵¹ but in September 1888, after the surrender of Ndabuko, he wished to be freed from his commitment. Not many months before, Harriette had expressed strong reservations about Escombe. Now she would not allow him to renege.²⁵² Dignified but unyielding, Harriette conceded that she could not pass over to Escombe her own responsibilities to the uSuthu but, she insisted, Escombe's commitment was to the Zulu people, not to herself. It was not for her to release him from these obligations. Escombe pleaded his commitment to Responsible government. Harriette responded with the comment that her sympathy for the uSuthu did not preclude concern for other issues. She recalled that her father had commented earlier that he did not know that they would be worse off under Responsible government.²⁵³ For Escombe the real problem was his intention of visiting Britain, but he would fulfil his promise, although he later commented to Merriman, the Cape politician, that it had been made in 'an unguarded

248. N.A., Col.Coll: telegrams and communications of Oct.1888, e.g. H.E. Colenso to Governor, 19 Oct.1888; Governor to H.E. Colenso, 24 Oct.1888 and Campbell to Governor, 26 Oct.1888. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 30 Oct.1888.

249. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*, pp.2-3.

250. C.O.427/3/24979: Havelock to Knutsford, 21 Nov.1888. Minute by Fairfield, 26 Dec.1888.

251. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 4 June 1888;; H.E. Colenso to H. Escombe, 12 July 1888; M.M. Fuze, *The Black People and Whence They Came: a Zulu View*. Translated by H.C. Lugg, edited by A.T. Cope (Pietermaritzburg, 1979), p.128.

252. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.131/59: H.E. Colenso to Chesson, 1 Mar.1887.

253. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 27 Sept.1888 and notes of interview with Escombe, n.d. (Sept.1888, int.ev.). B.M. Nicholls, 'Harriette Colenso and the Issues of Responsible Government in Natal'. Paper presented at the Workshop for Natal Historians, University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg, 1993.

moment'.²⁵⁴

The result was a compromise. Escombe met the uSuthu leaders and Harriette in conference. Harriette recognised that he and the British parliament had made appointments, but Escombe agreed that he would return if summoned.²⁵⁵ In the meanwhile, he engaged the services of Campbell to stand in for him, and 'Kambula' returned temporarily from the Transvaal to take charge of the defence at a fee. F.C. Dumat and the 'white uSuthu' and Zulu linguist, R.C.A. Samuelson, both advocates and attorneys of the Natal Supreme Court, were associated with him in this. Campbell instructed that Miss Colenso was to be 'the source of defence information'. George Burgess, a reporter, was recruited as shorthand writer.²⁵⁶ It was understood that Escombe, when in England, would work with the A.P.S. and members of the British parliament and would make representations to the Colonial Office.

Escombe's disinterestedness over the uSuthu trials of 1888-89 has been highly praised,²⁵⁷ but if one thinks in terms of his whole career, then high praise seems undeserved. For all his hesitation, Escombe was shrewd enough to see that there was advantage to be gained for himself and for Natal by his championship of the uSuthu. By 1888 he was firmly identified with the Forward party: the political group which favoured Responsible government for Natal, and the expansion of Natal's boundaries.²⁵⁸ One of the obstacles in the way of accomplishing these goals was that the 'home' government mistrusted the attitude of white Natalians towards the blacks within and beyond Natal's boundaries.²⁵⁹ In defending the uSuthu Escombe had a chance of showing humanitarian opinion at 'home' that there were, in Natal, politicians of standing who cared about justice and sound administration in regard to a subject race. He concluded, in effect, that the

254. Merriman Papers, no.211: Escombe to John X Merriman, 26 Apr.1889.

255. N.A., Col.Coll: Notes of interviews with Escombe, n.d. (Sept.1888, int.ev.) and notes in H.E. Colenso's script which summarise Escombe's arguments.

256. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso, notes on interview with Escombe, n.d. (Sept.1888, int.ev.); H.E. Colenso to Samuelson, 4 Nov.1888; H.E. Colenso to Dumat, 24 Oct.1888; draft claim by H.E. Colenso for reimbursement; Campbell to Campbell and Dumat, 20 Oct.1888. Fuze, *Black People*, p.129. *Natal Witness*, 16 Nov.1888.

257. For example, by Dr M. Buthelezi, leader of the Inkatha Freedom Party, in his address to the conference held at the University of Natal, 1979, to mark the centenary of the Anglo-Zulu War.

258. *Natal Witness*, 20 Sept.1888, report of debate in Natal Legislative Council.

259. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.355, cols 1079-82: for discussion, and especially comments of G. Campbell, 13 July 1891.

advantages of leading the uSuthu defence outweighed the disadvantages. He earned for himself the reputation of being the friend of the Zulus. Later chapters will give some attention to the question of the extent to which he deserves that reputation.

In the meanwhile Harriette travelled to Eshowe with Dumat and Samuelson. She had often wanted to visit Zululand, but hardly in such circumstances. On the way she was thrown off the seat next to the driver of the cart when a horse stumbled. Falling between the wheels, she was stunned. Recovering, she quickly took her place as one of the personalities involved in the proceedings of the Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand. She was pictured sipping tea at the end of the horseshoe formation in the court house that had been improvised from the storeroom of a trader.²⁶⁰ In England Sophie was excited, '... how *glorious* to know that *she* will be watching the case' (Sophie's emphasis). But Sophie added, 'we can hardly expect such a miracle as justice would be *done*'.²⁶¹

In the two years since the partition of October 1886 the uSuthu plight had deepened. The Colenso loyalty to the uSuthu cause had not weakened.

260. *Natal Witness*, 17 Nov.1888.

261. N.A., Col.Coll: Sophie Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 15 Nov.1888.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE COLENZO ENDEAVOUR 1888-1889

The uSuthu Defence

Introduction

With the subjugation of the uSuthu and the arrest of leaders and main participants in the disturbance, Zululand was relatively calm. The Colensos were dealing now with a depressing but static context. In the years 1888-89 they created and sustained the uSuthu defence. They had allies, but the main impetus came from them.

Because the situation in Zululand had stabilised, there is no need to explain a rapidly changing context prior to the discussion of the Colenso endeavour. But certain phases are distinguishable. The first phase runs from 15 November 1888 to 22 January 1889. On 15 November the Court of the Special Commissioners opened in Eshowe,¹ while Dinuzulu presented himself in Pietermaritzburg on the same day.² On 22 January the Privy Council gave its decision on the first of the applications made to it on behalf of Dinuzulu. Proceedings at Eshowe were then suspended.³ The second phase covers the period for which the Court of the Special Commissioners resumed its interrupted proceedings until their close: from 23 January to 27 April 1889.⁴ On 27 April Dinuzulu, Ndabuko and Shingana were sentenced to ten, fifteen and twelve years imprisonment respectively.⁵ The third phase is the immediate aftermath of the Eshowe proceedings. It ends with the decision of Harriette Colenso to continue her endeavours in Britain.⁶

Through all these phases the uSuthu defence had two general characteristics. It was double-sided in being both judicial and political. It was triangular in linking three places: Eshowe, Pietermaritzburg, and London. Decisions and events in the political and judicial sphere interacted. Since British policy had eventually made part of Zululand a British Crown Colony, there had to be a trial. Among the British the principle that a man should

-
1. *The Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand* (henceforward C.S.C.Z.), 15 Nov.1888 to 27 Apr.1889. Notes of evidence recorded by the President (London, 1890), p.8.
 2. C.S.C.Z., pp.955 and 957.
 3. *Ibid.*, pp.974-84.
 4. *Ibid.*, pp.148-53 and 190-1009.
 5. *Ibid.*, see index and pp.362, 544 and 856.
 6. See below, Chapter Five.

not be punished except after lawful trial was thought to be as old as Magna Carta.⁷ Alleged rebels could not simply be summarily tried and banished. True, when the legal argument about Dinuzulu seemed to have created an impossible situation, Havelock sought authorization for summary banishment. But this did not prove necessary and would have provoked stronger metropolitan criticism of British actions. What sort of trial there should be, where, and when it should be held were subsidiary questions. Calculations of political expedience, both on the part of officials and on the part of uSuthu friends, affected both the timing and the character of the judicial proceedings.

The defence was not confined to only one centre. Events in Eshowe, in Pietermaritzburg, and in London all counted and all interacted.

For much of the time Harriette was in Eshowe. She travelled up to Eshowe in the company of the defence lawyers and George Burgess, then a reporter on the *Natal Advertiser*, who was to be shorthand writer for the defence.⁸ At Eshowe Harriette stayed for a time with the Mansels. Mansel had once been a guest at Bishopstowe and Harriette accepted kindnesses from the Mansels, even though she was critical of his role at Ceza and believed that he had precipitated conflict.⁹ Subsequently she set up her own camp in huts near the court house. This she called 'Osutu'.¹⁰ In the meanwhile her sister and mother felt that 'the light had gone out of the house' when Harriette left.¹¹ Harriette stayed on at Eshowe after the conclusion of the sessions of the Court of the Special Commissioners until the middle of August. Then she spent two months at Bishopstowe but returned to Eshowe in October. She took with her Eric Colenso, her nine-year old nephew and godson, whose parents were in Johannesburg.¹² Throughout these years Agnes was at Bishopstowe, and Frank in London.

It is easy to underestimate Agnes' role in the Colenso endeavour; but she does not deserve to be eclipsed. Her support was essential to Harriette. Without the devoted admiration and

7. H. Butterfield, *The Englishman and his History* (Cambridge, 1944), pp.8-9.

8. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

9. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Friday night (Nov.1889, int.ev.).

10. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 31 Oct.1888; to Agnes 24 July and 2 Nov.1889.

11. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 21 May (1889, int.ev.).

12. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 23, 25 and Friday 31 Oct.1889, 10 and 12 Nov.1889; (Old Ref: Box 145); see chronology of H.E. Colenso's movements drawn up in connection with the Velemu land dispute.

sense of identification with her of Agnes and of their mother, until Mrs Colenso's death in December 1893, Harriette would not have been able to achieve so much. Agnes put it quite simply, 'We are one.'¹³ For a few days in November 1888 Agnes was obliged to take the lead and centre stage position. This was on the day of Dinuzulu's 'surrender' and during the subsequent days until he was removed to Eshowe.¹⁴ During this period, while telegrams whizzed, linking Eshowe, Pietermaritzburg, and London,¹⁵ Agnes announced the arrival of the 'lad', received directives and praise from Eshowe, and handled the instructions to the legal men. Thereafter, she was Harriette's *alter ego* in Pietermaritzburg. She had a frail and sickly mother to nurse and the mission to care for.¹⁶ Schooling was curtailed, but Agnes kept up lessons in both printing and singing.¹⁷ It was to Agnes that a party of the Dlamini tribe looked for support in their appeal that the succession to the deceased chief Bidhla should go to their candidate, Qika.¹⁸ Agnes did her best for them while reminding them that the Colensos were not '*amakosi*' but only '*abantu*' under '*amakosi*'. Agnes sent clothes, letters, and attendants to Eshowe.¹⁹ While at Bishopstowe, she kept an eye on the star defence witness,²⁰ Langa the son of 'Logotwayo' (Lokothwayo).²¹ He was the lad at whom R.H. Addison had evidently shot during the tensions of Zibhebhu's return. Shot was removed from his back for presentation and illustration in the Court of the Special Commissioners.²² In an undated fragment Agnes told Harriette:

'... I am pretty well, tho. [sic] when I've been all things to all men I mean women hard for 12 hours I turn dizzyish and church bells ring when I get to bed, but there is nothing wrong with me only brothers.'²³

She forwarded letters to Harriette and kept her sister informed of events in and from

13. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, n.d., possibly Dec.1889.

14. *Ibid.*, E. Renaud (Durban) to Dumat (Eshowe), telegrams, 15 and 16 Nov.1888; Colenso (Eshowe) to Colenso (Durban), 15 Nov.1888; Colenso to Escombe, n.d., (16 Nov.1888); A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Wed., 10 a.m. (20 Nov.1888, int.ev.). R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to Sophie Colenso, 11 Dec.1888.

15. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 21 Nov.1888.

16. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Sunday (1888?).

17. *Ibid.*, 1 Dec.1888; A.M. Colenso to A.W. Mason, June and July 1889.

18. *Ibid.*, Agnes Colenso, Diary for 1888, entry for 2 Dec.1888; A.M. Colenso to A. Mason, June and July 1889 and 22 Jan.1891.

19. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, n.d. (Jan.1889?, int.ev.).

20. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 9 Mar.1889; C.S.C.Z., pp.822-23.

21. Presumably Lokothwayo, identified by Laband as a minor chief who, in 1888, resisted arrest, presumed killed in August 1888. See Laband, *Rope*, p.423.

22. See below, p.151; N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 14 Apr. (1889, int.ev.).

23. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 149); A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, n.d. fragment (June 1889?).

Pietermaritzburg, among them their mother's health,²⁴ the fracas involving pupils from St Mary's night school,²⁵ the *Guardian* review of the *Life of Bishop Colenso*,²⁶ and Langalibalele's deterioration. The old chief's frailty added to the problems of 'Miss Agonies'.²⁷

Agnes Colenso combined a strong sense of proper decorum with shrewd perception. She wondered whether Harriette would leave the Court House when Escombe led evidence about Zibhebhu's treatment of women.²⁸ She hoped Harriette was not allowing the lawyers to smoke in her presence and protested that certainly 'the lad', Dinuzulu, must remain a gentleman in this matter.²⁹ Yet it was Agnes who noticed that Escombe had a 'natural objection to kings',³⁰ and who, while sharing her mother's delight at his high praise of Harriette, nevertheless noted his reference to letting the Zulus *think* they have a friend near (her emphasis).³¹ It was Agnes, too, who observed that those who had wished to foster an interest in the potential mineral wealth of Zululand would be working against the Colensos.³²

Both sisters were concerned over their brothers' affairs, especially those of Robert, whose health, finances, and psychological state were all poor.³³ Robert's wife returned from England. To Robert's 'surprise', she left their son, Eric, at Bishopstowe before joining her husband in Johannesburg.³⁴ At this stage, Robert grudged the Zulus the help his sisters gave,³⁵ but Frank gave Agnes and Harriette all the support he could. They thought some of his actions ill-judged. For example, they criticised his launching an appeal for funds in his own name through the *Women's Penny Post*.³⁶ But his personal position was for a time more worrying. In December 1888 he resigned the position he then held as actuary

24. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb (1889, int.ev.); Wednesday 10 am ($\pm$ Nov.1888, int.ev.).

25. *Ibid.*, 14 Apr.1889.

26. *Ibid.*, 4 May (1889, int.ev.).

27. *Ibid.*, 15 Dec.1888, and other letters, n.d.

28. *Ibid.*, 14 Apr.(1889, int.ev.).

29. *Ibid.*

30. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 149): n.d. (late 1888? int.ev.).

31. *Ibid.*, 7 May (1889, int.ev.).

32. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 149): n.d. (1888 - from placing in relation to other letters).

33. *Ibid.*

34. *Ibid.*, 3 July (1889, int.ev.).

35. *Ibid.*, 21 July (1889, int.ev.).

36. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 149): Tuesday (possibly early 1889, int.ev.).

under the accusation of having interfered in the affairs of a brother official, but was reappointed at a lower salary.³⁷ Subsequently, when he joined the Eagle Assurance Company, his professional life ran smoothly.³⁸

The Court of the Special Commissioners, consisting of Walter Wragg (president), G. Rudolph and J.E. Fannin, set to work with great speed and self-importance.³⁹ Contacts with the Natal official elite and awareness that their appointments had been approved by the Secretary of State may have encouraged the Commissioners to take a lofty tone.⁴⁰ W.Y. Campbell urged objections, lodged exceptions, and pleaded the necessity of more time if the defence were to be adequately prepared.⁴¹ His urgings and, even more, Harriette's presence were intimations that the Court should take the defence seriously. Harriette's notes and amendments, to be found in available copies of the Notes of Evidence, show how minutely she followed proceedings and how zealously she enlarged on defence arguments.⁴²

But Campbell's objections were over-ruled, and his requests for postponement treated with little consideration. He secured only a short postponement of the trial of Ndabuko when the Court decided that his case would be heard last of those on the present register. The court proceeded with other cases where the prisoners were not defended.⁴³ In the main, Campbell declined the responsibility of defence for chiefs where no time for preparation was given.

The first of the chiefs to be tried was Somhlolo of the Biyela tribe,⁴⁴ who lived in the Entonjaneni district. Somhlolo had felt acutely the dilemmas involved in having to choose between the risks and advantages of 'loyalty' to the magistrate, or of joining the uSuthu. The Biyela people had divided on the issue: Somhlolo, the regent, after much hesitation

37. *Ibid.*, Sophie Colenso to S.F. Colenso, Dec.1889; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 26 Dec.1888.

38. See above, p.6.

39. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

40. Fannin Papers: J.E. Fannin to E. Fannin, 19 Nov.1888.

41. C.S.C.Z., pp.146 and 147.

42. The annotated copy of *The Court of Special Commissioners for Zululand: Notes of Evidence* in the Killie Campbell Library, Durban, was given by H.E. Colenso to E. Renaud who later handed it to the Killie Campbell Library. Copy in N.A., Col.Coll: see, for example, insertion at p.267. Copy in Don Library, see comment on p.11.

43. C.S.C.Z., see Index and note sequence of cases.

44. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes; C.S.C.Z., pp.7-49.

had gone to Hlophekhulu to join Shingana; the children of the previous chief, Mkhosana, had been taken by the headmen to the magistracy.⁴⁵ By his own testimony, the deciding factor for Somhlolo was fear: Hlangazana had brought him a threatening message allegedly from a Boer *Mkhosi* who resented being supplanted in the district by the magistrate. Somhlolo pleaded his fearfulness and his hope that in joining Shingana he was saving the tribe.⁴⁶ The Special Commissioners convicted Somhlolo of the crimes of high treason, rebellion, and public violence and sentenced him to five years imprisonment.⁴⁷

Harriette was not pleased with the character of Somhlolo's defence. She thought officials had intimidated him.⁴⁸ There had been too much stress on his fear of Shingana rather than on their joint fear of Zibhebhu, from whom both were 'running away'. Newspapers suggested, so Agnes told Harriette, that after trial Somhlolo wished to cut altogether the 'mischievous' acquaintance of Miss Colenso. Embarrassment was understandable. He had tried to exculpate himself at the expense of those whom Harriette tended to defend. Later Somhlolo gave evidence against Shingana.⁴⁹

The defence had their own points to make. They mocked at the fact that the term 'high treason' was untranslatable.⁵⁰ That was not the fault of the Commissioners. Where they were to blame was in pronouncing verdict and sentence against Somhlolo and others prior to the hearing of other interlocking cases.⁵¹ The defence contended that the decisions about Somhlolo prejudged issues to the detriment of men tried later. Moreover, to proceed to try Somhlolo when he had no legal counsel was to invite criticism.⁵² Subsequently, the Court tried to avoid such errors. At first, Gallwey ignored a telegram from Harriette protesting that men were being tried without the benefit of legal representation, but he reconsidered his position.⁵³ The government made strenuous efforts to provide Somkhele

45. C.S.C.Z., pp.11 and 107.

46. *Ibid.*, pp.12, 13, 35 and 47.

47. *Ibid.*, pp.6-49; Index and especially p.9.

48. See miscellaneous manuscript annotations by H.E. Colenso in the copy of the C.S.C.Z. in the Natal Archives.

49. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 12 Mar.(1889, int.ev.). C.S.C.Z., pp.459-61.

50. *Natal Witness*, leader, 27 Nov.1888. C.S.C.Z., p.794.

51. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 94): Foolsap sheet of questions in H.E. Colenso's script. She noted that in sentencing Somhlolo the judge had prejudged Shingana's intentions at Hlophekhulu.

52. C.S.C.Z., pp.7-49.

53. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 138): W.Y. Campbell to Sir (Knutsford?), copy, 25 Dec.1888.

and the coast chiefs with counsel but, acting on advice, the chiefs rejected the services of G.H. Hulett. They preferred to re-iterate the point that they did not have the lawyer of their choice.⁵⁴

Decisions in the early cases gave to the defence the opportunity to appeal to underlying principles of justice: that a man should be deemed innocent until proved guilty; that a trial must be fair; that it must be held before a lawful tribunal; that the accused was entitled to know what was the specific charge against him. In the case of Dinuzulu Escombe challenged the proceedings of the Special Court on the grounds that the legality of Dinuzulu's removal from Natal to Zululand was still *sub judice*.⁵⁵ In a statement of protest included in the official record, they objected that they had not been able to bring before the court all the witnesses they would have liked to summon, that proceedings were being hurried and that they had been denied documenting evidence.⁵⁶ In the case of Somkhele and the coast chiefs the defence emphasised the legal principle that a man could not be punished twice for the same offence.⁵⁷

W.Y. Campbell's defence of the unfortunate Nzukuzonke was not very impressive. The accused was an uSuthu convicted of culpable homicide for having killed Nondubela, a follower of Mnyamana. Nondubela was shot while raiding the corn pits of Nzukuzonke. The killing happened just after the dispersal of the uSuthu from Ceza when corn-thieving was general. Nzukuzonke's associates told him he had done right in that he had 'killed a porcupine that was eating the corn.' The Court did not consider Nzukuzonke's action justified by provocation and circumstance, nor did they think that his subsequent fearfulness mitigated the crime. R.H. Addison gave evidence about Nzukuzonke's apprehensiveness, his prompt surrender at the mere summons of the magistrate, and his making statements voluntarily. Nzukuzonke was sentenced to twelve years imprisonment. The defence witness on whom Campbell had been relying failed to appear.⁵⁸

54. *Ibid.*

55. C.S.C.Z., Exceptions lodged by Escombe, viz. Appendix S, pp.987-89.

56. *Ibid.*, see, for example, Appendix K, pp.933-34, petition of W.Y. Campbell, 28 Nov.1888, and pp.934-35 statement of F.C. Dumat, 28 Nov.1888; Appendix L, pp.935-36, exceptions taken on behalf of Shingana.

57. C.S.C.Z., p.938, Appendix N.

58. *Ibid.*, pp.51-65, especially pp.53, 59 and 64; N.A., Col.Coll: Nzukuzonke's statement.

For the prosecution the trial of Somkhele and the coast chiefs⁵⁹ was a useful foreshadowing of the trials of Ndabuko, Shingana, and Dinuzulu. Somkhele was a descendant and a marriage connection of the Zulu royal house and the chief of a substantial following, the Mphukunyoni.⁶⁰ He, with other coast chiefs, was convicted of high treason and sentenced to five years' imprisonment. The chiefs gave evidence themselves and called their own witnesses. What helped the defence was the revelation that they had already been fined for the offence for which they were now being tried and punished.⁶¹ But much of the evidence in these trials helped the prosecution. There was, for example, evidence of the attack on the traders, White and Knight, who had successfully fled for their lives but abandoned a sick colleague, Ashby, to his death in saving themselves. There was evidence too of the attack on the magistracy in the Lower Mfolozi. In all, the picture was created that the disturbances in the Lower Mfolozi were the repercussions of rebelliousness in the Ndwandwe district.⁶² Perhaps it was to serve Zibhebhu's interests that Addison gave evidence in this trial. He testified about the attack on Msutshwana and maintained that the boy who actually killed Msutshwana had himself been killed subsequently at the clash at Ivuna.⁶³ There was not much encouragement for the friends of Dinuzulu⁶⁴ in the way all the coast chiefs asserted that they had armed their followers in response to orders from Dinuzulu, and there were frequent references in these trials to the role of Mafukwini, the reputed messenger from Dinuzulu.⁶⁵

In regard to Ndabuko, W.Y. Campbell's fight for time was much more vigorous and spectacular. On 15 November 1888 Campbell asked for time and was refused.⁶⁶ He then submitted a number of exceptions against the jurisdiction of the Court. His main challenge was that Proclamation IV was invalid. This contention he based on the argument that it superseded the lawfully constituted courts created by Proclamation II of 1887.⁶⁷ The defence, it would seem, was as ready to sacrifice consistency for point-scoring as any one

-
- 59. C.S.C.Z., pp.67-142, Somkhele, Ndabayake, Mtateni, Masekwana Lugoloza, and Dlemudlemu - all were convicted of high treason, rebellion, and public violence.
 - 60. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.E. Havelock, 25 June 1888. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.
 - 61. *Leader, Natal Witness*, 6 Dec.1888.
 - 62. C.S.C.Z., p.121.
 - 63. *Ibid.*
 - 64. *Ibid.*, pp.122-23.
 - 65. *Ibid.*, pp.75, 80 and 137.
 - 66. *Ibid.*, pp.147 and 155.
 - 67. *Ibid.*, pp.146-47 and 154.

else. It had, after all, been Harriette and Harry Escombe who challenged the suitability of existing courts and who urged the need to appoint a Special Court.⁶⁸ In addition, Campbell repeated arguments that were to recur in defence submissions, for example, that the Court of the Special Commissioners denied to the accused the opportunity of trial by jury which they would have possessed in terms of earlier legislation.⁶⁹ Campbell took exception to the vague indictment and to the fact that it did not allege hostile intent.⁷⁰ He submitted an affidavit from F.C. Dumat, J.W. Henderson, and himself on the impossibility of summoning witnesses within the time allowed.⁷¹ On 15 November Campbell asked for postponement until 15 January. When the trial began on 25 November he asked postponement until February. When this was refused, he withdrew from the case.⁷² He had already wired purple phrases to the Governor urging him to telegraph the gist of the defence arguments to the Secretary of State. This Havelock, after consulting Wragg, refused to do.⁷³ But the government did not monopolise communication. Harriette and Campbell both cabled overseas. Harriette sent a cable to the A.P.S.⁷⁴ Campbell called in the help of F.R. Statham then editor of the *Natal Advertiser* in sending telegrams to the *Daily Chronicle*.⁷⁵ In addition, Campbell cabled to Escombe the news of his withdrawal from the case. He referred to the 'terrible disclosures' obtained already by the defence and to the eviction of 3000 people to make way for Zibhebhu. Escombe drew attention to these statements in a letter to *The Times*.⁷⁶ The timing was useful. Escombe's letter was published after the Colonial Office had urged delay on Havelock and just before some discussion in the House of Commons. A few days before the Colonial Office telegraphed to Havelock its concern at newspaper reports of the sentence of five Zulu men for the murder of the Louws. The reports were distorted and exaggerated. The

68. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 29 Sept.1888; H.E. Colenso to Governor (draft), 3 Oct.1888.

69. C.S.C.Z., pp.146 and 154; cf. H. Escombe & F.C. Dumat, *A Remonstrance on Behalf of the Zulu Chiefs* (London, 1889).

70. C.S.C.Z., pp.147 and 155.

71. *Ibid.*, Appendix J, pp.929-32.

72. *Ibid.*, pp.147 and 155.

73. C.5892, pp.113-15, no.77: Havelock to Knutsford with enclosures, viz. enclosure 1: W.Y. Campbell to Havelock, telegram, 18 Nov.1888; enclosure 3: Wragg to Havelock, 19 Nov.1888; enclosure 4: W.Y. Campbell to Havelock, telegram, 19 Nov.1888; enclosure 6: Havelock to W.Y. Campbell, 16 and 19 Nov.1888.

74. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso (My darling child), 16 Nov.1888; H.E. Colenso to A.P.S., copy, telegram, Nov.1888; F.W. Watkins to H.E. Colenso, 23 Nov.1888.

75. *Ibid.*, W.Y. Campbell to F.R. Statham, 16 Nov.1888.

76. *The Times*, 6 Dec.1886, reprinted in Escombe's *Correspondence between the Colonial Office and Mr Escombe as to the Trial of the Zulu Chiefs* (London? 1889?), p.2.

core of truth was the execution of Nkhowana for the killing of Mandlakazi followers in March. In his telegraphed denial of the reports Havelock omitted all reference to Nkhowana and impugned the reliability of all Natal newspaper reports, except the *Natal Mercury*.⁷⁷

On 5 December 1888 the Court of Special Commissioners adjourned. The 'idle' reason given by Mr Justice Wragg was a specious technicality. He was not allowed, as a puisne judge of the Natal Supreme Court, to spend longer than a month out of the colony of Natal.⁷⁸ On 6 December 1888 the Under-Secretary of State for Colonies, Baron H. de Worms, gave a different explanation. He made it plain that the adjournment was brought about to comply with the wishes of the Secretary of State.⁷⁹ Here was one instance where political considerations and judicial proceedings impinged upon one another. The enmeshing is not surprising, for what sustains sound effective standards of justice in the last resort is the common sense of an enlightened public opinion. The Colonial Office acted in response to its perception of that opinion. In securing this adjournment the defence had won a triumph. Defence efforts in Eshowe, in Pietermaritzburg, and in London all contributed to this success. It seemed a triumph that heralded others. But in the end it proved hollow: it did not save the uSuthu and it probably angered local officials. Later pleas for further postponement, though treated sympathetically in London, were rejected in Pietermaritzburg.⁸⁰

The Court of Special Commissioners was in recess, but the defence team was still active. When defence witnesses were arrested, they made quick if unavailing representations and secured a promise of 'safe conduct' from the Governor, which did not, however, act retrospectively. One of the men so arrested was Mafukwini, Dinuzulu's messenger.⁸¹ Moreover, the defence exposed a flagrant case of illegal flogging, inflicted on three uSuthu men by the acting resident magistrate of the Ndwandwe district, L.E.N. Tyrrell, after a summary trial. Their crime, so the *Natal Advertiser* reported, was that they attempted to

77. C.O.427/3/2377: Havelock to C.O., 2 Dec.1888 and minute by de Worms, 3 Dec.1888.

78. *Natal Advertiser*, 8 Dec.1888.

79. *The Times*, parliamentary report, 7 Dec.1888.

80. C.5892, p.152, no.98: Knutsford to Havelock, telegram, 12 Jan.1889; no.99: Havelock to Knutsford, telegram, 14 Jan.1889; p.196, no.132: Knutsford to Havelock, 28 Mar.1889.

81. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, n.d. (Jan.1889 int.ev.). Harriette had galloped after the party arresting Mafukwini. C.5892, p.169, no.117: Havelock to Knutsford, enclosure, G. Browne to Campbell and Dumat, 9 Jan.1889.

establish homesteads in an area claimed for Zibhebhu, and did not evacuate within a stipulated time. At least two irregularities were involved:

1. One man had been tried, convicted, and fined in his absence. This was Siziba, a prominent uSuthu who often represented the uSuthu, acted as uSuthu spokesman and had fallen foul of the authorities before. He had not of course been flogged, but he had been fined five head of cattle.
2. Three other men had been flogged immediately without the necessary authorization from the chief magistrate. The defence lawyers took up the case.

Osborn quashed the cattle fines. But his action was belated. Though he reported the case to the Governor in December, he was then merely 'investigating it'. Only after the defence lawyers had protested to him about the case did he act. It was the presence of one of the flogged men at Eshowe that alerted Dumat to the episode. As the *Natal Advertiser* pointed out, the sentences might be quashed, but the men could not be unflogged. It argued, said the *Natal Advertiser*, that there was a strong case for the advocated general enquiry into the administration of Zululand.⁸²

Phase One: Pietermaritzburg

Although Escombe thought it 'a distinct gain bringing Dinuzulu out of the hands of the Dutch',⁸³ the arrival of Dinuzulu in Pietermaritzburg not only flummoxed the officials but surprised Agnes Colenso. The resident magistrate at Ladysmith, of course, knew of his arrival in Natal, and there may well have been hints passed between J.W. Henderson and the Colensos on the subject.⁸⁴ But his actual appearance in Pietermaritzburg seems to have taken everyone by surprise. Leaving some of his *izinduna* at Ladysmith, Dinuzulu, with some of his companions and in the company of Willem Meyer, son-in-law of J.W. Henderson, travelled by train to Pietermaritzburg, spent some hours in the vicinity of Government House, near the railway station, and then proceeded to Bishopstowe. There Agnes Colenso with her mother and the faithful Colenso friend, Katie Giles,⁸⁵ received him. Agnes responded resourcefully to the situation. In Eshowe, the Commissioners assumed quickly that Dinuzulu would be sent to them for trial. This the Colensos sought

82. *Natal Advertiser*, leader, 'Glimpse of Zululand', 7 Jan.1889; cf. C.S.C.Z. pp.787 and 790: evidence of Vusindhlu.

83. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to H.E. Colenso (copied by A.M. Colenso), 29 Nov.1888.

84. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso, diary, entry for 2 Nov.1888.

85. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 179): K. Giles to H.E. Colenso, 15 (Nov.1888, int.ev).

to prevent. Agnes bore the brunt of this contention, though she was guided in part by telegrams from Eshowe.⁸⁶

Having made sure of Dinuzulu's identity, she offered him the hospitality of the farm cottage on the Bishopstowe estate which, since the 1884 fire, had been the Colenso home. She arranged for him to meet her mother and showed him the contents of the house. Then she went in to Pietermaritzburg with some of his *izinduna*. At Government House she was denied an interview with the Governor but delivered her letter announcing Dinuzulu's surrender. In one of the ludicrous moments of the tragi-comedy, Gerald Browne, secretary to Havelock, spluttered in protest that 'the Governor does not want him.'⁸⁷ The old invitation to come to Pietermaritzburg to see the Governor was irrelevant. Dinuzulu was to be arrested. The Colensos wanted to ensure that Dinuzulu should be kept in Natal. Meanwhile an *induna* of the Secretary of Native Affairs had carried to the S.N.A. a report of Dinuzulu's arrival at Bishopstowe.⁸⁸ Agnes, on returning to Bishopstowe, was met by a party of Natal Mounted Police. They were already positioned around the homestead when she arrived. The man in charge, Sheckleton, carried with him a warrant issued by the Governor under the imperial statute known as the Fugitive Offenders Act. Dinuzulu accepted in dismay that he must go into Pietermaritzburg under police escort and once there he was lodged in the police barracks and kept in custody.⁸⁹ Dinuzulu protested that he had come to Pietermaritzburg to have the allegations against him investigated; and denied that he had 'surrendered' to being arrested on charges made against him in Zululand or that he consented to removal to Eshowe.⁹⁰

For Havelock at this point the main problem was clear, the solution to it uncertain: what was he to do with Dinuzulu? There seems to have been no official hesitation on the point

-
- 86. Binns, *Dinuzulu*, pp.134-36; S. Marks, 'Harriette Colenso and the Zulus', *J.A.H.*, 1963; N.A., Col.Coll: telegrams of Nov.1888; A.M. Colenso, manuscript account of the surrender; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Wed. 10 a.m. (21 Nov.1888, int.ev.).
 - 87. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 199): E. Renaud to Dumat, 15 Nov.1888; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, n.d. (Nov.1888, int.ev.).
 - 88. *C.S.C.Z.*, p.956, Appendix R: affidavit of H.C. Shepstone, 19 Nov.1888.
 - 89. N.A., Col.Coll: K. Giles to H.E. Colenso, ? Nov.1888; A.M. Colenso, hand-written account of the episode. *C.S.C.Z.*, pp.951-86, Appendix R: especially p.958, statement of A. Sheckleton, 14 (sic) Nov.1888, statement of W.P. Meyer, 16 Nov.1888 and affidavit of H.C. Shepstone, 19 Nov.1888.
 - 90. *Ibid.*, p.960: affidavit of A.R. de Labistour, 20 Nov.1888; p.961: affidavit of T. Blaikie, 20 Nov.1888.

that he should be brought before the Court of the Special Commissioners in Zululand. But this raised the slippery legal problem: how was this to be done? Havelock's subsequent difficulties arose from the failure to consider simultaneously two questions: how best to take Dinuzulu into captivity in Pietermaritzburg, and how to have him removed with all speed to Eshowe. The authorities regretted the warrant issued under the Fugitive Offenders Act. Even if it did apply in Natal and Zululand, and to a man in Dinuzulu's position, it provided that anyone so arrested was entitled to full information and to a delay of fifteen days before being removed from the place of his arrest.⁹¹ This the government officials, with Miss Colenso so busy, obviously wished to deny. They tried to do so by freeing themselves of the complications of the Fugitive Offenders Act. They alleged that the warrant was irrelevant. It had not been served, and Dinuzulu had simply surrendered. They went further and, after H.C. Shepstone had interviewed Dinuzulu, alleged that Dinuzulu had voluntarily agreed to being removed from Natal to Eshowe.⁹² This Dinuzulu, his *izinduna*, and his legal representatives were subsequently to deny strongly.⁹³ They suspected Shepstone of acting *mala fides*. It is just possible that there was genuine misunderstanding between the two parties: Shepstone wanted to have Dinuzulu's agreement to his removal to Eshowe: Dinuzulu, who had left some *izinduna* at Ladysmith, wanted to have them all with him. Each assumed that the other agreed to what he wanted. Shepstone's role in regard to the surrender of Dinuzulu was tartly criticised later.⁹⁴

Initially, on 17 November 1888, the dispute went before the Natal Supreme Court. Here, the pro-uSuthu lawyers, G.A. de R. Labistour and A.W. Mason, secured a temporary interdict prohibiting Dinuzulu's removal from Pietermaritzburg. But on 20 November the government applied successfully to be released from the prohibition.⁹⁵ The Chief Justice, who was nearly at the end of his career, said some very curious things, while Mr Justice Turnbull, who was also on the bench when the application was made, seems to

91. *Ibid.*, p.966: Dinuzulu's petition to the Privy Council, 27 Nov.1888.

92. N.A., Col.Coll: Labistour to Dumat (Eshowe), telegram, 20 Nov.1888.

93. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 181): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, n.d. (22 Nov.1888, int.ev.); C.S.C.Z., p.959: Dinuzulu's declaration of 19 Nov.1888.

94. *Ibid.*, Appendix R, pp.951-86; cf. pp.979-80 for comment of Sir H. Davey, 'They do odd things in South Africa.'

95. *Ibid.*, p.963: order of court discharging interdict, 20 Nov.1888; p.967: affidavit of A.W. Mason, 26 Nov.1888.

have been most unhappy about the judgment.⁹⁶ By this time the authorities had issued another warrant: viz. a warrant under Natal Law No.20 of 1880. Turnbull was in a dithery state of mind about whether Law No.20 applied to Dinuzulu's case; but the government got what it wanted out of the judges.⁹⁷ The interdict of 17 November was cancelled; and leave to appeal to the Privy Council was denied.⁹⁸ Dinuzulu's subsequent departure to Eshowe was something of an official conjuring trick. Agnes arrived at the police barracks to find that Dinuzulu had already begun the journey to Eshowe. She had already given him money and kindness. She was no longer directly in touch with him.⁹⁹

The decision of the Natal Supreme Court did not prevent appeal to the Privy Council, but made it a more protracted business. Friends of the uSuthu would have to take two steps, not one: first, the preliminary application to the Privy Council for leave to appeal;¹⁰⁰ second, the appeal itself. For this they would need money to pay the £300 required as security and to pay the lawyers who would conduct that appeal.¹⁰¹

The application to the Privy Council, ably handled by Sir Horace Davey,¹⁰² went forward with as much speed as the defending lawyers could effect. They had good grounds. They argued against the removal of Dinuzulu from Pietermaritzburg to Eshowe on the strength of a warrant issued subsequent to the first warrant. The second warrant was the warrant under the Natal Law No.20 of 1880. Its applicability was doubtful. It had been passed to meet the exigencies created by the arrest of Sekhukhune at a time when the Transvaal was a British colony. It covered the situation in which a prisoner arrested in one British colony was conveyed through another to a third. This was not quite the situation in regard to Dinuzulu. In addition, its validity was questionable. A local statute (*i.e* Law 20 of 1888) could not stand against the provisions of an imperial statute (*i.e* the Fugitive

96. *Ibid.*, pp.971-72: transcript of the judgment of the Chief Justice; N.A., Col.Coll: Labistour to Dumat (Eshowe), 20 Nov.1888.

97. C.5892, pp.146 and 147; C.S.C.Z., pp.972-73.

98. C.5892, pp.145 and 146: judgment of Natal Supreme Court, 20 Nov.1888.

99. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Wed. 10 a.m. (21 Nov.1888, int.ev.); Marks, 'Harriette Colenso'.

100. C.S.C.Z., pp.974-83: proceedings in the Privy Council, 22 Jan.1889 re the application for leave to appeal.

101. *Ibid.*, pp.984-85: Text of Order in Council 29 Jan.1889 granting leave to appeal.

102. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

Offenders Act).¹⁰³

There were further complications. Whether or not the Fugitive Offenders Act applied to Natal was doubtful, although this was not raised at this stage.¹⁰⁴ In addition, the defence raised on Dinuzulu's behalf the legal technicality of whether the Governor of Zululand (in which capacity Havelock had signed the warrant) had jurisdiction in Natal. This was something of a legal quibble. The practical arguments were more obvious. It would be better for Dinuzulu's lawyers if his trial were to be held in Pietermaritzburg. It would be easier to find accommodation for themselves and to communicate with Dinuzulu. Then, too, there was the 'unspoken assumption': in Pietermaritzburg Dinuzulu would be less vulnerable to the antagonism of Zululand officials.¹⁰⁵

From mid-October Harry Escombe was *en route* for Britain via Johannesburg, Kimberley, and Cape Town. His departure made local defence more difficult. Havelock would not easily recognise W.Y. Campbell as Escombe's representative,¹⁰⁶ although Campbell had accepted the brief from Escombe for a fee of £500 by 20 October.¹⁰⁷ Escombe had to wire from Kimberley to Pietermaritzburg to confirm Campbell's application for postponement of the Court of the Special Commissioners. The Governor rejected the application.¹⁰⁸ It was only circuitously through Escombe's office that Harriette received copies of the depositions in Ndabuko's case; they were not given to her directly.¹⁰⁹

As a colonial politician of standing, Escombe was entitled to courtesy from the Colonial Office even though he did not enjoy its respect. Provocative gibes at Downing Street were probably part of the stock in trade of colonial politicians, but they did not encourage

-
- 103. C.5892, p.121, no.82: Havelock to Secretary of State with enclosures, and p.138: Mason (for G.A. de R. Labistour) to G. Browne, 21 Nov.1888; C.S.C.Z., Appendix R, pp.975-85.
 - 104. C.S.C.Z., pp.974-83: proceedings in the Privy Council re leave to appeal, especially p.978.
 - 105. *Ibid.*, p.980: statement of Sir Horace Davey in Privy Council proceedings, 22 Jan.1889.
 - 106. N.A., Col.Coll: memorandum, unsigned, but obviously by Escombe, copied in several scripts, giving an account of his role; found with Governor to Escombe, 26 Oct.1888, inside N.A., Col.Coll. copy of C.S.C.Z.
 - 107. *Ibid.*, W.Y. Campbell to Campbell and Dumat, 20 Oct.1888.
 - 108. *Ibid.*, Escombe (Kimberley) to Campbell (Durban), telegram, 27 Oct.1888; Escombe to W.Y. Campbell, 29 Oct.1888.
 - 109. *Ibid.*, Garlicke to H.E. Colenso, telegram, 18 Oct.1888; Governor to Escombe, telegram, 23 Oct.1888.

Colonial Office goodwill.¹¹⁰ In London Escombe had useful contacts: Frank Colenso, Charles Hancock, then acting as secretary of the A.P.S. with which Escombe had corresponded previously, and Escombe's new son-in-law Sydney Gedge, who was connected with the legal firm of Loughborough and Gedge.¹¹¹ By now the earlier Colenso suspicion of Escombe had dissipated, and Harriette hoped he would do more good in London than he could do in Pietermaritzburg.¹¹²

Since his interview with Harriette and Ndabuko's messengers on 10 October,¹¹³ Escombe had kept in touch with her and with the defence, from the Transvaal, from Kimberley, and perhaps from Madeira, where the news of Dinuzulu's surrender was cabled to him.¹¹⁴ In Johannesburg he stayed with Robert Colenso.¹¹⁵ In London he was entertained by the Frank Colensos. Frank and Charles Hancock helped arrange meetings for him with British MPs.¹¹⁶ Escombe kept Harriette informed of his activities from London. Perhaps thinking of a plan concerted before he left South Africa, Escombe wrote on 29 November that he hoped Campbell had been refused time and had resigned. He added with becoming, if irrelevant, concern that he hoped Harriette was not subjecting herself to too much strain.¹¹⁷

Frank Colenso may have put Escombe into touch with Joseph Chamberlain to whom Frank sent copies of Harriette's printed papers.¹¹⁸ In October 1888 Harriette urged her brother 'if you can enlist Mr Chamberlain it means victory.'¹¹⁹ Certainly Joseph

-
110. C.O.4273/24979, Havelock to Knutsford, no.173: 21 Nov.1888. Minute by Fairfield, 26 Dec.1888.
 111. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. Escombe genealogy in the Don Library. N.A., Col.Coll: Sophie Colenso's diary, 1889: entry for 29 Jan.1889.
 112. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Z.220: postscript by J.W. Colenso on copy of an 1883 letter from Robert Colenso; N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to (addressee not identified), 30 Oct.1888.
 113. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 16 and 17 Oct.1888; (Old Ref: Box 98): H. Escombe, *The Zulu Trials* (typescript), 22 Jan.1889; and Escombe's memorandum, copies in various scripts, filed in C.S.C.Z.
 114. *Ibid.*, Escombe, *Zulu Trials*; Garlicke to Dumat, Nov.1888; H.E. Colenso to Havelock (copy), 25 Oct.1888; H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 16 Nov.1888, requesting his return; and Escombe memorandum copied in various scripts, filed in C.S.C.Z.
 115. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Friday night (1889, int.ev.); R.J. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 25 Oct.(1888, int.ev.).
 116. *Ibid.*, Sophie Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 3 Jan.1889; C. Hancock to H.E. Colenso, 6 Dec.1888.
 117. *Ibid.*, Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1888.
 118. *Ibid.*
 119. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso quoting letter of H.E. Colenso, n.d (late 1888, int.ev.); R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 3 Oct.1888.

Chamberlain, who still seems to have held something of a balance of power in the House of Commons and who had broken one government in 1886, was treated with a good deal of respect. He had shown his interest in affairs South African and his sympathy with the uSuthu leaders.¹²⁰ On 18 January Escombe telegraphed encouragingly to Dumat 'Chamberlain helps.'¹²¹ But Chamberlain was too astute, it seems, to identify with the uSuthu about whom few people cared. He counselled that the interests of the uSuthu would be best served by representations to, rather than attacks on, the Colonial Office. He argued, further, that the Colonial Office would be bound to support its subordinates. It was a principle to which he did not himself adhere after the Jameson Raid when he made scapegoats of Edward Fairfield and Graham Bower. Frank copied out Chamberlain's views, but suggested to Harriette that they should not make them too widely known.¹²²

There was certainly some degree of parliamentary interest in the affairs of the uSuthu. On 22 November 1888 Hancock wrote appreciatively to Harriette of the efforts of Dr G.B. Clark and the McArthurs. He introduced Escombe to the McArthurs, one of whom questioned de Worms that night.¹²³ In fact, what the defence secured in this period in London were three successes.

One was the parliamentary pronouncement of Baron de Worms, the parliamentary Under-Secretary for Colonies in the House of Commons since Holland's elevation to the House of Lords in February 1888. The Baron was not a very impressive figure, but, because he was spokesman for the government, his words were important.¹²⁴ What mattered to the defence at this stage was the fact of his assurance that the sentences imposed by the Court of the Special Commissioners would not be carried out until after the evidence had been reviewed by the Home government.¹²⁵ Escombe claimed that this was tantamount

120. H.E. Colenso, *Mr Chamberlain on the Zulu Question* (excerpts from his speech in House of Commons, 23 July, 1888) (London, 1895?).

121. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Dumat, telegram, 18 Jan.1889; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 29 Jan.1889.

122. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 7 Mar.1889, enclosing J. Chamberlain to F.E. Colenso, n.d and 25 Feb.1889 (copies).

123. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes; N.A., Col.Coll: C. Hancock to H.E. Colenso, 22 Nov.1888.

124. Salisbury Papers: Salisbury to Holland, informing him of his own elevation to the peerage, 13 Feb.1888. See, for example, '*Baron de Worms Forgets Himself*', reprint from *South Africa* and *British Hansard*, vol.329, cols 215-39, Mar.1892. R. Fulford, *Votes for Women* (London, 1957), p.84.

125. See below, fn.159.

to an admission that the Special Court was not to be trusted. Escombe's jubilation was shared by the *Natal Advertiser*, but it was not well based.¹²⁶ The parliamentary undertaking bound the Colonial Office to nothing except that attention would be given to the cases and conclusions. It seems in itself an extraordinary undertaking in that it pledged executive interference with judicial decisions: an apparent violation of the principle of the independence of the judiciary.

A second success for the London endeavour of the Colensos and their associates was the interruption of the Court of the Special Commissioners. In telegraphing to the Governor that this was desirable the Colonial Office¹²⁷ reacted to circulating criticisms and uneasiness that an impatient Court could not demonstrate that justice was being done. To gallop through cases might spare the Zululand treasury but it was detrimental to the reputation of the government that allowed this to be done. When Wragg gave his own reason for the adjournment¹²⁸ - that he could not be absent from the colony for longer than a month - he obviously did not anticipate that de Worms, concerned for the reputation of the government, would reveal the more significant reason to the House of Commons.¹²⁹ The uSuthu defence had succeeded in making the Commissioners look foolish but they had not thereby helped the uSuthu. The postponement came in early December. The extreme Colenso hope at this point was that the postponement would be the prelude to the dissolution of the Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand and the institution of a Commission of Enquiry. But this Knutsford did not intend.¹³⁰

The third partial success of the London endeavour of the uSuthu defence was the decision of the Privy Council on 22 January to allow Dinuzulu (through his lawyers) to lodge an appeal against the finding of the Natal Supreme Court of 20 November that permitted his removal to Eshowe.¹³¹ Escombe sent a jubilant telegram, and Frank Colenso believed that the outcome of the appeal to the Privy Council was a success.¹³² Once more, it must have seemed to him, the Privy Council had done what it had done in the

126. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1888 and leader in *Natal Advertiser*, 5 Dec.1888.

127. C.5892, p.93, no.65: C.O. to Havelock, telegram, 3 Dec.1888.

128. *Natal Advertiser*, 8 Dec.1888.

129. British *Hansard*, vol.331, col.1235: statement of de Worms, 6 Dec.1888.

130. Salisbury Papers: Knutsford to Salisbury, 13 Dec.1888.

131. C.S.C.Z., pp.984 and 985.

132. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Dumat, 22 Jan.1889; F.E. Colenso to McLaren, Jan.1889.

ecclesiastical cases involving his father: vindicate right and justice.

But the Privy Council findings of 22 January 1889 did not go all the way to please the Colensos. Certainly leave to appeal was granted and this leave conceded that defence contentions on behalf of Dinuzulu could well be right. But the exchange of views between the defence counsel for Dinuzulu and the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council suggested that, even if the ultimate verdict went against the Natal government, this would not necessarily be of great help to Dinuzulu.¹³³ He would be taken back to Natal, but proceedings against him would not necessarily be quashed.

It would be up to the Natal government, assisted by the legal expertise available to it in Pietermaritzburg and from London, to think again. Moreover, the Privy Council did not inhibit further proceedings in the Court of the Special Commissioners due to resume on 23 January. True, the Lord Chancellor indicated clearly enough that the Privy Council 'favoured' [Escombe's word] the stay of proceedings.¹³⁴ He observed that anyone who now proceeded with the trial of Dinuzulu would incur a very heavy responsibility. This was a sentence which the Colensos and their associates quoted frequently.¹³⁵ But, though a very strong hint, it was not an instruction or a judicial decree. The comment of the counsel briefed for the uSuthu interest that this would not help Dinuzulu very much if he had already been hanged, did not affect the attitude of the Privy Council.¹³⁶ The Lord Chancellor said subsequently that the January decision had been made under two misapprehensions: one that Dinuzulu was in danger of being hanged; the other that Dinuzulu was still in Natal at the time of the proceedings. The second claim indicates that the Lord Chancellor had forgotten the questions and comments during the first hearing.¹³⁷ Leave to appeal had been granted; but what this would amount to in practice was an open question. The Privy Council proceedings had, as Escombe hoped, given a measure of publicity to the uSuthu cause.¹³⁸ The finding certainly set the

133. C.S.C.Z., Appendix R, pp.974 *et seq.*, proceedings of the Privy Council in the matter of the Petition for Leave to Appeal in the Matter of the Arrest of Dinuzulu, 22 Jan.1889. See, especially p.983, exchange between the Lord Chancellor and Sir Horace Davey.

134. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Dumat, 22 Jan.1889.

135. For example, British *Hansard*, vol.333, col.1288, 8 Mar.1889.

136. C.S.C.Z., p.983.

137. *Ibid.*, N.A., Col.Coll: Record of Proceedings in the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, July 1889.

138. *South Africa*, 3 Aug.1889, citing paragraph in *Daily News*.

Colonial Office a complicated legal tangle to unravel: but it did not in itself save Dinuzulu either from trial or from condemnation at the hands of the Court of the Special Commissioners.¹³⁹ There were some in Britain, among them Frank and Fox Bourne, who were determined to continue the Privy Council proceedings. A Zulu Defence Fund was founded to raise the necessary finances,¹⁴⁰ and whatever his own real attitude, Escombe encouraged Frank Colenso in his view that recourse to the Privy Council was the best way to proceed.¹⁴¹

While in Britain, Escombe conducted a voluminous correspondence with the Colonial Office. This he was to continue on his return to South Africa.¹⁴² Knutsford made it plain from the beginning that he would not easily supersede the Court of the Special Commissioners and that he thought Escombe's place as defence lawyer was in Eshowe; but he granted Escombe an interview on 3 December 1888 and did not omit Escombe's letters from Blue Book publication.¹⁴³

It was difficult for the Colonial Office to meet its varied obligations on the uSuthu issue. It managed to evade or mute some controversies. It omitted from the official published record material relating to dispute between Havelock and Smyth. In addition, it sponged away allusions to double-dealing or 'fibbing' on the part of the Boer 'allies' of Dinuzulu. But some dilemmas remained.¹⁴⁴ In Natal and Zululand subordinates and appointees expected support against criticism; on the other hand, cabinet associates of the Secretary of State disliked parliamentary questions and press comment. An added uncertainty for the Colonial Office was Havelock's delay in sending information.¹⁴⁵ In these circumstances, the Colonial Office resorted to makeshift expedients designed to appease critics while interest lasted, without alienating subordinates. Colonial Office concern about

139. A.J. van Wyk, 'Dinuzulu en die Usutu-opstand van 1888', *A.Y.B.* 1979 (Pretoria, 1983), p.223, fn.9; C.5892, p.192: memorandum of Gallwey, 6 Feb.1889.

140. H.R. Fox Bourne, *The Zulu Defence Fund*. There are two versions of this printed appeal; one issued before the setting up of a committee in June 1889, the other shortly afterwards. Both unsigned but obviously by H.R. Fox Bourne.

141. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 7 Mar.1889; F.E. Colenso to Escombe, 2 May and 18 July 1889.

142. Escombe, *Correspondence between the Colonial Office and Mr Escombe*, and see below, fns.148 and 149.

143. *Ibid.*

144. C.O.427/2/23265: Havelock to C.O., 27 Oct.1888. Minute by Knutsford, 28 Nov.1888; C.O.427/3/25685: Havelock to C.O., private, 2 Feb.1890. Minute by Fairfield, 7 Feb.1890.

145. C.5892, p.84, no.56: Knutsford to Havelock, telegram, 24 Nov.1888.

the Special Court and the unfavourable publicity evoked by Campbell's withdrawal from the defence was aggravated by the legal problems that clustered around the removal of Dinuzulu from Pietermaritzburg to Eshowe.

Escombe sought the maximum advantage from the dilemmas of the Colonial Office, but his persistence was unavailing.¹⁴⁶ Over the weeks he had to lower his sights as the range of possibilities contracted. At first he wanted a complete reversal of policy: the chiefs should be pardoned and released on Escombe's personal guarantee, while a full scale investigation of the affairs of Zululand was conducted.¹⁴⁷ Then, after receipt of a Colenso-Dumat telegram, he urged that at least there should be an investigation into the way the trials were being conducted.¹⁴⁸ In the end he asked, in vain, for further postponement. He contended that the trials should not resume on the 23 January but be delayed until the end of February and that the Secretary of State should overrule Havelock's objections to this course. To give Havelock discretion over the timing of trials was to give him the power to thwart investigation into the actions of Zululand officials.¹⁴⁹

The Colensos sensed that Escombe had lost any illusions he might have had about the Colonial Office, and Agnes certainly thought this an advantage.¹⁵⁰ Escombe left Britain shortly after the proceedings in the Privy Council on 22 January 1889.¹⁵¹ He believed that the Lord Chancellor's expression of opinion during the proceedings in favour of the postponement of the Eshowe trials would enhance the defence prospects of delay. But, in fact, all the officials were prepared to do was ensure a sequence for the Eshowe cases that would delay Dinuzulu's case until Escombe had returned and could appear for the defence.¹⁵² Escombe could be very pertinacious when he chose, but his later request for a second commission to sit in Natal to review the proceedings of the Court of Special

146. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 98): Escombe, Zulu Trials.

147. *Ibid.*, p.5, Escombe to Secretary of State, 21 Dec.1888.

148. C.5892, p.120, no.79: Escombe to C.O., 24 Dec.1888, enclosing telegram from Colenso and Dumat which protests against enquiry and seeks postponement.

149. *Ibid.*, p.152, no.98: Secretary of State to Havelock, telegram, 12 Jan.1889; no.99: Havelock to Secretary of State, telegram (received 14 Jan.1889); no.100: Secretary of State to Escombe, 6 Jan.1889; and p.153, no.102: Escombe to Secretary of State, 16 Jan.1889.

150. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Friday night (Jan.1889, int.ev.)

151. He addressed a letter to Knutsford on 27 Feb.1889: C.5892, pp.197-99, enclosure in no.134.

152. C.S.C.Z., Index to Cases, Registrar's Record, pp.1, 70-72, 146-52, 366-72, 579-89 and 861-63.

Commissioners fell on deaf ears.¹⁵³

While in Britain, Escombe did not give all his attention only to the uSuthu. He had views on other questions and he expressed them. For example, he urged the capacity of colonial statesmen; and he endorsed Natal's claims to expansion and to Responsible government.¹⁵⁴ He wanted Harriette and Frank not to lose sight of the relevance of the defence of the uSuthu to the Responsible government issue: it was 'a colonial defence against officials'.¹⁵⁵ Escombe himself stated that, to him, the question of Zululand was only part of the much bigger question of South East Africa, and his public pronouncements in Britain encouraged the view that, to Escombe, justice to the uSuthu, if an end in itself, was also a means to another end.¹⁵⁶ After his return to South Africa, Escombe wrote to Merriman that he had been trapped by the promise made in 'an unguarded moment' to defend the uSuthu, but did not regret the undertaking.¹⁵⁷ It was evident, however, that he was glad to be 'clear of Zululand'. Escombe was anti-Imperial rather than pro-uSuthu.

With Frank's help and supporting lobbying, Escombe had made himself known to the handful of MPs interested in Zululand.¹⁵⁸ Questions at the end of 1888 showed that there were some capable of sympathy for the Zulus. On 15 November Dr Clark suggested Colenso influence when he remembered Langalibalele and asked whether Ndabuko would be tried under native law or under ordinary criminal law. In reply, de Worms spoke of the Special Court and described the commissioners as 'three gentlemen of judicial experience unconnected with Zululand'. He informed the House that the accused would be tried for definite charges under the civilized criminal law, and that they could be defended by counsel. The court, he added, was to keep a full record. He gave the undertaking which was subsequently so often quoted by the uSuthu friends. This was that the sentences would not be carried out until Her Majesty's government had had the opportunity to consider the

153. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Knutsford, 27 Feb.1889. See fn.151.

154. *Natal Mercury*, 25 Jan.1889, brief report of Natal dinner presided over by Sir E. Wood; and *ibid.*, 31 Jan.1889, on interview with Escombe in *South Africa*.

155. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 17, 24 and 26 Mar.1889.

156. Merriman Papers: Escombe to John X Merriman, 1 June 1889.

157. *Ibid.*, 26 Apr.1889.

158. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov. 1888; Charles Hancock to H.E. Colenso, 22 Nov.1888 and 6 Dec.1888; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: F.E. Colenso to Osborne Morgan, 4 Dec.1888.

evidence, and the Queen's pleasure was known.¹⁵⁹

The surrender of Dinuzulu prompted more questions. On 16 November 1888 Sir John Gorst, replying to Osborne Morgan, read out a telegram from Havelock to the effect that Dinuzulu had been apprehended in Natal; that Shingana had surrendered in Zululand; and that the Special Court had begun its proceedings.¹⁶⁰ Sometimes questioner was better informed than under-secretary. This was clearly the case when Dr Clark on 20 November 1888 asked about the interdict of 17 November 1888. Clark knew too of the defence concern that the trials were being hurried on and he reminded the government that the distribution of parliamentary papers was overdue.¹⁶¹ J.E. Ellis, on behalf of Mr McArthur, caught de Worms ignorant initially of the fact that Ndabuko, Somkhele and other chiefs were standing trial for high treason.¹⁶² He made de Worms say explicitly that there was no legal provision for trial by jury in Zululand. On 22 November 1888 the question of the discharging of the interdict was raised.¹⁶³

On 27 November Dr Clark asked a number of questions which included reference to the resignation of Campbell because he had been denied adequate time for the preparation of the defence, claimed the need for a 'full investigation into the matter', and went so far as to suggest that Dinuzulu might be left without counsel. The reply was to the effect that the Colonial Office had been informed by Havelock that Miss Colenso had engaged Escombe for the defence, that Escombe would himself no doubt engage counsel, and that Dinuzulu like the other chiefs would be tried for treason. The Secretary of State did not doubt that there would be full investigation; and the friends of the uSuthu were given only the assurance that investigation into the uSuthu allegations against officials had been deferred until after the trials which, it was thought, would shed light on the whole circumstance.¹⁶⁴ At this stage a further enquiry was still possible.

Dr Clark was tenacious. On 3 December, the date of Escombe's interview with the Colonial Office and the date of the telegram urging Havelock to adjourn the trials, he

159. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.330, col.1232: 15 Nov.1888.

160. *Ibid.*, cols 1393-94: 16 Nov.1888.

161. *Ibid.*, col.1663: 20 Nov.1888.

162. *Ibid.*, col.1660: 20 Nov.1888.

163. *Ibid.*, col.1841: 22 Nov.1888.

164. *Ibid.*, vol.331, cols 309-10: 27 Nov.1888.

asked about the newspaper report¹⁶⁵ of executions at Eshowe against which Harriette had protested strongly.¹⁶⁶ The Colonial Office telegraphed to Havelock for information, and de Worms, in responding to the question, read out the telegram Havelock sent in reply. Havelock said that there was no truth in the report mentioned in the Colonial Office telegram. In this Havelock showed punctilious loyalty to the letter of the truth, but broke its spirit. He omitted allusion to Nkhowana. This was the man who had been condemned and executed at Eshowe but not, as the newspaper stated, for the murder of Klaas Louw. This question prompted from de Worms the repeated assurance that no sentence would be carried out prior to the consideration of the evidence by Her Majesty's government.¹⁶⁷ If Havelock equivocated on the question of the Eshowe execution, Dr Clark had de Worms splitting hairs about Somkhele a week later. Asked about the fine already imposed on Somkhele, de Worms solemnly assured the House that Somkhele had not been fined, but that a tribal fine had been imposed.¹⁶⁸

The announcement that the proceedings of the Court of the Special Commissioners had been suspended at the request of the Secretary of State was made on 6 December 1888. This was part of de Worms' response to a number of attacking and well informed questions from Mr McArthur and from Dr Clark. Their cumulative effect was to impugn the impartiality of the Special Court and its capacity to see that justice was done.¹⁶⁹

Phase 2: Eshowe

In the meanwhile, prior to the re-opening of the judicial proceedings, the defence had not been idle. Harriette spent Christmas in Eshowe with the uSuthu. She presumably distributed the gifts she requested from white friends in Pietermaritzburg.¹⁷⁰ More important, the defence lawyers were watching the officials. They took up, for example, the question of unauthorised floggings in the Ndwandwe district for which the acting resident magistrate Tyrrell was responsible. They secured publicity and they lodged a

165. *Ibid.*, cols 837-38: 3 Dec.1888.

166. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Havelock, copy, 20 Oct.1888.

167. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.331, cols 837-38: 3 Dec.1888.

168. *Ibid.*, col.1592: 10 Dec.1888.

169. *Ibid.*, col.1235: 6 Dec.1888.

170. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 22 Dec.1888; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 31 Dec.1888.

protest.¹⁷¹ They protested too against intimidation of witnesses. They took down the affidavit of a Zulu man who alleged that he had been gaoled because the evidence he offered differed from other witnesses, and sent it to T. Ellis MP.¹⁷²

Harriette's visits to Ndabuko seem to have been frequent and prolonged and they presumably continued even when the court was not sitting. Ndabuko, she thought, had performed not too badly in the witness box. He had probably been counselled by the defence representatives even though no lawyer actually pleaded on his behalf at the Court of the Special Commissioners. Harriette commented that his case was 'working out beautifully'.¹⁷³ Ndabuko's interventions in the course of the examination of witnesses were brief but effective: he insisted that as a leading man, he had been drawn into the disturbances by those who had favoured Zibhebhu; that he deplored the murder of the traders; and he remarked of Klaas Louw that 'he was one of us'. Ndabuko claimed he was the victim of biased evidence.¹⁷⁴

When Tshanibezwe, the son of Mnyamana, gave evidence, Ndabuko tried to show that he was biased and more concerned to expose uSuthu enmity to his father than their hostility to the Queen. Ndabuko was not successful in this, because Tshanibezwe insisted on the identity of his father's cause with that of the Queen.¹⁷⁵ The uSuthu defence team thought Tshanibezwe an officially-favoured witness, and Harriette subsequently commented that, though much of his evidence was hearsay, it was received by the Court without enquiry.¹⁷⁶ Evidently Ndabuko cut an impressive figure. Escombe referred to his complete self-denial and perfect dignity.¹⁷⁷ In their subsequent criticisms of the Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand, the uSuthu defence was to make much of the personal demeanour of Ndabuko and the fact that he was undefended.¹⁷⁸ He was

-
- 171. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to Charles Hancock, 30 Dec.1888; *C.S.C.Z.*, pp.889-90: Campbell and Dumat to Resident Commissioner, 14 Jan.1889; *Natal Advertiser*, leader, 'A Glimpse of Zululand', 7 Jan.1889.
 - 172. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 94): Affidavit of Luhayi. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.
 - 173. N.A., Col.Coll.: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso (My darling child), 21 Nov.1888.
 - 174. *C.S.C.Z.*, pp.195 and 243.
 - 175. *Ibid.*, pp.309-22.
 - 176. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 94): Mss. notes of H.E. Colenso, headed on C.6070, pp.1-17.
 - 177. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 95): Escombe's speech as defence counsel at the close of the trial of Dinuzulu.
 - 178. *C.S.C.Z.*, p.361.

sentenced to fifteen years imprisonment without hard labour.¹⁷⁹

Harriette's lawyer friends resumed direct participation in the judicial proceedings with the case against Shingana. Since Campbell had withdrawn from Eshowe, and Escombe had not returned from Britain, F.C. Dumat led the defence, assisted by R.C.A. Samuelson, Dumat did not know Zulu. Samuelson did. Harriette was, as ever, present in the court house.¹⁸⁰ Dumat submitted exceptions against the composition of the court and the indictment, but the case proceeded.¹⁸¹ Dumat's approach as defence counsel was to make as many objections as possible to statements of prosecution witnesses and to the procedure of the court¹⁸² and to insist that there was an alternative explanation for the conduct of Shingana. Dumat suggested that in raiding cattle Shingana was merely claiming his own: viz. the cattle that had been captured by the uSuthu at Etshaneni¹⁸³ and subsequently lost. This was an interesting pointer to the complex claims and counter-claims to cattle that could be urged in a society which had lurched into anarchy and where cattle raiding had become a means of survival. The main thrust of Dumat's argument was that Shingana and his followers had taken refuge at Hlophekhulu to avoid attack by Zibhebhu and that they were waiting for the British to deal with Zibhebhu before they abandoned the refuge.¹⁸⁴ In his concluding address Dumat reminded the court that the Mandlakazi war cry had been heard at Hlophekhulu.¹⁸⁵ The court would not allow Dumat to present the evidence of a Boer eye-witness at Ceza - one Labuschaigne¹⁸⁶ - but he was allowed to place on record accounts of the ruthless treatment meted out by Zibhebhu on those who occupied sites to which Zibhebhu believed himself entitled.¹⁸⁷ Dumat succeeded in putting question marks against the impartiality of Addison by eliciting and recording the fact that Addison had heard cases in his court in which Zibhebhu brought claims that preceded annexation and the assumption of British authority.¹⁸⁸ In addition, there was the evidence that Jantje, a Natal African who served in the Native

179. Binns, *Dinuzulu*, p.148.

180. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 126), Letterbook 3, p.132: H.E. Colenso to R.C.A. Samuelson, Oct.1888.

181. C.S.C.Z., Appendix L, pp.935-36.

182. *Ibid.*, p.405.

183. *Ibid.*, p.623.

184. *Ibid.*, p.464.

185. N.A., Col.Coll: Mss. in H.E. Colenso's script of Dumat's closing address.

186. C.S.C.Z., pp.483-84.

187. *Ibid.*, p.504.

188. *Ibid.*, p.517.

Contingent, expected to be rewarded with land in the Ndwandwe.¹⁸⁹ The case against Shingana was concluded on 9 March 1889. On 27 April he was sentenced to twelve years imprisonment.¹⁹⁰

Perhaps to allow time for Escombe to travel up to Eshowe, the Court of the Special Commissioners proceeded with the trial of a son of Somkhele, Xibilini, who with two associates was charged with the crime of shooting with intent to kill.¹⁹¹ He was one of the party involved in the attack on the traders, White, Knight and Ashby, when the white men were *en route* to the Lower Mfolozi magistracy to seek refuge with Pretorius.¹⁹² Ashby was abandoned by his white colleagues and subsequently murdered. No charge was made about that. What prompted the case was the experience of White and Knight as they scrambled and staggered for survival in the hours that followed. It obviously counted against Xibilini that the white traders claimed to have seen him shooting at them.¹⁹³ His associates were acquitted, but Xibilini was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment with hard labour.¹⁹⁴ Xibilini had no legal representation.¹⁹⁵ He alleged that the attack on the traders was in response to a message of Dinuzulu that they should proceed against the white men and bring back the cattle of Dinuzulu.¹⁹⁶ It was alleged against Xibilini that he had a grudge against White: the latter had assisted the resident magistrate in an attack on Somopho; and White had reported to J.L. Knight, the resident magistrate, that the young men of Somkhele were going to Dinuzulu. Xibilini was among the men who had been fined by the magistrate in consequence.¹⁹⁷

When the trial of Dinuzulu began on 14 March 1889, Escombe was in his place at Eshowe as the leading counsel for the defence.¹⁹⁸ He had left England shortly after the Privy Council hearing and, within a few weeks of his return to Natal, he had submitted to Knutsford another set of observations and suggestions. His letter on 27 February 1889 to

189. *Ibid.*, p.416.

190. *Ibid.*, pp.543-44.

191. *Ibid.*, p.546.

192. *Ibid.*, pp.551-53.

193. Laband, *Rope*, p.415; *C.S.C.Z.*, pp.545-75.

194. *Ibid.*, p.575.

195. *Ibid.*, p.550.

196. *Ibid.*, p.567.

197. *Ibid.*, p.557.

198. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 199): Dube to Renaud, 19 Jan.1889; *C.S.C.Z.*, p.579.

Knutsford included criticisms of the Special Court that he would urge later in Eshowe itself. What he suggested for the future was not acted upon: *i.e.* a commission to sit in Natal to review the decisions and the verdicts of the Court of the Special Commissioners. Equally unavailing was his appeal to have state funds made available for financing the defence. He pointed to the anomaly: the cost of the prosecution was sustained by state funds (in fact, from the Zululand treasury which derived the bulk of its revenue from hut tax).¹⁹⁹ What he did not say, though he might legitimately have done so, was that the Zululand treasury, which would have to meet all the costs of the Court of the Special Commissioners, was itself very largely dependent on the payment of hut tax or cattle fines.²⁰⁰ By contrast, apart from what Escombe himself paid, the costs of the defence fell on Harriette and her mother. Escombe estimated to Merriman that he had spent £1000 and many months on the uSuthu defence. This amount included the five hundred pounds he paid to Campbell and a monetary equivalent for his time and effort in a professional capacity.²⁰¹ Harriette's expenditure was £3000.²⁰² The financial help for which she and Escombe asked the government was evidently denied.²⁰³

Despite the misgivings aroused by the possible implications and repercussions of the Privy Council judgment of 22 January 1889, the trial of Dinuzulu began on 14 March 1889.²⁰⁴ He was to be tried for high treason, sedition, and public violence. The prosecution was evasive about whether they would in fact put Dinuzulu on trial for the trumped-up charge of murder, which was one of the charges mentioned in the initial warrants.²⁰⁵ The murder charge was eventually dropped, but not until the conclusion of Dinuzulu's trial for high treason, sedition, and public violence.²⁰⁶

Escombe was clearly determined to make things as difficult as possible for the officials and for the court. He had previously questioned whether or not the judges had been duly sworn

199. N.A., Col.Coll: Escombe to Knutsford, copy, 27 Feb.1889. See above, fn.151.

200. HC.347 Zululand: Revenue Return 1887-1189 and HC.348 Zululand: Seizure of Cattle Return 1887-1889.

201. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 145): H.E. Colenso, rough draft re expenses; and Escombe to H.E. Colenso (from Pretoria), 26 Oct.1888. Merriman Papers: Escombe to John X. Merriman, 26 Apr.1889.

202. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 145): H.E. Colenso, rough draft, request for financial help.

203. *Ibid.*, Escombe to Knutsford, 27 Feb.1889.

204. C.S.C.Z., pp.576-856.

205. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.(1888, int.ev.).

206. C.S.C.Z., pp.857-58; N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 15 Mar.1889.

in as well as the competence of the assistant judges.²⁰⁷ He wrote to the Governor scornfully upbraiding Addison because he had shot at the lad Langa 'as if a Zulu subject of the Queen were no better than a partridge'.²⁰⁸ Certainly Escombe did not endear himself to the judges of the Special Court.²⁰⁹ Having previously urged on W.B. Morcom, the prosecutor, that the trial of Dinuzulu should not proceed, pending the outcome of the appeal to the Privy Council, he now lodged objections to the jurisdiction of the court. He submitted a transcript of the Privy Council proceedings of January.²¹⁰ The exceptions which he took to the court included arguments which had previously been urged at other trials by his associates. But there was also new matter. He took exception to Proclamation II of 1887. It purported to introduce into Zululand a vague body of law. He was sceptical whether it and other proclamations had been adequately promulgated in Zululand and in the Zulu language. He took exception to Proclamation IV of 1888 because its language presupposed the guilt of those whom the Special Court was to try.²¹¹

The preliminary onslaught by Escombe settled down to a war of attrition against the prosecution. Intermittently he made a spectacular move probably designed to compel attention to the Special Court. Its proceedings, wrote the *Natal Mercury*, were met by the 'boredom of the public mind'.²¹² Like Dumat, he objected to the reception of hearsay evidence,²¹³ compelled attention to the execution of Nkhowana²¹⁴ and elicited evidence about, and drew attention to, the return of Zibhebhu. He forced from E.W.B. Knight, the Zululand trader, the remarkably understated admission, '... it is difficult for natives to live without rations.'²¹⁵ More important was the way in which he drew attention to the arbitrary methods of the Zululand magistrates. Theirs was the difficult task of trying, with few resources, to coerce acceptance of the authority they wielded, both executive and judicial, in a 'tribal' society. They used methods that certainly did not conform to the highest standards of law enforcement in a civilized society. When white rule was established, magistrates sometimes sought to maintain law and order and to apply

207. *Ibid.*, Escombe to Knutsford, copy, 27 Feb.1889.

208. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*, p.17, Escombe to Governor, 8 Mar.1889.

209. Fannin Papers, vol.8, ff.131-34: J. Fannin to E. Fannin, Easter Monday, 1889.

210. C.S.C.Z., pp.951-86, Appendix R. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

211. C.S.C.Z., Appendix S, pp.987-89.

212. van Wyk, 'Dinuzulu', p.248, fn.105 citing *Natal Mercury*, 1 May 1889.

213. C.S.C.Z., p.621.

214. *Ibid.*, pp.719-20.

215. *Ibid.*, p.745.

British standards of justice by 'methods of barbarism'. They were not necessarily cruel men, but they shared the current assumptions of white superiority and they had a very difficult task. In revealing their methods Escombe was helped by the way members of the Zululand police, the 'hated Nongqai', Vuzindla and Mangqongoza, boasted of floggings inflicted on instructions from Addison. He was aided too by the average citizen's distrust of officialdom and by an increasingly alert and hostile social conscience on questions of flogging and corporal punishment in Victorian society.²¹⁶

The essence of the uSuthu defence was that the fault lay with Zibhebhu and with the officials of the Zululand administration who had favoured him at the expense of the uSuthu.²¹⁷ Within a few days of the beginning of Dinuzulu's trial, Escombe argued that the court had heard sufficient evidence against Zibhebhu for it to issue a warrant for *his* arrest. This Wragg refused. He did so on the grounds that the proceedings in the cases where evidence had been given against Zibhebhu had not been completed. It was a plausible but not a convincing reason.²¹⁸ Mafukwini, the messenger of Dinuzulu against whom allegations had been made in earlier trials, had already been placed under arrest. In his case, admittedly, some of the trials in which evidence was given against him had already been concluded.²¹⁹ Escombe did not secure Zibhebhu's arrest at this point but, in applying for it, he emphasised criticisms of Zibhebhu's proceedings.²²⁰ Escombe argued for the quashing of the indictment against Dinuzulu or, at least, for the provision of such other relief as the court might give. These applications failed.²²¹ Escombe then attempted to storm the official citadel by applying to put in the witness box J.E. Fannin, one of the assistant commissioners. Dumat wanted the Governor himself. He could claim that both were needed to show that there was justification in the uSuthu sense of grievance against Zibhebhu. In neither case was the legal defence successful. But they had certainly implied that there was, at least, the suspicion that the Zululand administration had something to hide.²²² Then came the dispute about the submission of documentary evidence. Denied the opportunity of cross-examining the Governor, Escombe wished to

216. *Ibid.*, pp.787 and 818-19.

217. *Ibid.*, *passim*; but see p.212, statement of Bukwana.

218. *Ibid.*, p.581.

219. *Ibid.*, p.76; see below pp.160-61.

220. *Ibid.*, p.581.

221. *Ibid.*, pp.584-85, 794-96, and 990-96.

222. *Ibid.*, p.585; and Appendix U, pp.994-95.

have included in the official proceedings of the court, as documentary evidence, the Blue Book documents in which Havelock had expressed criticism of local officials and sympathy for the uSuthu and the Governor's correspondence with Harriette Colenso. In this Escombe failed; but at least he drew attention to the documents which the defence considered relevant and to the importance of the correspondence between Harriette and Havelock.²²³ He also called for the production of documents from the court records of Addison. In this he failed, almost completely.²²⁴ Close collaboration between Escombe and Harriette seems to be indicated by his concern for the Blue Book evidence and, of course, his awareness of the correspondence between Harriette and the Governor.

In presenting the case for the defence, Escombe showed both an awareness of what might evoke sympathy among those of the British public who heeded the affair and a sense of the dramatic. The attention he gave to illegal floggings satisfied both criteria.²²⁵ In addition, his criticisms of the Special Court showed him alert to concern in Britain over the Parnell Commission. Escombe's visit to Britain coincided with the public debate about the Commission appointed by the British parliament to enquire into allegations of complicity in crime which *The Times* had brought against the Irish leader.²²⁶ This seems to explain Escombe's interest in comparing the legislation which created the Court of the Special Commissioners in Zululand with the proclamation that created the Parnell Commission in Britain. The Zululand Proclamation was, Escombe insisted, much more deserving of criticism. The Court of Special Commissioners for Zululand had power to punish, even to inflict the death penalty, while those who gave evidence before it were not excused from giving self-incriminatory evidence nor indemnified against further prosecution.²²⁷ To Harriette, the Parnell Commission was the 'Irish dragon'; the Court of the Special Commissioners was her 'Zulu dragon' for whose collapse she hoped.²²⁸ The defence had accumulated a vast number of witnesses for the Dinuzulu case. J. Henderson and Harriette Colenso's own messengers had been active in this regard, and

223. *Ibid.*, pp.837-49, and 586.

224. *Ibid.*, pp.587-89, and Appendix U, pp.996-97.

225. *Ibid.*, pp.787, 818-19, 820-21, 829-31, and 889-90. *Natal Advertiser*, 7 Jan.1889.

226. R. Ensor, *England, 1870-1914* (Oxford, 1949), pp.181-83. Parnell was exculpated in Feb.1890.

227. *C.S.C.Z.*, Appendix T, pp.990-91, comparison of Special Court with the Parnell Commission, 10 Apr.1889.

228. Stabb Papers, vol.5, 2/2/57: H.E. Colenso to Mrs Stabb, 3 Mar.1889.

some imposters seem to have taken a hand as well.²²⁹ Escombe did not summon them all. He alleged that this was because they did not enjoy indemnity. He gained credit for Dinuzulu by securing the uSuthu leader's agreement that his people should not be asked to endanger themselves on behalf of the representative of the house of Shaka.²³⁰ One of Escombe's critics suggested that he would have prolonged the proceedings indefinitely, were it not that he had other commitments.²³¹

The showman in Escombe made the most of Langa, the son of Lokothwayo.²³² He was the youth who, according to Escombe, had been shot at by R.H. Addison as though he were a partridge. The 24 birdshot in the young man's back were evidently removed at Bishopstowe.²³³ At the opening of the trial, Escombe presented to the court an envelope containing the shot. In the printed record there is an illustration of the birdshot.²³⁴ Moreover, Langa identified 'Dick' in the court house during the proceedings. No legal action was taken against Addison over this matter, but it did suggest a stain against the reputation of a member of a respected Natal family.²³⁵

The friends of the uSuthu knew that Addison was hostile to the Zulu royal house. Mankulumana claimed that it was 'Dick' who began it all. They would have liked to bring him to book but they were not as successful as they would have wished. Addison was not called to account for the shooting of Langa. W.B. Morcom, who prosecuted at the trials of the uSuthu, suggested that Langa might have mistaken the identity of the man who shot him.²³⁶ In another regard, the case against Addison was exaggerated. Wrongly informed, Frank Colenso prompted a parliamentary question designed to elicit the admission that he had been one of 'Zibhebhu's whitemen'.²³⁷ This was denied.²³⁸

229. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, fragment, n.d., concerning Leathern, Henderson, and Dinuzulu's cattle.

230. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*, p.3; C.S.C.Z., Appendix T, pp.990-91.

231. Fannin Papers: J. Fannin to E. Fannin, Easter Monday, 1889.

232. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

233. C.S.C.Z., pp.586, and 821-24.

234. *Ibid.*, pp.592 and 823.

235. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes; N.A., Col.Coll: report of meeting of Escombe with uSuthu headmen, 22 Apr.1889.

236. C.S.C.Z., p.824. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

237. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: statement of Mubi and Twaisa who cite Ndabuko, c.July 1888; N.A., Col.Coll: G.B. Clarke to F.E. Colenso, 18 Aug.1888. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll: *Zulu Digest*, Series 8, p.1042 fn.

238. C.5892, p.55, enclosure in no.34: statement of Sifo and Soni, 9 July 1888; p.63, enclosure in no.34: Osborn to Havelock denying the charge, 26 Aug.1888.

He had in fact not been one of Zibhebhu's associates in the same way as Colenbrander and Eckersley, and Harriette Colenso acknowledged that the allegation was misplaced.²³⁹ But, though there was confusion over some matters, the illegal flogging to which attention was drawn in the British parliament, was well attested. For this, Addison was censured by the Secretary of State.²⁴⁰ In addition, he was removed from the Ndwandwe district. It was a politic decision. Addison fared better in the Nqutu among Hlubi's men, and his career prospects were not permanently harmed by the defence allegations against him in the trials of 1888-1889.²⁴¹

A.L. Pretorius, resident magistrate in the Lower Mfolozi district, incurred criticism because of the summary and illegal fines he had imposed on the coast chiefs shortly after their submission. The announcement by the coast chiefs before their sentence that they had already been fined for the offence of going against the magistrate caused something of a stir. The principle that a man should not be punished twice for the same offence was apparently transgressed. Something was done to ensure the return of the cattle which had been paid against this illegal fine, though official arithmetic where cattle were concerned was not reliable. The confusion of the times probably contributed to this. Pretorius resigned from the colonial service and faded from the history of Zululand.²⁴² Tyrrell, the man who had inflicted illegal floggings in the Ndwandwe district while he was temporary resident magistrate and while the Court of the Special Commissioners was in session, was dismissed from the service.²⁴³ There were then a few reminders to the officials that they were expected to observe the law they were obliged to enforce. In addition, general regulations concerning floggings of prisoners were tightened and publicised.²⁴⁴

The only sentence of death passed by the Special Commissioners was on Mpikwa, the man

239. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 87): H.E. Colenso account of interview with Havelock, 17 Sept.1888.

240. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.336, col.1812: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms, 4 June 1889; vol.337, cols 548-89: question by C. Bradlaugh, answered by de Worms, 24 June 1889. C.5892, p.407, no.202: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 10 Oct.1889.

241. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

242. C.S.C.Z., p.41; Appendix N, p.938.

243. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.335, col.221: question by W.B. McLaren, answered by de Worms, 11 Apr.1889.

244. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.1164: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms.

who was found guilty of the murder of the trader Tonge in the Lower Mfolozi district. A *nongqai* gave evidence that Mpikwa had led them to the place where the trader's body was to be found. There was evidence too from a witness, Dikidana, that Mpikwa had been heard to demand of the trader, 'Where are the king's cattle going?' The verdict of guilty on Mpikwa was unanimous.²⁴⁵ Knutsford, despite his noted repugnance to hangings, would have confirmed this sentence, if it were not for the delay that had elapsed between the passing of the sentence and the review of this and other sentences in London.²⁴⁶

For the defence the climax in Eshowe was Escombe's address to the court on behalf of Dinuzulu. The text was typed out in London and formed part of the documentation of the friends of the uSuthu.²⁴⁷ In the long speech, lasting 6 hours, Escombe surveyed the whole field of the defence; but summed up the pith in a sentence:

'One single cause will explain the whole of these circumstances; and that cause is found in Usibepu (sic), and not in disloyalty towards the Queen.'

On his own behalf and on behalf of the defence Escombe claimed, 'We have made the best defence we can with the means at our disposal.' He argued that even if the defence failed, they would at least have shed light on the general condition of Zululand. He ended on a lofty note of altruism:

'... and we who are taking part in the defence hope to find our reward in a more contented country - a happier Zululand.'²⁴⁸

In the immediate context Escombe's proceedings on behalf of the uSuthu cost him popularity. Fannin was very sour about Escombe as defence counsel. He jeered at Escombe's 'firework eloquence', at his attempts to subpoena Fannin himself and the Governor, and was irritated at the way in which Escombe had prolonged the proceedings in Eshowe. He believed that Escombe would have kept them in session for a further month had it not been for other commitments.²⁴⁹

245. C.S.C.Z., pp.864-84, especially p.871.

246. C.6070, p.17, no.3: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 13 Feb.1890.

247. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 95): text of Escombe's speech in defence of Dinuzulu. There is a copy in the R.H.L. A.S.P.

248. *Ibid.*, see *Natal Mercury*, 26 Apr.1889.

249. Fannin Papers, vol.8, ff.123-26: J.E. Fannin to E. Fannin, 31 Mar.1889; ff.127-130: J.E. Fannin to E. Fannin, 12 Apr.1889; ff.131-34: J.E. Fannin to E. Fannin, Easter Monday.

On 27 April the Court of the Special Commissioners ended with the sentencing of the three leaders: Ndabuko to fifteen, Shingana to twelve, and Dinuzulu to ten years' imprisonment.²⁵⁰ Harriette sent to England a detailed and vivid description of the elaborate ceremony during which Zibhebhu had ridden alongside the prisoners, while the escorts marched with bayonets fixed and the band played 'Johnnie came marching home.'²⁵¹

Shortly before sentencing Escombe had warned the uSuthu who were attending the trials that guilty verdicts were likely. Probably Harriette arranged the meeting, for the benefit of both the colonial politician and the uSuthu leaders and, perhaps, because her own advice was vulnerable to official suspicion. Harriette, with Magma Magwaza Fuze, interpreted for Escombe. The latter warned the uSuthu leaders that 'the sky might thunder for them' in Zululand, but there remained the further prospect of trial in England where there was, said Escombe, a kind feeling towards the Zulus. The uSuthu did not attend the court when sentences were pronounced.²⁵²

For their part Siziba and Mankulumana, uSuthu headmen, opened up new fields for Escombe by telling him of their fears. Escombe nevertheless insisted that they must look to the Queen's courts not to the assegai. He pledged that 'what can be done will be done,' but he warned them that he was only a representative and there was a limit to what he could do. There was, he told them, no limit to an Englishman's love of justice and fair play.²⁵³ A record of the proceedings at this meeting was made by the shorthand writer George Burgess.²⁵⁴ This was later made available to the lawyer conducting the uSuthu case before the Privy Council, Fullarton.²⁵⁵

Escombe left Eshowe even before the sentences were passed. He faded from the forefront

250. C.S.C.Z., Index and pp.362, 544 and 856.

251. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 28 July 1889. *Natal Witness*, 21 Sept.1889, reprinting a report from the *Manchester Examiner*.

252. M.M. Fuze, *The Black People and Whence They Came: a Zulu View* (Pietermaritzburg, 1979), p.150.

253. C.5892, p.216, no.148: Havelock to Knutsford, 1 May 1889, enclosing letter from Escombe with record of his meeting with uSuthu representatives on 22 Apr.1889.

254. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 95): record of meeting with uSuthu headmen, compiled by G. Burgess, typescript, 22 Apr.1889.

255. *Ibid.* See cover of the typescript.

of uSuthu championship. With Dumat he submitted to the Secretary of State, through the Governor, a number of long letters which surveyed the trials and tried to highlight the points most favourable to the uSuthu.²⁵⁶ These letters formed the basis of the '*Remonstrance on Behalf of the Zulu Chiefs*' published in mid-1889 in London.²⁵⁷ On Frank Colenso's insistence it was financed by the Zulu Defence Fund and published after the Privy Council hearing.²⁵⁸ It was a cumbrous piece of propaganda, mind-boggling to the uninitiated, but possessed of a telling concluding sentence, 'There is not in the whole of Her Majesty's possessions a race more loyal and more wronged than the Zulus'

For the rest, Escombe gave advice to the Colensos and worried the officials at the thought of what he might do.²⁵⁹ He sent a silver hunting watch to Dinuzulu and rowed out into Durban bay when the chiefs were later embarked for St Helena. But it was Dumat, financed by Harriette, who subsequently travelled to London as a largely ineffective champion of the uSuthu.²⁶⁰ Later the main and the public burden of their cause fell to Harriette who was encouraged by Escombe's praise to think that she had his support. Agnes wrote of Harriette's 'obeying' Mr Escombe in staying on at Eshowe; Harriette wrote that it was really Sobantu who encouraged him to become an uSuthu.²⁶¹

London

Heavy as were her commitments in Eshowe, it was part of Harriette's role to keep her brother Frank and their London friends informed of events in Eshowe. The defence could no longer afford printing, and it was probably Frank who had typewritten copies made of some of Harriette's letters to make circulation easier. Among the letters to her brother which were circulated in typewritten form were those in which she described the Christmas

256. C.5892, p.256, no.170: Havelock to Secretary of State enclosing three communications from Dumat and Escombe dated 13, 20 and 22 May 1889, and p.294 Havelock to Secretary of State enclosing letter from Dumat and Escombe, dated 3 June 1889.

257. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*; N.A., Col.Coll: Dumat to H.E. Colenso, 11 Aug.1889.

258. Judgment was given late in July 1889. C.S.C.Z., Appendix Z-5, pp.1007-009, *The Times Law Report*, 30 July 1889; Dinuzulu's Petition for Leave to Appeal against the Conviction by the Court of the Special Commissioners, 27 Apr.1889.

259. N.A., Col.Coll: H. Escombe to F.E. Colenso, 15 May 1889; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 4 June 1889.

260. *Ibid.*, Escombe to F.E. Colenso, 15 May 1889; Dumat to Escombe, 5 July 1889.

261. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 145): H.E. Colenso to mother, n.d. (May 1889, int.ev.); A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 11 May 1889.

she had spent with the uSuthu prisoners.²⁶² Christmas beef was distributed and a service conducted by Paul Mthimkhulu, Dinuzulu's Christian companion and *inyanga*.²⁶³ Other letters of January drew attention to the way in which the defence was having an impact, even though the Special Court was adjourned. Osborn, she told Frank, had formally quashed the verdict against Siziba and his associates, though this could not unflog the victims of illegal floggings.²⁶⁴ Harriette wrote too of her concern at the way hut tax was being levied on the sites of burnt kraals, and of how the young men of the disturbed districts were being pressured into working for the Natal government railways.²⁶⁵ Harriette sent her brother a transcript of the first part of Ndabuko's trial. She thought that Escombe would be pleased at the vigour of the defence. In February she wrote of the way Zibhebhu, though under some kind of arrest, was nevertheless allowed to ride about the countryside. MPs took up the question.²⁶⁶ The letters give occasional glimpses of Harriette herself: on her knees in Ndabuko's hut, busily writing,²⁶⁷ or dazed by effort:

'I am stupid to-day from sitting up last night copying and not fit to do justice to the witnesses to be examined by us, but there is no one else to do it.'²⁶⁸

By early February Harriette was in touch with Fox Bourne²⁶⁹ who took over the duties of secretary to the A.P.S. She alerted Fox Bourne to the way in which Zibhebhu was indulged and to the close association between Zibhebhu and the officials. She warned him of the anti-uSuthu bias of the *Natal Mercury* and told him that the *Natal Advertiser* sometimes carried telegraphic reports that came from the defence.²⁷⁰ Both Fox Bourne and Frank were possible routes to members of parliament and the chance of parliamentary attention. Harriette sent over to London lists of questions that Escombe thought might perhaps be asked in parliament.²⁷¹ These questions focussed on the court's reception of hearsay evidence, the intimidation of witnesses, and on the way in which Dinuzulu's

262. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 95): H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, n.d. (Jan.1889, int.ev.).

263. *Ibid.*, 6 Jan.1889. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

264. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 6 Jan.1889.

265. *Ibid.*, 14 Jan.1889.

266. *Ibid.*, 3 Feb.1889.

267. *Ibid.*, n.d. (Jan.1889, int.ev.).

268. *Ibid.*, 14 Jan.1889.

269. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

270. cf. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 3 Feb.1889.

271. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 4 Apr.1889.

lands were being occupied by non-uSuthu even before he had been found guilty.²⁷²

Some encouragement came from London. Fox Bourne was interested and was to be instrumental in setting up the Zulu Defence Fund with its own committee to back the appeal to the Privy Council.²⁷³ During the proceedings of the court at Eshowe the defence could still hope for a favourable verdict from the highest tribunal in the empire. In January 1889 Escombe wrote somewhat ingenuously that the decision of the Privy Council was of less importance than the publicity of the proceedings,²⁷⁴ but he appeared to be confident of the outcome in March 1889.²⁷⁵ After the verdicts in Eshowe were made known, Frank Colenso wrote that the Privy Council was the 'best way', 'the high road to success', and 'a *sine qua non*'.²⁷⁶

While the Court of the Special Commissioners was sitting from 23 January to 27 April, there was a handful of MPs who, on occasion, called interest to Zululand. In February Mr A. McArthur asked about the enforcement of sentences on Somkhele and on the other uSuthu already sentenced, and about the procedure of the Special Court in regard, for example, to Ndabuko. In addition, he raised the question of the Privy Council Proceedings. De Worms obviously felt that the government was on firm ground. He replied that the trial of Dinuzulu was to proceed because Her Majesty's government had been informed that the outcome of the appeal to the Privy Council would in no way invalidate the findings of the Special Court.²⁷⁷ Later, when W. McLaren quoted the words of the Lord Chancellor strongly recommending delay, de Worms explained that the Lord Chancellor had at that point been under the misapprehension that Dinuzulu was in danger of being hanged prior to a Privy Council decision. This, said de Worms, was not the case, because there had been the assurance of review from London of the cases tried at Eshowe. De Worms added that local officials reported that delay in the trials was having a bad effect on the loyal blacks and said that the trials were to proceed.²⁷⁸ In

272. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.8: question by T. Ellis, 1 July 1889; vol.338, col.130: question by T. Ellis, 11 July 1889; col.528: question by T. Ellis, 16 July 1889.

273. Fox Bourne, *Zulu Defence Fund*.

274. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 98): H. Escombe, Zulu Trials, typescript, Jan.1889.

275. *Ibid.*, H. Escombe, speech of 14 Mar.1889.

276. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to Escombe (faded copies), May 1889.

277. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.333, cols 258-59: question by A. McArthur, answered by de Worms, 25 Feb.1889.

278. *Ibid.*, col.1288. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

subsequent interventions McLaren floundered into the legal confusion over the warrants issued against Dinuzulu. He implied that the local officials were delaying the transmission of the record of the proceedings of the Natal Supreme Court, without which appeal to the Privy Council could not be pressed. De Worms reiterated the government contention: the proceedings of the Privy Council were of little consequence.²⁷⁹

In addition, questions were asked about Zibhebhu and about the local officials. These were designed to show that there was the strong suspicion of murder against Zibhebhu, of pro-Mandlakazi bias on the part of the officials, and of arbitrary acts of official power. McLaren asked whether Zibhebhu was to be charged with murder and received from de Worms an explanation of the delay in taking steps against him; in April McLaren insisted that Zibhebhu had been left free, while de Worms replied that he had been 'in custody' on 4 February 1889.²⁸⁰ In the meanwhile, McLaren reminded the House of the involvement of Fannin with the demarcation of an earlier boundary for Zibhebhu, and suggested that Addison had been one of 'Zibhebhu's whitemen.'²⁸¹ Moreover, McLaren refused to allow the question of the illegal floggings inflicted by Tyrrell to disappear. De Worms on 4 April informed the House that Tyrrell, an acting resident magistrate, had been dismissed from the post; but, he added, somewhat misleadingly, that his superior (Osborn presumably) had acted promptly in dealing with the case, and on his own initiative.²⁸²

After the sentences were passed there was some press comment in Britain, as MPs asked what the government intended to do about them. The usual answer was the repeated assurance that the sentences would be reviewed.²⁸³ In addition, Tom Ellis called the attention of the House to allegations of illegal floggings, and the question of Zibhebhu and the murder of Msutshwana.²⁸⁴

279. *British Hansard*, 3rd series, vol.334, cols 131-32: question by W. McLaren, answered by de Worms, 19 Mar.1889.

280. *Ibid.*, vol.333, col.1637: question by McLaren, answered by de Worms, 14 Mar.1889; vol.335, col.599: question by McLaren, answered by de Worms, 16 Apr.1889.

281. *Ibid.*, vol.333, col.1637: question by McLaren, answered by de Worms, 15 Mar.1889.

282. *Ibid.*, vol.335, col.221: question by McLaren, answered by de Worms, 11 Apr.1889.

283. *Ibid.*, col.777: question by R.N. Fowler, answered by de Worms, 30 Apr.1889; vol.336, col.1811: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms, 4 June 1889.

284. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.310: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms, 20 June 1889; vol.338, col.130: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms, 11 July 1889; vol.338, col.528: question by T. Ellis, answered by de Worms, 16 July 1889.

During, as before, the trials there had been much criticism of Osborn and of the local officials, but, by March 1889, the Colonial Office had decided that they would not abandon Osborn. The Resident Commissioner offered his resignation. Havelock insisted that, if he resigned, he should be accorded his full pension rights. Knutsford decided against this and Osborn remained in office sustained by the praise of the Secretary of State.²⁸⁵

Eshowe

After the sentences were pronounced on 27 April, Eshowe emptied. The Commissioners were glad to go. Fearing a rescue attempt, they had sometimes been nervous, and Fannin, at least, found the proceedings unduly prolonged.²⁸⁶ The President still had the duty of reporting on the cases.²⁸⁷ The uSuthu following dispersed even before sentences were pronounced. Escombe and the defence lawyers departed for Pietermaritzburg.²⁸⁸

Harriette remained at Eshowe as Escombe advised her.²⁸⁹ She had three main reasons for staying. One was her concern for the convicted men, whose fate was still uncertain. A second reason was the trial of Mafukwini, the reputed messenger of Dinuzulu, who had been held prisoner since 11 December 1888.²⁹⁰ A third was her watchfulness over Zibhebhu and her concern that he should not be able to triumph with impunity over the uSuthu.

She had been in close touch with the prisoners during the trials and she tried to watch out for their interests after their sentencing. She monitored their treatment and their health. She continued to care for the sick.²⁹¹ She compelled the authorities to provide 'thick knitted guernseys' for the coast chiefs.²⁹² She peppered the authorities with requests to

285. van Wyk, 'Dinuzulu', p.229.

286. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 2 Dec.1888; Fannin Papers: J.E. Fannin to E. Fannin, Easter Monday 1889; C.5892, p.222, no.149: Havelock to Secretary of State, 6 May 1889, transmitting copies of correspondence. *Natal Mercury*, 30 Apr.1889.

287. C.6070, pp.1-17, no.1: Wragg to Knutsford, 31 Jan.1890.

288. N.A., Col.Coll: Report of meeting between H. Escombe and uSuthu headmen, 22 Apr.1889.

289. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 11 May 1889.

290. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 94): Statement of Mafukwini, 17 Dec.1888; C.S.C.Z., p.850: see insertion from notes of G. Burgess on affidavit submitted by Dumat.

291. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 24 July 1889.

292. *Ibid.*, W.W. Baxter to H.E. Colenso, 23 July 1889; (Old Ref: Box 144): Copies of correspondence of H.E. Colenso with Dr. Leaky and Saunders, July 1889; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 24 July 1889.

visit the prisoners.²⁹³ Having tussled with the officials, she began to teach Dinuzulu and his uncles to read and was delighted at signs of progress.²⁹⁴ She wrote a prayer for the services which Paul Mthimkhulu Radebe held at least until 4 May.²⁹⁵ She remonstrated with officials over a rumour that the wives of Ndabuko were to have huts destroyed for non-payment of tax.²⁹⁶ She waited to hear what was to be the outcome of the review of sentences promised by the Colonial Office.

Harriette was alone²⁹⁷ in her attempts to act in the interests of Mafukwini, Dinuzulu's messenger, who was tried before the Chief Magistrate's court, *i.e.* before Osborn, assisted by magistrates A. Shepstone and J. Knight. He was arrested on 11 December at Eshowe, where he had been summoned as a defence witness. Evidence in the early trials referred to the role of Mafukwini in delivering messages, and he was charged with incitement to murder.²⁹⁸ The uSuthu defence team protested about his arrest and the interference with other witnesses.²⁹⁹ Havelock gave instructions which amounted to a safe conduct - but not full immunity - to other witnesses; but Mafukwini remained a prisoner, first at the Lower Mfolozi magistracy then at Eshowe.³⁰⁰ He was not tried before the Court of Special Commissioners and, when he was brought before the Resident Commissioner and Chief Magistrate, he had no lawyer to defend him. He was charged with being an accessory to the murder of the trader Tonge. Harriette took over his defence, acting as 'prisoner's friend' because she could not herself be the lawyer.³⁰¹

Harriette argued for Mafukwini in much the same sort of way as the lawyers had done for

293. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 145): H.E. Colenso to Sir, 18 June 1889.

294. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 140): H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 20 June 1889; R.H.L., Br. Empire Series S.18 A.S.P., C.150/193: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 24 June 1889.

295. N.A., Col.Coll: C.R. Saunders to H.E. Colenso, 25 Jan. and 4 May 1889; A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Thurs. 9 May and 2 July 1889.

296. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 192): Mitchell to Osborn, 4 Oct.1889; Osborn to Mitchell, 8 Oct.1889 (copies).

297. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 142): H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, Friday night (Aug.1889, int.ev.).

298. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 94): statement of Mafukwini, copy in H.E. Colenso's script, 17 Dec.1888; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 24 July 1889.

299. *Ibid.*, statement of Luhayi; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, Tues. (Dec.1888, int.ev.); R.C.A. Samuelson to C.R. Saunders, 11 Dec.1888 (2 letters, copies).

300. C.5892, pp.400-01, enclosure 2, no.198: report by Resident Commissioner, 26 Aug.1889; pp.398-400, enclosure in no.198: H.E. Colenso to Mitchell, 20 Aug.1889.

301. *Ibid.*, pp.398-403, no.108: Mitchell to Secretary of State, 30 Aug.1889 with enclosures; *viz.* no.1: H.E. Colenso to Secretary of State, 20 Aug.1889; no.2: report of Osborn, 26 Aug.1889; no.3: report of H.C. Koch, 26 Aug.1889. The legal profession was closed to women until the 1920s.

the uSuthu leaders. She stressed that the accused had no lawyer and that the time to prepare the defence was too short.³⁰² In countering her arguments, officials asserted that Harriette could have called on the services of a lawyer in Stanger or of Escombe in Pietermaritzburg; she had seen the prisoner daily and been given copies of depositions; and the court had assisted her in itself putting her questions to witnesses during the hearing.³⁰³ In fact, officials were annoyed that Harriette had dissuaded Mafukwini from calling Dinuzulu as a witness and implied that she had influenced crown witnesses.

Assiduously comparing statements made by witnesses against Mafukwini with what the same witnesses had said in earlier trials, she claimed that one witness in particular, Dikidana, had clearly perjured himself in the course of the Mafukwini trial. She suspected, too, that crown witnesses had concerted their evidence. The officials, she noticed, did not comment on her specific criticisms.³⁰⁴ After Mafukwini had been sentenced to five years' imprisonment with hard labour as an accessory to the murder of trader Tonge, Harriette asked for the reconsideration of his case and that of Mpikwa, who had been sentenced to death for this murder.³⁰⁵ Knutsford rejected her pleas for Mafukwini on the grounds that the promise to suspend sentences applied only to those arraigned before the Court of the Special Commissioners.³⁰⁶ He commuted the sentence on Mpikwa to life imprisonment, but did so reluctantly. Both Knutsford and Havelock would have liked to see Mpikwa hanged.³⁰⁷

All the while Harriette was at Eshowe, she kept a careful watch on Zibhebhu. She believed that the favouritism of officials towards Zibhebhu had brought disaster upon the uSuthu and she certainly did not wish to see Zibhebhu triumph vindictively over the supporters of the Royal House.³⁰⁸ During the proceedings of the Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand the defence team for the uSuthu had so vociferously emphasised the role of Zibhebhu in the disturbances that there were limits to what the

302. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 144): H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 20 Aug.1889.

303. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 142): H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, Friday night (Aug.1889, int.ev.).

304. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 12 Nov.1889.

305. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 144): H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 20 Aug.1889.

306. C.5892, p.407, no.201: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 9 Oct.1889.

307. C.5893, pp.8-9, no.5: Havelock to Secretary of State, 15 Dec.1889; and C.6070, p.17, no.3: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 13 Feb.1890.

308. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 142): H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, n.d. (Apr.1889? int.ev.).

goodwill of the local officials could accomplish for him.³⁰⁹ At the same time, Harriette noticed and publicised what happened outside the court room. She drew attention to the freedom of movement Zibhebhu enjoyed when he was supposedly under arrest for the murder of Msutshwana and to his high profile presence.³¹⁰ She publicised the triumph he had enjoyed in riding alongside the escort when the uSuthu leaders were summoned for sentencing; she scoffed at the official explanation that this had been inadvertent, in that Zibhebhu at the time was on his way to the court house of the resident magistrate at Eshowe in connection with the preliminary examination being conducted against him.³¹¹

As a result of her vigilance the officials found it impossible to allow him to move north, perhaps in conjunction with Charles Saunders on his expedition to Tongaland in July 1889. He was peremptorily recalled.³¹² In addition they were obliged to appease Zibhebhu's critics by taking some official cognisance of the charges made against him. Zibhebhu was, in fact, caught between the counter pressures of the officials and the Colensos. He was not punished for the acts of violence alleged against him, especially the murder of Msutshwana, but he was not rewarded for his loyalty to officials. Local officials knew how closely meshed were the activities of Zibhebhu and their interests as officials. They dragged their feet over calls from Havelock that Zibhebhu should be brought to trial.³¹³ Eventually Charles Saunders, resident magistrate at Eshowe, conducted a preliminary investigation into the charge of murder against Zibhebhu. He found that there was no case for Zibhebhu to answer.³¹⁴ Officials in Pietermaritzburg were concerned at the finding,³¹⁵ but in London Knutsford accepted it as a *fait accompli*.³¹⁶ Zibhebhu was not, however, allowed to return to the Ndwandwe district.³¹⁷

309. *Ibid.*, speech of Dumat in defence of Shingana; C.S.C.Z., pp.702-03, 724 and 745.

310. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/93: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 24 June 1889; Laband, *Rope*, p.428.

311. *Ibid.*

312. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/197: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 2 Oct.1889.

313. Laband, *Rope*, p.428; N.A., Col.Coll: Mitchell to H.E. Colenso, 29 July 1889.

314. C.5892, pp.341-89, no.190: Mitchell to Knutsford, 31 July 1889, with enclosures.

315. *Ibid.*, especially pp.341, 350 and 387.

316. C.6070, pp.50-52, no.35: Knutsford to Mitchell, 24 June 1890.

317. Laband, *Rope*, p.428.

Pietermaritzburg

In the third phase of the activity in the period 1888-1889 Pietermaritzburg was not a storm centre; but it cannot be ignored.

At Bishopstowe Agnes continued to keep the home fires burning and to do what she could to stir interest in Zululand. As ever she kept an eye on what was published in the newspapers.³¹⁸ On Harriette's behalf she consulted with Escombe about the stricter enforcement of the prison regulations at Eshowe.³¹⁹ She was drawn into a complicated dispute over a succession question.³²⁰ She cared for her mother, who was sometimes ill.³²¹ Her domestic responsibilities were increased when Emily and Eric returned from Britain, and when Emily, dismayed by reports of Robert's state of health and state of mind, joined her husband in Johannesburg, leaving Eric in the charge of the Bishopstowe household.³²²

In Pietermaritzburg itself the officials and the press were interested in the sequel to the condemnation of the chiefs. The pertinent question for the officials was what advice and representations to make to the Colonial Office in connection with the revision of the sentences. The officials and their supporters realised quickly that it would be undesirable to allow Dinuzulu and his uncles to remain at Eshowe. Osborn advocated their removal.³²³ But the question was not immediately relevant. Havelock, who had contemplated leave the previous year, decided in 1889 to take his leave from June.³²⁴ He would be in Britain when Mr Justice Wragg presented his report and his notes of evidence on the cases tried before the Court of the Special Commissioners,³²⁵ when the Privy Council reached their later decisions,³²⁶ and when the Colonial Office reviewed the proceedings and the sentences.³²⁷

318. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 149): A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, Sat. morning (1889).

319. *Ibid.*, 4 June 1889.

320. *Ibid.*, 1 Dec.1888.

321. *Ibid.*, telegrams of Aug.1889.

322. *Ibid.*, 22, 28 June and 21 July (1889, int.ev.).

323. C.5892, enclosure in no.162: Osborn to Havelock, 15 May 1889.

324. C.6070, p.31, no.16: Havelock to Knutsford, 14 Apr.1890.

325. *Ibid.*, note Havelock's address in April 1890: Cornwall Gardens, London.

326. See fn.258 and below, pp.168-69.

327. See fn.325.

In addition, mindful of the Colonial Office undertaking that it would review the findings of the Court of the Special Commissioners, Escombe and Dumat continued the constant defence practice of making representations to the Colonial Office, sometimes through the Governor. Havelock forwarded their further letters without delay and did not wait for the reports of local officials before doing so. In these letters the uSuthu defence lawyers were eager to maintain their contention that Zululand officials violated basic principles of justice and fair play. They drew attention to the atmosphere of intimidation that prevailed at Eshowe and to the way the prisoners were treated more harshly after sentence had been pronounced.³²⁸

These points mattered but they were subsidiary to the main defence drive: to argue that blame for the disturbances rested with the officials and with Zibhebhu and that the actions of the uSuthu should be construed as favourably as possible. This thinking underlies the compilation of the *Remonstrance on Behalf of the Zulu Chiefs*, a weighty but cluttered production. In it they contended that officials had levied arbitrary fines. The advance of 26 April had taken the uSuthu by surprise, while the warrants which the police wished to serve were of doubtful validity. The uSuthu had acted on the defensive at Ceza. The attack at Ivuna had been an attack on Zibhebhu, not on government property. Somkhele and the coastal chiefs had been punished twice for the same offence. The shooting of Langa had been an example of the high handedness of a resident magistrate, but even the Governor himself had broken the maxim that there should be no punishment without trial when he imposed a fine of fifty head of cattle on Ndabuko and Dinuzulu, while the Governor's pledge that grievances would be redressed had not been honoured. The statements of the defence lawyers concluded with the assertion:

‘The only difficulty which the defence apprehend is the difficulty of making people believe that at the close of the nineteenth century and in the name of the Queen these things have been done which have been disclosed.’

One of the questionable contentions of Dumat and Escombe was that the uSuthu would have been tried more fairly if arraigned before a white jury in Natal. Their *Remonstrance on Behalf of the Zulu Chiefs* was the pro-uSuthu response to the notes of evidence which Wragg compiled.³²⁹

328. C.5892, pp.216-22, no.148: Havelock to Knutsford, 1 May 1889, enclosing letter from Escombe with record of his meeting with uSuthu representatives on 22 Apr.1889; pp.224-25, no.151: Havelock to Knutsford, with enclosures, 8 May 1889.

329. Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance* (London, 1889; republished 1908), Conclusion and p.2.

London

London was by far the most important centre of activity for the 'Colenso endeavour' in the years 1888-1889. Here was to be found the Colonial Office, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the Parliament and, indeed, the A.P.S. All had a role to play.

For a time Knutsford held his counsel when answering criticism. A good deal came from the A.P.S. where H.R. Fox Bourne succeeded Charles Hancock as the secretary. Letters were exchanged, and many of these were published *inter alia* in the *Aborigines Friend*, in contemporary Blue Books, and as separate pamphlets.³³⁰ After the trials at Eshowe were over, the A.P.S requested a prompt and searching investigation. It urged the Secretary of State to defer any action until the defence submissions had been heard, to take all circumstances into account, to acknowledge that the uSuthu, while not blameless, had been forced into desperate courses, and to take advantage of Havelock's absence on leave to institute 'more beneficial administration'. Fox Bourne wrote of 'the evils which now afflict Zululand'.³³¹ This set in motion an exchange of letters between Society and Colonial Office in which neither would give way to the other.³³² The A.P.S. could worry and discomfort the Colonial Office but, in the end, because it had the power, the Colonial Office would have the last word. What is more, the big issue - whether or not official policy in Zululand should be transformed - was often obscured by particular or even minor controversies. Among these were questions about Zibhebhu (whether or not he should have been tried before the Court of the Special Commissioners, and whether or not he had been in custody on 28 April) and about the harsher treatment imposed on the uSuthu leaders after their conviction, of which Harriette informed the A.P.S. The reaction of the Colonial Office was to defend its local officials, either immediately or after calling for a report from them, and to allege errors or misrepresentation.³³³ In fact there was a see-saw of correspondence: the A.P.S and its associates made charges against officials, the officials, in their turn, made charges against the uSuthu and against those who advised

330. H.R. Fox Bourne, *The State Trials in Zululand. Correspondence between the Committee of the Aborigines Protection Society and the Colonial Office, to which is added a letter by Earl Grey* (London, 1889). C.5892, nos.143, 144, 145, 152, 153, 160, 165, 179, 180 and 184 are all part of the A.P.S./Colonial Office correspondence.

331. C.5892, pp.208-10, no.143: A.P.S. to Knutsford, 10 May 1889.

332. See fn.330.

333. C.5892, p.338, no.188: Dumat to C.O., 18 Aug.1889; p.391, no.191: C.O. to Dumat, 27 Aug.1889; p.392, no.193: C.O. to Mitchell, 31 Aug.1889; p.394, no.195: Dumat to C.O., Sept.1889.

or represented them.

At the end of July Mitchell summed up the local official attitude to the uSuthu leadership, both in regard to their past and their future. He wrote:

‘That they promised some shadowy sort of allegiance to Her Majesty as paramount Chief is, I believe, true; but as soon as they found what was the nature of the rule brought about by the proclamation of annexation, they from that moment plotted resistance.’³³⁴

Mitchell was quite clear that to allow the uSuthu leaders to remain in Zululand, whether as free men or as prisoners, would encourage strife in the future which would involve the abaQulusi from across the Republic border.

To strengthen activity in London Harriette paid for F.C. Dumat to travel to Britain in the interests of the condemned chiefs and the Zulu people.³³⁵ He was ‘hot-foot’ from Eshowe and very well versed in uSuthu affairs, but he was a young man and not, it seems, very effective. Harriette was disappointed with what he accomplished.³³⁶ Dumat himself did not find much encouragement in the London scene and was further handicapped by the illness of his wife.³³⁷ He was, however, well received by Frank Colenso, Charles Hancock, and Fox Bourne and worked with them in regard to the judicial appeal to the Privy Council and the moral appeal to the British parliament and people.

Dumat attended the inaugural meeting for the Zulu Defence Fund Committee on 24 June 1889. Fox Bourne took the initiative in this. He wrote and published a printed appeal which summarised recent Zulu history. He invited contributions to the Fund and he persuaded Colenso relatives (Uncle Charles, no less, as well as Frank) and Colenso friends (John Westlake) to support the Fund and become members of the Committee. The initial aim was to raise funds for the Privy Council appeal, but part of the money raised was used for publications.³³⁸ These included the pamphlet entitled *State Trials in Zululand: Correspondence of the Committee of the Aborigines Protection Society and the Colonial*

334. *Ibid.*, pp.338-39, no.189: Mitchell to Knutsford, 30 July 1889.

335. N.A., Col.Coll: H. Escombe to F.E. Colenso, 15 May 1889.

336. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 12 Nov.1889.

337. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 27 June 1889; C. Hancock to H.E. Colenso, 27 June 1889.

338. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to C.J. Bunyon, 21 Aug.1889; Fox Bourne, *Zulu Defence Fund*.

Office (London, 1889). Another was the *Remonstrance* by Escombe and Dumat. This was contorted reading and its effectiveness as a propaganda tool is doubtful, but at least it was available. Harriette republished the *Remonstrance* in the later crisis that afflicted Dinuzulu.³³⁹

Until the end of July the main hopes of the Colensos and the friends of the uSuthu were focussed on the Privy Council. In January they had obtained permission in the Privy Council to appeal against the decision of the Natal Supreme Court which had given legal sanction to the removal of Dinuzulu from Pietermaritzburg to Eshowe.³⁴⁰ It was, however, decided not to proceed immediately with this appeal. It was held in suspense until two other applications to the Privy Council were made.

The first of these was the request to the Privy Council to waive the usual requirement for the lodging of security before an appeal was made. If that were waived, it would be easier for the uSuthu friends to proceed with the appeal against the decision of the Natal Supreme Court. The second application was for leave to appeal against the verdict of the Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand.³⁴¹

Perhaps because of their father's experience in his ecclesiastical disputes, the Colensos set high hopes on the Privy Council. Harriette believed that a favourable decision could save Dinuzulu, and Frank was very determined on the appeal. He consulted with the lawyers who were to conduct it and seems to have contributed to the expenses from his own pocket.³⁴² The result was 'heavy disappointment' - and sour comment from Uncle Charles.³⁴³

The Privy Council decided at the end of July 1889 that it would neither grant leave to appeal against the verdict and sentence of the Court of the Special Commissioners nor

339. Fox Bourne, *State Trials in Zululand* and Escombe & Dumat, *Remonstrance*. Harriette had this reprinted in the City Printing Works, Pietermaritzburg, 1908. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 9 Aug.1889.

340. See above pp.137-38.

341. See fn.258.

342. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/193: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 24 June 1889; N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 22 Mar., 9 May and 18 July 1889.

343. *Ibid.*, Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 22 Aug.1889; C.J. Bunyon to S.F. Colenso, 31 July 1889. C.5892, pp.334-36: Crown Agents to C.O., 1 Aug.1889 with enclosures, including the judgment.

dispense with security. Frank thought that the counsel who actually pleaded the case had bungled the presentation. Clearly the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were not impressed by the arguments that were submitted to it. Perhaps it was unfortunate that the application for leave to appeal against the decisions reached at the Court of the Special Commissioners was associated with the still pending appeal concerning the validity of the warrant under which Dinuzulu had been removed from Natal in dealing with the appeal against the decision of the C.S.C.Z. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council objected that it was being asked to grant leave for an appeal that rested on technicalities. It rejected the defence contention that the Governor had, in creating the ordinary courts of Zululand, exhausted the power entrusted to him. The Lord Chancellor, Lord Halsbury observed that in the case of a 'conquered country' it had always been held that 'the Crown might make whatever laws it pleased.'

The Privy Council therefore took the view that it was within the power of the Governor, as the representative of the Crown in a conquered colony, to create the Court of the Special Commissioners. It was also quite plain that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council did not wish to encourage the belief that appeal to it would be allowed on the basis of technicalities: there must be ground for believing that there had been a substantial denial of justice. It evidently did not consider itself called upon to decide that there was a *prima facie* case for believing that there had been a substantial failure of justice in this case.³⁴⁴ The lawyers representing Dinuzulu were not very impressive, and Frank thought it a pity that Sir Horace Davey had had to withdraw to be replaced by an ill-prepared Mr Rigby. Frank sensed the animosity of Lord Halsbury, the Lord Chancellor, who presided.³⁴⁵

The decision was a disappointment to the Colensos, yet seems hardly surprising. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was a legal tribunal. It applied the legal standards of British society and the accepted principles of British law. It was not an adequate tribunal for settling a matter on which the fundamental issues were those of morality or even long term political expediency: as these were not legalistic points. The Colensos looked to the Privy Council for relief and assistance which it could not supply. Yet for all

344. See fn.258.

345. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 1 Aug.1889. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

that, the fact that appeals to the Privy Council had been made compelled the officials to be very careful that their next moves, for example, the removal of the chiefs to St Helena, complied with the laws then in force.³⁴⁶

With the Lord Chancellor observing that Dinuzulu could gain no practical objective from continuing with his appeal against the Natal Supreme Court decision of 20 November, the Privy Council decided not to encourage him. It refused to waive the deposit of £300 required as security before the appeal could be heard.³⁴⁷

After the disappointment of the Privy Council decisions the Westminster parliament was all the more important.³⁴⁸ The questions that were asked there focussed on three matters. There was a demand for papers relating to the trials of the uSuthu leaders: there was concern of two kinds about Zibhebhu, that he should be brought to justice for the murder of Msutshwana and that he should not be allowed to return to the Ndwandwe district; thirdly, there was criticism of the actions of local officials.

There was a recurring request for papers for some months. In May, W. Redmond was told that 'probably' all the papers would be presented.³⁴⁹ W. McLaren wanted the papers in Somhlolo's case promptly and asked about papers dealing with the cases of Ndabuko, Shingana, and Dinuzulu. He was told that despatches would be published in the normal way, but that, because they were so voluminous, the notes of evidence would be distributed by placing a batch of fifty in the library of each House.³⁵⁰ In June parliament was still waiting.³⁵¹ In July T. Ellis asked whether Havelock had brought with him a report on the trials. He was told that the second part was still being completed in Natal.³⁵² By August Knutsford could state that the first part had been deposited in

346. C.5893, pp.21-22, no.27: Mitchell to Knutsford, 13 Jan.1890, with enclosures.

347. C.S.C.Z., pp.1005-007. C.5892, p.334, enclosure in no.182: Sutton and Ommanney to Crown Agents, 31 July 1889.

348. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 1 Aug.1889.

349. British *Hansard*, vol.335, col.995: 2 May 1889.

350. *Ibid.*, vol.336, col.635: 21 May 1889.

351. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.9: 17 June 1889.

352. *Ibid.*, vol.338, col.58: 16 July 1889.

the respective parliamentary libraries and that the second would soon follow.³⁵³ The resulting 'Black Book' is formidable. It consists of over 1000 pages. Preparing and printing so large a volume took time, but the constant deferments suggest that delay eroded interest.³⁵⁴ Harriette noticed discrepancies and omissions in the Black Books which she compared to the shorthand transcript of the evidence secured by the defence. That formidable Black Book was the response to parliamentary pressure created by the Colensos. Its production cost the Zululand government £450.³⁵⁵

Early in May de Worms assured McLaren that, although Zibhebhu had not been tried before the Court of the Special Commissioners, nevertheless a preliminary investigation was being held.³⁵⁶ Some weeks later, T. Ellis asked de Worms whether he knew that Zibhebhu, so far from being in custody on 28 April, had in fact been participating in the jubilation over the sentencing of the uSuthu. He wanted to know how Zibhebhu would be tried if he were in fact committed. De Worms answered that he would be tried by the ordinary courts of Zululand.³⁵⁷ Somewhat later, when it was known that the case against Zibhebhu had been discharged at the preliminary investigation, Ellis demanded information. De Worms gave a shuffling reply in which he admitted that the Governor was not 'altogether satisfied' about the result of the preliminary investigation.³⁵⁸ But Zibhebhu had his parliamentary champions too. This became clear when there was some possibility that Zibhebhu might after all be brought to trial. Mr Baumann suggested that Zibhebhu was being harshly treated in that, although an 'acquitted man', he was being detained at Eshowe;³⁵⁹ and, on 30 July 1889, the Earl of Kingston wanted to know what power the Governor possessed to order a trial of Zibhebhu, despite his having been discharged at the preliminary investigation.³⁶⁰ De Worms replied that Zibhebhu was not an 'acquitted man' but a man who had not been tried. If Zibhebhu were in fact now

353. *Ibid.*, vol.339, col.879: 9 Aug.1889. The second part was evidently brought to England by Wragg. See Z.G.H.723/2562/89: Secretary of State to Governor, 28 June 1889. C.5893, p.9, no.6: Colonial Office to Houses of Parliament, 17 Dec.1889.

354. *The Court of the Special Commissioners for Zululand* (London, 1890).

355. Z.G.H.726/78/1890, no.2: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 7 Jan.1890. The available copies of the Black Book, in the Natal Archives, in the Killie Campbell Library and in the Don Library are all annotated by H.E. Colenso.

356. *British Hansard*, vol.335, col.988: 2 May 1889.

357. *Ibid.*, vol.337, cols 8-9: 17 June 1889.

358. *Ibid.*, vol.338, col.130: 11 July 1889.

359. *Ibid.*, col.851: 19 July 1889.

360. *Ibid.*, col.1694: 30 July 1889.

to be brought to trial, this would be either because the Governor invoked his powers as Supreme Chief, or because the Crown Prosecutor issued a warrant for the re-arrest of Zibhebhu, as he was entitled to do in accordance with a Natal law that applied in Zululand.³⁶¹

In Natal and Zululand neither Gallwey nor Koch would take the responsibility of acting in this way. Gallwey observed that though this power legally existed, it had never been exercised.³⁶²

In the course of the parliamentary exchanges about Zibhebhu the question of whether or not he should be tried for the murder of Msutshwana gave way to the question of whether or not he should be allowed to return to his location. Here, Harriette's watchfulness secured success. Ellis knew of hardships among the uSuthu over evictions during the trials.³⁶³ De Worms denied that Zibhebhu had been allowed to return to his location,³⁶⁴ but Bradlaugh had information that he had started out with Saunders on the expedition to Tongaland, where according to the reports of Colonel Jesser Coope, he had conducted raids in the previous year. De Worms defended Zibhebhu's raiding of the previous year but agreed, at Bradlaugh's insistence, to enquire into the question of Zibhebhu's accompanying Saunders to Tongaland.³⁶⁵

In the event Zibhebhu was obliged to remain at Eshowe. It would be against native custom, said de Worms, for him to leave without the permission of the Resident Commissioner.³⁶⁶ In fact the discussion of Zibhebhu's location compelled the government, through de Worms, to acknowledge how vexed and complicated was the question of Mandlakazi-uSuthu claims.³⁶⁷ In a remark that was ominous for the future de Worms assured the House that it was the duty of the Supreme Power to apportion land in a country where private property in land was unknown;³⁶⁸ and he later gave the

361. *Ibid.*

362. C.5892, pp.387 and 390, enclosures in no.190: M. Gallwey to Havelock, report, 4 June 1889 and M. Gallwey to Mitchell, telegram and report, 18 July 1889.

363. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.310: 20 June 1889.

364. *Ibid.*, vol.338, col.130: 11 July 1889.

365. *Ibid.*, vol.340, col.113: 22 Aug.1889.

366. *Ibid.*, vol.338, col.851: 19 July 1889.

367. *Ibid.*, vol.339, col.1024: 12 Aug.1889.

368. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.311: 20 June 1889.

assurance that no decision about Mandlakazi and uSuthu lands would be reached until there had been thorough investigation into the deviating boundaries of Zibhebhu. Harriette had eventually secured public recognition of one of her points. De Worms declared too that as far as possible, tribesmen would not be obliged to *konza* to antagonists.³⁶⁹ In Natal the demarcation of boundaries for Zibhebhu was halted. This, too, was a Colenso success.³⁷⁰

Parliamentary indignation and criticism of the administration of Zululand and its officials took different forms. There was, for example, from T. Ellis, the quick aside about 'official rejoicing' at the sentencing of the uSuthu.³⁷¹ There were specific questions about R.H. Addison and the allegation that he had coerced evidence by means of flogging and torture.³⁷² T. Ellis' actions on 1 July in moving addresses from the House of Commons implied a need for closer overall scrutiny of the general administration of Zululand: one address called for information about revenue, the other for information about cattle fines and seizures in Zululand from annexation to 1 June 1889.³⁷³

In asking their questions and voicing their criticisms MPs drew on material provided by Harriette and Frank and their associates. Frank, for example, was in touch with Charles Bradlaugh, whom Escombe described as one of the most powerful men in the House of Commons. Frank sent Bradlaugh copies of papers from his sister about Mafukwini, and Bradlaugh took up the Zulu cause.³⁷⁴ In December members of the defence team had exposed illegal floggings administered at the behest of Tyrrell, and, during his defence of Dinuzulu, Escombe led Crown witnesses into statements about floggings. George Burgess' letter published in the *Natal Advertiser* on 16 May 1889 helped draw Bradlaugh into the

369. *Ibid.*, vol.339, col.1024: 12 Aug.1889.

370. Z.G.H.723/598/1889: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 15 July 1889, with minute by Osborn, 28 Aug.1889, and by Mitchell, n.d.

371. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.310: 17 June 1889.

372. *Ibid.*, vol.336, col.1812: 4 June 1889 and vol.337, col.310: 20 June 1889.

373. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.1169: 1 July 1889; H.C. no.347: *Return showing the Revenue of the Government of Zululand, 14 May 1887 to 1 June 1889*. Ordered to be printed Aug.1889; H.C. no.348: *Return showing the numbers of heads of cattle levied as fines and otherwise seized by the Government of Zululand, from 14 May 1887 to 1 June 1889*. Ordered to be printed for parliament, Aug.1889.

374. N.A., Col.Coll: H. Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 28 Sept.1889; F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 26 Sept.1889.

controversy.³⁷⁵ He made the general flogging issue one of his crusades and directed criticism at the Zulu administration on this issue. With Ellis, Bradlaugh was mainly responsible for the parliamentary questions and comments on floggings which led to official enquiries. For example, Bradlaugh, relying on Burgess, alleged in June 1889 that the 'cat' used in Zululand was weighted with pieces of metal.³⁷⁶ Ellis asked in July whether de Worms was aware that in Zululand magistrates customarily caused floggings to be administered without reference to the Chief Magistrate,³⁷⁷ and a few weeks later he instanced specific cases of floggings for which he desired information.³⁷⁸ Since the question of punishment by flogging was a matter of public controversy where the strengthening current of opinion was adverse, and since the principle of the rule of law was also involved, these allegations could not simply be ignored. Enquiries were made.³⁷⁹ Tyrrell was reproved and dismissed.³⁸⁰

Addison's actions were subjected to enquiry and report. In his report Addison stated that the men had been flogged, not for a pass offence, but for intended participation in armed resistance. He urged that, under native law, this would have been punishable by death; but his reasoning did not save him from the Secretary of State's censure.³⁸¹ In addition, the Secretary of State instructed that a general circular be issued to all magistrates which insisted on the strict observance of the regulations in cases of corporal punishment and reprobated its use in cases of contempt or defiance of the resident magistrate.³⁸² Proclamation I of 1890 insisted that the provisions of the Natal law should apply to cases of contempt of court in Zululand.³⁸³ In an oblique way the government had been forced to acknowledge that there had been things amiss in the administration of Zululand.

375. C.S.C.Z., pp.787 and 790; G. Burgess's letter in the *Natal Advertiser*, 16 May 1889, cited the evidence of Manongoza on 15 Apr.1889.

376. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.311: 17 June 1889; vol.337, col.548: 24 June 1889.

377. *Ibid.*, col.1169: 1 July 1889.

378. *Ibid.*, vol.339, col.1125: 13 Aug.1889.

379. Z.G.H.723/561/1889: Minute by W. Windham, 8 Aug.1889; Z.G.H.723/673/ 1889, no.99: Secretary of State to Mitchell, 29 Aug.1889. Minute by Osborn, 24 Jan.1890.

380. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.1169: 1 July 1889.

381. Z.G.H.723/700/1889: Secretary of State to Governor, 18 July 1889, Melmoth Osborn, 16 Sept.1889, and Addison's Report, 10 Sept.1889. C.5893, p.11, no.8: Secretary of State to Governor, 20 Dec.1889.

382. *British Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.337, col.1164: 1 July 1889; Z.G.H.723/560/1889: Secretary of State to Governor, 24 June 1889; Z.G.H.723/580/1889: Resident Commissioner to Governor, 30 July 1889.

383. *Zululand Proclamations*.

Criticism of the officials was coupled with compassion for the prisoners. Repetition of the promise that the sentences on those convicted at Eshowe were to be reviewed stalled and soothed pleas for mitigation. On 2 May 1889 W. Redmond suggested that Dinuzulu's voluntary surrender was an argument in favour of the reduction of his sentence.³⁸⁴ MPs expressed concern that the prisoners in Eshowe were being treated with unnecessary severity while they awaited the promised reconsideration of their sentences.³⁸⁵ There were signs of impatience in the demand for papers and in Redmond's question in June as to whether any steps had been taken.³⁸⁶ But, as time passed, it became clear that the meaning of the promise of re-consideration had been re-interpreted in the Colonial Office. When first made the promise seemed unconditional. It was possible for the defence to hope that the trials at Eshowe would be the prelude to a general investigation into the affairs of Zululand. In June 1889 Ellis expressed concern in Parliament that the Secretary of State had closed the door to such an investigation;³⁸⁷ and in August de Worms made it quite clear that the Colonial Office had no intention of performing a re-consideration that would amount to a justification of the uSuthu. He told Bradlaugh that they would be shown as much leniency as was compatible with the nature of their offences and the safety of Zululand. This was de Worms' response to a suggestion from Bradlaugh that parliament should be given the opportunity to discuss the question before any decision was reached. In regard to Bradlaugh's further question, whether it had been decided to send the uSuthu chiefs to St Helena, de Worms declared that he required prior notice. In response, Bradlaugh gave notice of his own intention: if such a step were taken, he would feel it his duty to raise the whole question on the answer to the Address next session.³⁸⁸

During 1888-1889 questions in parliament and letters to the press drew some public attention to the uSuthu prisoners and to Harriette's role as their champion. She attracted the notice of one or two of the publications for women. On 12 October 1889 *The Queen*, evidently a fashionable journal, featured an account of Harriette.³⁸⁹ By then she was already well-known to the readers of the *Women's Penny Paper*. Owned and edited by

384. British *Hansard*, 3rd Series, vol.335, col.995: 2 May 1889.

385. *Ibid.*, vol.337, col.9: 17 June 1889.

386. *Ibid.*

387. *Ibid.*, vol.336, col.1811: 4 June 1889.

388. *Ibid.*, vol.340, col.477: 26 Aug.1889.

389. The same report had appeared in *The Graphic* in Aug.1889. N.A., Col.Coll: Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 22 Aug.1889.

Helena Muller³⁹⁰ (alias Temple) it boasted proudly that it was owned and published by women³⁹¹ and was obviously dedicated to promoting the claims of women to a wider public role. Charles Hancock sent in extracts from her letters which were published.³⁹² Then Frank, who entertained the editor at his dinner table,³⁹³ sent in lengthy extracts from a letter written by Escombe as well as extracts from Harriette. He commented on these extracts and appealed to the 'sisterhood' of England to support his sister.³⁹⁴ Further extracts were published later.³⁹⁵ Some 'leaderettes' on Harriette and the uSuthu appeared.³⁹⁶ Then, for some months, a contribution from Harriette became a regular, weekly feature as her commentary on events and experiences in Eshowe was published in instalments under the heading 'Eshowe Trials'.³⁹⁷ This publicity was a good introduction to Harriette's own efforts in England. These were the next phase of the Colenso endeavour.

Harriette had realised that there was little she could do for the uSuthu either at Eshowe or in Natal. Her appeal to Knutsford on behalf of Mafukwini was rejected, and it became clear that the uSuthu leaders were to be removed from Eshowe. St Helena was thus on the horizon. A Natal newspaper reported that the Zulu chiefs were to be sent there.³⁹⁸ Harriette wrote to Sir Charles Mitchell on the subject and sent a cable to the A.P.S.³⁹⁹ Then having spent about two months at Bishopstowe, Harriette returned to Eshowe in the middle of October accompanied by her nephew Eric (a boy of nine) and Mubi Nondenisa.

Harry Escombe sent with her a silver watch for Dinuzulu.⁴⁰⁰ It was an amusing journey. She travelled part of the way with Bishop McKenzie, the white-helmeted Bishop

390. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

391. Its title page was endorsed 'The only paper in the world conducted, written, printed and published by women'. *The Woman's Penny Paper* ran from 1888-1890. It subsequently became *The Women's Herald*, 1891-1893 and then *The Woman's Signal*, 1894-1899. It went through various theosophical, liberal, and temperance phases in that time (Information Dr Nan Albinski).

392. *Women's Penny Paper* (henceforward W.P.P.), 30 March 1889.

393. N.A., Col.Coll: Sophie Colenso, diary, Sat. 2 Feb.1889.

394. 'Miss Colenso and Zululand', *W.P.P.*, 11 May 1889.

395. *Ibid.*, 29 June and 20 July 1889.

396. *Ibid.*, 1 June 1889.

397. *Ibid.*, 10, 17, 24, 31 Aug.1889 and 7, 14, 21 and 28 Sept.1889.

398. *Natal Mercury*, 3 Oct.1889.

399. N.A., Col.Coll: Mitchell to H.E. Colenso, 11 Oct.1889, and H.E. Colenso to Mitchell, 13 Oct.1889; F.W. Watkins (Reuters) to H.E. Colenso, 10 Oct.1889.

400. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 24 Oct.1889.

of the Church of the Province of South Africa, Bishop of Zululand, who told her that he was often addressed as Bishop Colenso, and later their travelling companion was Dick Addison's sister.⁴⁰¹ Once at Eshowe, they stayed for a time at the Osutu camp but were hospitably received by the Mansels at least for some meals, to Eric's obvious relief. He preferred the beef of Commandant Mansel to the salmon and biscuits of his aunt Harriette.⁴⁰² It was a busy time for Harriette. She received a constant stream of uSuthu visitors who reminded her how great a responsibility was their trust in her.⁴⁰³ She had articles for the *Women's Penny Post* to send off,⁴⁰⁴ and was so busy with her writing that Ndabuko declared he believed it had taken possession of her.⁴⁰⁵ She found it hard to leave the prisoners in December for they declared they had much to settle with her.⁴⁰⁶ Having left them in Eshowe, and Eric with his parents in Johannesburg, Harriette returned to Bishopstowe clear that she must go to England for the sake of Bishopstowe mission and for the Zulus.

What helped determine her was the official response to her representations on behalf of Mafukwini. It arrived while Harriette was away and was faithfully copied out by the Colenso friend Katie Giles.⁴⁰⁷ It disappointed Harriette, but it seems to have strengthened her resolve. She wrote to Sir Charles Mitchell, Havelock's replacement and then successor as Governor, to inform him that she believed it now to be her duty to proceed to England to plead the cause of the uSuthu there.⁴⁰⁸ She contemplated going on her own but then, overcoming her mother's forebodings and her sister's hesitation, resolved that they should all make the trip.⁴⁰⁹ Friends seem to have been agreed that it was advisable for Harriette to go to Britain. Escombe advised her to take counsel with English lawyers about the prospects of further Privy Council activity.⁴¹⁰ There were offers of hospitality. Harriette hoped to collect funds while overseas for a printing press

401. *Ibid.*, 23 Oct.1889 and Friday (Oct.1889, int.cv.).

402. *Ibid.*, 10 Nov.1889.

403. *Ibid.*, 12 Nov.1889.

404. *Ibid.*, 10 Nov.1889.

405. *Ibid.*, 12 Nov.1889.

406. *Ibid.*

407. N.A., Col.Coll: copy of Mafukwini correspondence.

408. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 15 Dec.1889. C.5893, p.17, no.17: Mitchell to Knutsford, 17 Dec.1889, and enclosure H.E. Colenso to Mitchell, 15 Dec.1889.

409. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 14 Nov.1889.

410. *Ibid.*, H. Escombe to H.E. Colenso, 10 Nov.1889.

or even for rebuilding.⁴¹¹ She was thinking of public speaking.⁴¹² The Colenso women travelled first class, for her mother's and her sister's sake and, indirectly, at her uncle's expense. If she had been on her own, Harriette said, she would have been prepared to travel as an 'indigent uSuthu',⁴¹³ but she remembered with pleasure the lovely big cabin on the deck of the *Melrose* which she had once shared with her father.⁴¹⁴

411. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/197: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 2 Oct.1889.

412. Rees, *Colenso Letters*, p.426, S.F. Colenso to My own H, n.d. (Dec.1889, int.ev.).

413. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to C.J. Bunyon, 20 Jan.1890.

414. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 12 Nov.1889.

CHAPTER FIVE

HARRIETTE IN ENGLAND

From Hard Facts to

government. In

ted. Sir John

had led the

and in

of this

873,

w

Five key features in this period are discussed below:

Section A: The distinctive character of the

Section B: The outlook in 1890: Facts hard but

Section C: Harriette's aims and resources in England

Section D: The levels of her campaigning

Section E: The prospect of change in mid-1893: Hopes high but frag

SECTION A: The Distinctive Character of the Episode

The years 1890-1893, which form an interesting episode in the history of the Colenso endeavour, were for Harriette exciting and exacting years. They had two novel features. One was that Harriette, herself, campaigned in England. Though a veteran controversialist, she had never before been at the forefront of a conflict in Britain. This had been her father's role, or her brother's, or her sister's.¹ In the previous years she had hoped that Escombe would be successful in London and she had then sent Dumat over to be an uSuthu representative.² Now Harriette had her own impact on British humanitarians and politicians. The second novel feature was that these seemed to be years of achievement. After the Liberals came to power in 1892, Harriette was encouraged by the way her representations were received and, when the Colenso women returned to Bishopstowe in September 1893, she believed that uSuthu success was close.

Two important changes came about in these years and they encouraged Harriette to be hopeful. One was the change of government in Britain in the middle of 1892. When W.E. Gladstone became Prime Minister once more in 1892, he appointed Lord Ripon to be Secretary of State for the Colonies, with Sydney Buxton as Parliamentary Under-Secretary.³ Though the Colensos, like the Aborigines Protection Society, tried to insist that their appeal was non-party, most of Harriette's supporters, like many members of the

1. See above, Chapter One.

2. See above, p.166.

3. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

Society, were Liberals.⁴ Harriette expected benefit from the change of government. In Natal by mid-1893 Responsible government was on the point of being instituted. Sir John Robinson, with Escombe as his supporter not his opponent in the later years, had led the colony through controversy and acrimony to acceptance, both in the colony and in London, that Natal should have Responsible government. Harriette was not afraid of this change.⁵ Paradoxically it was the Colensos' chief political opponent since 1873, Theophilus Shepstone, who doubted its benefits.⁶ Harriette was prepared to let the new Responsible ministers prove themselves and she shared the optimism of some blacks about the possibility of improvement.⁷

SECTION B: Facts Hard but Hollow

For the uSuthu in 1890 the outlook was bleak, but there were some gleams of light. The key factors in the situations confronting Harriette were the following:

- (a) Dinuzulu, Ndabuko and Shingana were in exile at St Helena;
- (b) Osborn was still Chief Magistrate and Resident Commissioner in Zululand and he was firmly supported by Havelock's successor, Sir Charles Mitchell. A new appointment sometimes raised humanitarian hopes, but not in the case of Sir Charles. Harriette's early expectations were disappointed.⁸
- (c) Zibhebhu was in southern Zululand near Eshowe awaiting his opportunity.

Harriette continued her uSuthu campaign as a matter of faith and duty. She did not calculate the chances of success but believed they existed. In fact, there were some grounds for hope, even though these are more clearly discerned in retrospect than they could have been in 1890. Comments on each of the main facts in the situation as it existed in 1890 explain what were the sources of encouragement.

4. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 23 June 1885; H.C. Swaisland, 'The Aborigines Protection Society and British Southern and West Africa' (D.Phil., University of Oxford, 1968), pp.21-23.

5. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 17, 24 and 26 Mar.1889.

6. Shepstone Papers, Box 16: T. Shepstone to R.G.W. Herbert, 15 Aug.1885 with enclosure. R. Gordon, *The Shepstone Family* (Cape Town, 1968), p.296.

7. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, n.d. (Dec.1889? int.ev.) but contrast R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/46: F.E. Colenso to a Free State Correspondent, 25 Feb.1885; H.E. Colenso, speech at A.G.M. of A.P.S., 17 May 1893 in *Aborigines Friend*, June 1893; *Inkanyiso*, 24 Mar.1893, Leader.

8. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes; Extract from *Echo*, 22 Feb.1893 (printed sheet).

(a) The Exile of the Zulu Chiefs

Whether the chiefs should be removed to St Helena, when this should be done, and how it should be effected were questions which gave Knutsford much anxiety. Local officials, though fearful of legal complications, insisted that they must be removed from Zululand and from Natal.⁹ Knutsford was afraid of parliamentary criticism and legal complications. Remembering Bradlaugh and thinking of Chamberlain, he consulted his cabinet colleagues about the timing of the removal.¹⁰ Should he or should he not wait for parliament to have its say? His colleagues decided that he need not wait, and he went ahead with the plans for the removal of the Exiles.¹¹

Aware of the contentions about the removal of Dinuzulu from Natal to Eshowe,¹² officials wanted to be sure that they would be able to move the *abaNtwana* from Eshowe to St Helena without risking a similar rumpus. To avoid legal objections Mitchell wanted the party to embark at Port Durnford rather than Durban, and there was support for this in the Colonial Office. It was evidently thought that there were worse things than the risk of drowning, to which Fairfield alluded, or the need to have a gunboat cruising off the coast, which Herbert suggested. Herbert was afraid that Escombe might get up demonstrations and apply for a writ of *habeas corpus* and that 'Miss Colenso may demand interviews and counsel them to escape *etc etc*.' Knutsford who, at the time, was consulting with both Wragg and Havelock in London, did not rush.¹³ In fact Port Durnford proved to be too risky, too complicated, and too expensive. The party of Exiles sailed from Durban in the *Anglian*¹⁴. Fears that they might be stopped at the Cape proved unfounded, although bad weather caused delay.¹⁵

9. C.T. Binns, *Dinuzulu the Death of the House of Shaka* (London, 1968), p.146.

10. C.O.537/124B Cabinet Paper African, no.383: confidential, 9 Dec.1889.

11. *Ibid.*, autograph comment by Knutsford, 16 Dec.1889.

12. See above, pp.132-34.

13. C.O.427/6/23331: C.H.B. Mitchell to Knutsford, confidential, 5 Nov.1889, and minutes by Fairfield, Bramston, Herbert, and Knutsford, all dated 3 Dec.1889, with letters from Wragg, 7 Dec.1889, and Havelock, 9 Dec.1889.

14. Z.G.H.727/127/1890: R.G.W. Herbert to Union Steamship Company, 14 June 1890; 128/1890: Secretary of State to Mitchell, secret, 20 Jan.1890.

15. *Ibid.*, 728/260/1890: R.L. Antrobus to Mitchell, 20 Mar.1890; C.O. 427/10/3191: Union Steamship Company to C.O., 17 Feb.1890 and C.O.427/10/3422: Union Steamship Company to C.O., 20 Feb.1890.

They were a large party, only three of whom were prisoners.¹⁶ Paul Mthimkhulu was included at Dinuzulu's strong request. He was a Christian man, from the Cape, who shared Dinuzulu's fortunes for decades; at Ceza where he led prayers, at Bishopstowe where he came with Dinuzulu to 'surrender', at Eshowe where he conducted services, and at St Helena where he stayed with the Exiles until their return. He remained with Dinuzulu until Paul's own death in 1908.¹⁷ Some requests were either not made or turned down.¹⁸ Neither Mtokwane, Dinuzulu's trusted emissary, nor Magama Magwaza Fuze¹⁹ were allowed to go to St Helena with the Exiles.

Officials took great care about all the arrangements.²⁰ After the embarkation Mitchell read and forwarded to London reports of their departure. He was particularly anxious to refute suggestions that blacks had given a demonstration of loyalty to Dinuzulu and disconcerted about reports of the salute *Bayete*.²¹

Officials kept a careful watch on Miss Colenso. Once informed of her intention to visit Britain, Fairfield thought she might call at St Helena *en route*. He advised that Mr R.L.A. Antrobus, who was Acting Governor there, should be warned and advised 'to avoid irritation and agitation on the part of herself and her friends here'. He should allow her access to the prisoners, although this was not really within the regulations.²²

(b) Osborn

Osborn had survived all the hostilities that had been directed against him by the Colensos,

-
16. viz. Dinuzulu, Ndabuko, Shingana, female companions, male attendants, Dr Paul Mthimkhulu, and W.R. Saunders, the guardian.
 17. Z.G.H.726/88/1890: M. Osborn, memorandum, 22 Feb.1890; N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 198): H.E. Colenso's notes on Paul Mthimkhulu, and (Old Ref: Box 85): H.E. Colenso's notes on the texts which he preached at Ceza. C.5892, p.308: *i.e.* part IV of statement of Escombe and Dumat, enclosed in Escombe to Havelock, 3 June 1889. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.
 18. Z.G.H.726/62a/1890: Escombe to Mitchell, 27 Jan.1890.
 19. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. M.M. Fuze, *The Black People and Whence They Came* (Pietermaritzburg and Durban, 1979), p.131.
 20. See, for example, Z.G.H.726/59/1890: Secretary of State to Mitchell, confidential, 3 Jan.1890, and C.O. to Grey-Wilson, 27 Dec.1889. Binns, *Dinuzulu*, pp.147-49.
 21. Z.G.H.726/161/1890: Lucas, R.M. of Durban to Mitchell, report on embarkation, 12 Feb.1890; cf. Z.G.H.727/115/1890: Report of *Natal Witness*, 8 Feb.1890 and a number of comments.
 22. C.O.427/6/78 No.185: Mitchell to Knutsford, 17 Dec.1889. Minute by Fairfield, 9 Jan.1890; Z.G.H.726/108/1890: Knutsford to Mitchell, confidential, 15 Jan.1890.

by military men, and by the Governor.²³ In fact, the succession of Mitchell in place of Havelock probably strengthened Osborn's position, for Mitchell approved his policy and was quite explicit about his own loyalty to the subordinates whom Harriette criticised.²⁴ But governors came and went, and Mitchell would not last forever. For one thing, he was opposed to Responsible government²⁵ and did not wish to stay once that had been instituted. As time passed, as governors changed, and as forms of government altered, Osborn's position became less secure. His patron, Sir Theophilus Shepstone, who had already lost influence, died in June 1893.²⁶ In 1890 Osborn was still there for the time being, but only for the time being. He was a suspect man whose removal would be easier once those who had exercised superior power or influence in the 1880s had lost their positions. Harriette asserted stoutly and consistently that Osborn's removal was essential before British rule in Zululand could be beneficial.²⁷

(c) Zibhebhu

The Mandlakazi leader was another problem. Like Osborn he was a suspect man, and any policy designed to favour him would probably provoke criticism. Officials had not conceded the Colenso contention: that the cause of the disturbance of 1888 had been the restoration of Zibhebhu to the Ndwandwe.²⁸ But even Knutsford, despite his growing impatience with Miss Colenso and with the A.P.S., had to concede that it was risky to hazard another restoration,²⁹ with its dangers of more disturbances and even more vehement humanitarian criticisms of British policy. In fact, Zibhebhu had missed whatever chance was once his of achieving a successful usurpation of power over all Zululand. Time might have hallowed and legitimised such a seizure, but active and sustained British support was necessary, and this he did not get. His previous record of 'loyalty' made the

23. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 29 Sept.1888; H.E. Colenso to Havelock, 2 July 1888; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 27 Dec.1888. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 7 July 1889.

24. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 9 May 1889 and Dumat to Escombe, 5 July 1889. Mitchell to H.E. Colenso, n.d. (letter damaged) (late 1889, int.ev.).

25. Granville Papers, Box 213: Sir Charles Mitchell to R.L. Antrobus, 18 May 1886.

26. Gordon, *Shepstone*, pp.301-03. Shepstone died on 23 June 1893, three months after the death of his wife.

27. For suspicion of over-indulgence in alcohol, see R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, Friday, Sept.1888; *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 27 May 1889. cf. 'The Usuthu' in *Natal Witness*, 30 July 1892; H.E. Colenso, *Mr Commissioner Osborn as One Cause of Confusion in Zulu Affairs* (1892).

28. See fn.10 above.

29. See above, pp.161-62.

local officials in Natal willing to offer it, but in England there were those who were determined that it should be denied.³⁰

In general the situation of 1890 was adverse but not beyond hope of change. To effect change Harriette would have to win support for her aims and use her resources to the best possible advantage.

SECTION C: Harriette's Aims and Resources

While in Britain, Harriette worked towards her long term ends and sought to accomplish short term goals.

As in the past her long term aims were two-fold. She wanted to bring about the regeneration and re-consolidation of the Zulu people under Dinuzulu. In addition, she wanted to ensure a harmonious and symbiotic partnership between Dinuzulu, as the representative of the Zulu people, and the white authorities. She was convinced that Dinuzulu, as the embodiment of the traditional leadership and the cohesion of the Zulu people, was the best possible intermediary for them between the old and the new conditions of life. It was her constant plea that Dinuzulu should not only be allowed to return to Zululand but that he should be accorded a 'central position' in its government. She regarded this as a matter of crucial importance.³¹

Harriette urged the British government to 'gather the Zulus, & [sic] to take Dinuzulu by the hand in earnest thereof'.³² In the Colonial Office the permanent officials gave crisp formulation to their often hostile view of her aim. They accused her of encouraging the ambitions of the uSuthu and the kingly pretensions of Dinuzulu. Fairfield once claimed

30. H.E. Colenso, *Fresh Trouble in Zululand* (1891?) and *Fresh Troubles in Zululand* (1892) (henceforth *Trouble and Troubles*). *South Africa*, 3 Aug.1889, correspondence of A.P.S and C.O.; C.5892, p.334: Knutsford to Havelock, 1 Aug.1889, and p.393: Mitchell to Knutsford, 6 Aug.1889. For official appreciation of Zibhebhu, see *Zululand. Land Delimitation Commission (1902-1904). Reports of the Joint Imperial and Colonial Commissioners* (hereafter *Zululand. Land Delimitation Commission*) (Pietermaritzburg, 1905) p.299.

31. H.E. Colenso, *The Zulu Impeachment of British Officials in 1887-8 Confirmed by Official Records in 1892 and the Results of the Boundary Commission* (London, 1892), p.25 and *Present Position Among the Zulus with Some Suggestions for the Future* (London, 1892), pp.29-30.

32. Quoted in D.R. Edgecombe, 'The Influence of the Aborigines Protection Society on British Policy Towards Black African and Cape Coloured Affairs in South Africa, 1886-1910' (Ph.D., Cambridge University, 1976), p.222.

that Harriette and her associates wished to 'dance on everyone'.³³ For herself, Harriette denied that she had ever encouraged the Zulus to hope for a restoration of their independence or that she had ever regarded Dinuzulu as king; but she maintained that his position of leadership should be recognised and fostered, and that the Zulu people were entitled to receive from the British government the introduction of a better form of polity.³⁴

There is as much irony as accuracy in the comment that Harriette wanted Dinuzulu to become what she condemned Zibhebhu for being: the official favourite. But this transposition of role would require a transformation of policy that could be effected only if British decision-makers adopted views comparable to her own.

Her short term goals were in part means to her long term ends. At least four are evident. In the first place every possible consideration should be given to the Exiles at St Helena, both in regard to Dinuzulu's desire for learning and his uncles' desire for respect for traditional customs.³⁵ Secondly, she believed firmly that Dinuzulu's association with his uncles should be fostered. They were his bond with the past and with the traditional *mores* of the Zulu.³⁶ In the third place, it was very desirable to foster the links between the Exiles at St Helena and their followers in Zululand and to encourage their communication with sympathizers in Britain³⁷ and, later, support for her idea of their being allowed to visit Britain.³⁸ Fourthly, there was the crucial issue of Zibhebhu. Harriette was determined that he should not be allowed to return to the Ndwandwe district. She concentrated much effort on this issue. If Zibhebhu were allowed to return to the

33. C.O.427/14/16322, no.62: Mitchell to C.O., 16 July 1892. Minute by Fairfield, 20 Aug.1892. C.O.427/15/16749: A.P.S. to C.O., 22 Aug.1892. Minute by Fairfield, 28 Sept.1892.

34. H.E. Colenso, *Cases of Six Usutu (other than the Exiles at St Helena) Punished for Having Taken Part in the Disturbances of 1888* (London, 1893), p.18 fn, cf. H.E. Colenso's annotation in C.S.C.Z., p.798 (copy in N.A., Col.Coll); N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 June 1892.

35. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, Sept.1891 re *i.a.* headrings, cf. C.O.247/139/16239: Grey-Wilson to Fairfield, private, 10 July 1891, enclosing letter of Exiles to H.E. Colenso, 9 July 1891 concerning their request that a favoured headring-maker/hairdresser should be sent to Zululand. Grey-Wilson backed their request.

36. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 27 July 1889.

37. Note the role of Magma. K.C.A.L. Dinuzulu Correspondence: 1.044. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Dinuzulu (Exiles), June 1895 (English translation).

38. H.E. Colenso, *Memorandum in Reply to Objection against a Visit of the Zulu Exiles to England*, 27 August 1895. (London, 1895).

Ndwandwe, this would jeopardise present peace, and blight Dinuzulu's future prospects.³⁹

Harriette's Resources while in England

Harriette's gifts of character, of physical strength, and capacity for dedication were among her continuous and important resources. These were crucial qualities, whatever her environment. While she was in Britain, other attributes helped to win her appreciation and support. Her total oblivion of self won friends to her cause. Humour and humility enabled her to laugh at exaggerated animosity. She was amused that Smyth should find he had the Colenso women as travelling companions on the voyage to Britain. He had been patted on the back for suppressing the uSuthu rebellion yet he found it - in Harriette - still continuing.⁴⁰ Harriette was not by instinct a 'platform woman'.⁴¹ Her public role hitherto had been that of supporter: her father's 'staff', Escombe's adviser and interpreter, the consultant and agent of W.Y. Campbell. She was aware of her limitations. She wrote, for example, of her propensity to do something 'comical to the legal mind'.⁴² This personal humility gave her urgent pleadings a quiet tone that greatly impressed some of her auditors. Total dedication and unselfishness explain Harriette's poise and power to impress.

Among Harriette's resources were the love and support of her family. The years 1890-93 were one of the few episodes when all the members of the Colenso family were in one country.⁴³ Robert abandoned Johannesburg and returned to Britain where, with help from the Bunyons, he established his family home and began a practice.⁴⁴ Both he and Frank⁴⁵ were in London and opened their homes to their mother and their sisters, who however set themselves up in lodgings for a time.⁴⁶

39. H.E. Colenso, *Trouble and Troubles*. The pamphlets illustrate her concern and arguments.

40. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles (Jan.1890 int.ev); cf. T. Jeal *Baden-Powell* (London, 1991), p.137.

41. Miss Lonsdale, 'Platform Women' in *Nineteenth Century*, vol.15, Jan-June 1884.

42. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Escombe, 15 Oct.1888.

43. See illustrations: photograph of the Colenso family, p.xxi.

44. See above, Chapter One, pp.4-5.

45. *Ibid.*, pp.5-8.

46. Letters were written from Acacia Road and Hamilton Gardens. See *i.a.* N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 1890-1893.

Sarah Frances Colenso enjoyed the social life in London, although she knew this could be only a temporary visit. They could not afford a comfortable permanent home in Britain, and the pull to Natal was strong.⁴⁷ It would have gratified Harriette to know that her mother was pleased, but what was as ever indispensable to her was the unquestioning shared commitment of her sister. Agnes and Harriette, Frances Ellen had once remarked, were 'like husband and wife, the whole world to one another'.⁴⁸ Agnes hated London for its cold and fog, but her loyalty to her sister was as warm as ever.⁴⁹

Uncle Charles and Aunt Eliza Bunyon had a part to play. He helped the Colenso sons. He gave Robert an allowance⁵⁰ and, an insurance man himself, he saw Frank begin what became a very successful actuarial career.⁵¹ The Colenso daughters puzzled both him and his wife. Frances Ellen, in the distraught dignity of the last years of her life, found them less than welcoming⁵² and Harriette was sometimes acid about him.⁵³ The Bunyons were dismayed by the public and independent role of Frances Ellen and of Harriette and, perhaps, a little envious of Frances Ellen's beauty.⁵⁴ But Charles Bunyon honoured family obligations and was an affectionate and dutiful uncle.⁵⁵ He was a supporter of the A.P.S., became a member of the Zulu Defence Committee founded to give special attention to the position of the uSuthu leaders, and contributed to its funds.⁵⁶ He escorted Harriette on one of her visits to the Colonial Office.⁵⁷ His death in 1892 was probably a more serious loss to the Colenso family than is at first apparent.⁵⁸ Relations with his widow and daughter appear to have chilled.⁵⁹

47. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, n.d. (Sept.1883, int.ev.), on a slip of paper.

48. *Ibid.*, Fr.El. Colenso to Sophie, 9 Mar.1886.

49. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 2 Oct.1890, 9 Apr.1891, n.d., Nov.1891.

50. *Ibid.*, R.J. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 14 May 1896; H.E. Colenso to Lady Cox, 24 Jan.1891.

51. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers Mss.Afr.S 1285(6) ff.1429-30: F.E. Colenso to Sophie Colenso, 1 Aug.1890.

52. *Ibid.*, S.F. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 1 Dec.1886.

53. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 13 Mar.1881 and Mss.Afr.S 1286(1) f.225: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 14 Dec.1887.

54. Her photograph shows her beauty. See e.g. J.J. Guy, *Destruction of the Zulu Kingdom* (London, 1979), between pp.88-89; K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd.55: C. Bunyon to A. Werner, 5 June 1933.

55. i.a. N.A., Col.Coll: G. Burne-Jones to Fr.El. Colenso, 27 Apr.1887; Rees, *Colenso Letters*, pp.241 and 404-05.

56. H.R. Fox Bourne, *The Zulu Defence Fund* (London, 1889) - the later version.

57. See below, p.202. N.A., Col.Coll: Notes of interview of 11.Feb 1890 with Knutsford.

58. *Ibid.*, K.M. Lyell to H.E. Colenso, 27 June 1892.

59. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd: C. Bunyon to A. Werner, 5 June 1933.

The Colenso women were not wealthy philanthropists. True, they were not destitute, and none of the Colenso daughters had to earn her living except as a missionary. But their income was, at best, that of reduced gentlefolk. When Frances Ellen visited Britain in the 1880s her allowance was five pounds a month.⁶⁰ The address of the Royal National Hospital at Ventnor embarrassed her, because it implied that this was a charitable organisation.⁶¹ Frank lamented, 'if only we Colensos could make a little money.'⁶² In South Africa, Harriette speculated a little in gold shares, as she hoped that this would give her the means to put a spoke in Osborn's wheel.⁶³ Robert hoped to profit personally from the gold discoveries. Sarah Frances inherited some money from her sister Ellen in 1882, but the terms of the will stipulated that at least part of this was to be for Mrs Colenso's exclusive use.⁶⁴

When Colenso died his episcopal stipend was paid over to the Curators or held by the Colonial Bishoprics Fund.⁶⁵ His family inherited the proceeds of three insurance policies, claims on debtors (which caused much contention), and some properties in Natal which Colenso held in his personal capacity.⁶⁶ In offering financial help to Statham Harriette referred to an inheritance from her paternal aunt, Emily.⁶⁷ Money (over £550) collected in the Colenso Sympathy Fund after the Bishopstowe fire was spent in part on publishing the *Ruin of Zululand*.⁶⁸ In the 1890s she estimated that the joint income of the Colenso women was £250 (or, on another estimate, £300) and they received help - and

60. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 1 Mar.1887.

61. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/70: Fr.El. Colenso to F.W. Chesson, 13 Dec.1886; cf. Rees, *Colenso Letters*, p.406: S.F. Colenso to Fr.El. Colenso, 12 Sept.1886.

62. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 27 June.1889.

63. *Ibid.*, R.J. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 6 Sept.1886.

64. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 2 Mar.1894.

65. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 140): H.E. Colenso to J.R. Saunders, Jan.1891.

66. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. S.35 KCM.49531: F.E. Colenso, statement of Bishop Colenso's personal estate, 11 Sept.1883; cf. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: F.E. Colenso to P. Frankland, 12 Oct.1883 (Letterbook). Harriette insisted that the Curators owed the Bishop's personal estate £450 as a result of complicated financial transactions involving Morelands Bond. See, e.g. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Secretary of Curators, 6 Aug.1907. Dr Ross owed money: see R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 4 Nov.1885 and F.E. Colenso to Dr Ross, 28 Apr.1888. For the Berea lands see *i.a.* N.A., 3 Dbn.4/1/2/761: 25/162 H/19. See also N.A., Col.Coll: Somerset House to F.E. Colenso, 12 Dec.1906. Rees, *Colenso Letters*, pp.381-82 and p.390.

67. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Bb.21: H.E. Colenso to F.R. Statham, 10 Feb.1884.

68. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: S.F. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, Easter Monday (1885? int.ev.), Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 28 Dec.1884 and H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 15 Dec.1884.

a small bequest - from Uncle Charles.⁶⁹ It was not easy for them to find the thousands of pounds they spent on the defence of the uSuthu.⁷⁰ They received no remuneration as missionaries;⁷¹ but believed that as 'His unmarried girls' they had been lent enough to continue their father's work.

While Harriette was in England she relied on communication from associates in Natal: the blacks on the Bishopstowe estate, among them in particular Magama Magwaza Fuze who was for a time employed as a printing instructor at St Alban's College, and Mubi Nondenisa.⁷² Zulu messengers were certainly not unusual at Bishopstowe; some seem to have established themselves semi-permanently on the Bishopstowe estate, demanding and receiving sustenance from the Bishopstowe blacks.⁷³

The closest friend of the Colenso women in Natal was Katie Giles,⁷⁴ whom they called posthumously 'a brave woman and a faithful friend'.⁷⁵ In the 1890s she seems to have played the sort of role which her brother-in-law Warwick Brooks⁷⁶ had played in the 1860s: that of a committed friend. Harriette described her as the 'headquarters of our side' in Natal.⁷⁷ She received and forwarded information - and rumours - to and from Harriette and anxiously bestirred herself about such things as the expired passes of the uSuthu men at Bishopstowe.⁷⁸ She wrote to the press herself on occasion.⁷⁹ Her cousin, Mary Giles of Oxford, was in touch with Harriette while in England,⁸⁰ while

-
69. In 1899 she told Frank their joint income was £200, see R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: H.E. Colenso to R. and F. Colenso, 17 Nov.1899. Earlier estimates were slightly higher. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Lady Cox, 24 Jan.1891.
70. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers, Mss. Afr.S 1286(2) f.650: H.E. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 26 Apr.1890 estimated £3000. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 145): rough draft, n.d., marked for C.J.B. (Charles John Bunyon). Harriette estimated £3100.
71. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Lady Cox, 24 Jan.1891.
72. K.C.A.L., Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044: Letters of Magama Magwaza Fuze to the Exiles at St Helena, often on behalf of Zulu messengers; H.E. Colenso, *Troubles, Aborigines Friend*, June 1891, Letters of Magama Magwaza Fuze and Mubi Nondenisa. St Albans College, run by a clergyman of the Church of the Province of South Africa, had a brief existence in the 1890s.
73. K.C.A.L., Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044 *passim*; N.A., Col.Coll: K. Giles to A.M. Colenso, Sunday 17 Aug.1890.
74. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.
75. Inscription on tombstone. K. Giles' grave is close to that of the Colenso women in the Pietermaritzburg Commercial Road Cemetery.
76. Rees, *Colenso Letters*, p.142.
77. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 June 1892.
78. *Ibid.*, K. Giles to H.E. Colenso, 21 Oct.(1891, int.ev.) and 24 Nov.(1892? int.ev.); K. Giles to A.M. Colenso, 10 (Jan.1892? int.ev.).
79. *Ibid.*, K. Giles to *Natal Witness*, Friday 8 Mar.(1889 or 1895?).
80. *Ibid.*, M. Giles to H.E. Colenso, 9 July (1892? int.ev.).

Mrs Muller of the *Women's Penny Post* was evidently a friend of Katie Giles and, formerly, of Warwick Brooks.⁸¹ Throughout the first of her visits to England in the 1890s Harriette believed that Escombe was her key ally in Natal. She kept in touch with him through Katie Giles and the Bishopstowe men, Magama and Mubi.⁸² Escombe had tried to have a private interview with the Exiles in Natal prior to their embarkation, but the Governor refused.⁸³ In England Harriette was in touch with Escombe's family who sent her copies of the *Witness*.⁸⁴ Escombe forwarded to Harriette complaints from the uSuthu about proceedings in the Ndwandwe; but he did not take up the question himself.⁸⁵ He did not regard justice to the uSuthu as one of his main political goals. He had in the past acted for whites claiming land in Zululand. He would not jeopardise other political ambitions for the sake of the uSuthu. He met the Colenso women on their return to Natal and received them for two days in his Durban home, and Harriette appreciated his kindness.⁸⁶ His later actions suggest that there was some calculation in his welcome: he thought it expedient that Harriette should continue to regard him as a friend.⁸⁷ Harriette seemed to expect that she would still receive support from the *Natal Witness* and the *Natal Advertiser*, but Katie Giles was to find the *Witness* not always interested in reports of Harriette's lectures.⁸⁸

In Britain Harriette attracted support because she was a Colenso, a woman, and a colonist. Since 1874 there had been a close association between the Colensos and the A.P.S. As correspondence shows, viewpoints were not always identical, but dependence was mutual. Before her arrival in England, Fox Bourne had already given Harriette stalwart support. He had helped prepare an audience for her. Her picture appeared in the *Graphic*, an illustrated journal with a role comparable in its day to that of television now, and in *The Queen*, 'the Ladies' journal'. During the previous years the A.P.S. had written frequently to the Colonial Office,⁸⁹ and Fox Bourne had taken the leading role in forming the Zulu

81. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Mrs Muller, 28 Feb.1890.

82. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 16 July 1891; K. Giles to H.E. Colenso, 15 May 1892 and 10 June 1892; cf. K.C.A.L. Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044: Magama to Exiles, *passim*.

83. Z.G.H.728/267/1890: Secretary of State to Mitchell, confidential, 15 Mar.1890.

84. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 6 June 1890 and 18 Sept.1891.

85. H.E. Colenso, *Trouble and Troubles*.

86. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Lyell, 28 Sept.1893.

87. See below, Chapter Seven for the events of Jan.1895.

88. N.A., Col.Coll: Editor of *Natal Witness* to K. Giles, 25 June 1896.

89. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 17 Oct.1889 and Ruskin to H.E. Colenso, 31 Oct.1889; Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 22 Aug.1889.

Defence Committee which was to raise funds and concentrate energies on the Zulu Cause.⁹⁰ The Society continued to support Harriette. The *Aborigines Friend*, for example, reported the arrival of Miss Colenso in February 1890 and it continued to give room to Harriette and her concerns.⁹¹ After the trials ended, the Society maintained its correspondence with the Colonial Office.⁹² It reiterated and publicised its pleas for an impartial enquiry into the affairs of Zululand.⁹³ It continued to attack local officials and Zibhebhu.⁹⁴ These allegations were denied by officials, but they prevented the return of Zibhebhu to the Ndwandwe area. At one point an exasperated Lord Knutsford, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, obtained from Osborn, for Blue Book publication, a curt telegram which denied that Zululand was suffering from 'deplorable evils' and claimed that the allegations of the Society were without foundation.⁹⁵ Nevertheless, the Society took up in concert with Harriette the issue of a further attempt to demarcate locations for the competing factions of Zulu in the Ndwandwe area.⁹⁶

Harriette could benefit from the association with Fox Bourne, the Secretary of the A.P.S. but relations were not always smooth. There were, for example, two rough patches, in late 1890 and in mid-1891. In 1890 Harriette criticised the A.P.S. for the way it focussed on the issues raised by Stanley's activities in the Congo, to the detriment of Zulu affairs. Though busy at the time with a 'little book' on Stanley, Fox Bourne was sure that he had so exerted himself over the Zulu Defence Fund as not to deserve Harriette's criticism. Objecting to her public disparagement of the A.P.S., he suggested that the A.P.S. withdraw from involvement in Zulu matters and that the Zulu Defence Fund Committee be reconstituted to exclude A.P.S. members. Harriette responded that she had meant no personal attack, that she wanted no change in the Zulu Defence Fund, that she appreciated the efforts of the A.P.S., but urged that it could do more. Mollified, Fox Bourne

90. Fox Bourne, *Zulu Defence Fund*.

91. *Aborigines Friend*. The journal of the Aborigines Protection Society published correspondence with the C.O. and proceedings of Annual General Meetings.

92. *i.a.* *State Trials in Zululand* (correspondence of the committee of the A.P.S. and the C.O.).

93. *Ibid.*, N.A., Col.Coll: Knutsford to A.P.S., 19 Apr.1890 (copy).

94. See, for example, C.O.427/10/6016: A.P.S. to C.O., 28 Mar.1890 and Knutsford to Mr Gorst, 7 Apr.1890; C.O.427/10/7668: A.P.S. to C.O., 23 Apr.1890 and minutes, especially Knutsford, 26 Apr.1890; C.O.427/10/15/212: A.P.S. to C.O., 4 Aug.1890 and minutes, especially Knutsford, 7 Aug.1890.

95. C.O.427/8/9109: Mitchell to C.O., 14 Apr.1890; C.O.427/8/9537: Mitchell to C.O., 22 Apr.1890 and minutes.

96. H.E. Colenso, *Trouble and Troubles*.

responded more mildly. Christmas greetings indicated cordiality.⁹⁷

Then, a few months later, Harriette was incensed by two things. The Duke of Fife, a director of the British South Africa Company, presided over the annual general meeting of the A.P.S. He blandly assured the Society that it would find an ally in the British South Africa Company.⁹⁸ Almost simultaneously, Harriette heard of a speech in South Africa by Cecil John Rhodes, Prime Minister of the Cape and the driving force behind the British South Africa Company. In commenting about Pondoland, Rhodes had said that he 'preferred land to niggers'.⁹⁹ It was a crude expression. Rhodes attempted to explain it away by commenting that he had meant only that, given the choice between unpopulated and populated land, he would prefer the former. Harriette interpreted this phrase as a clear indication that Rhodes favoured a policy of either killing off or exterminating the black inhabitants.¹⁰⁰ Neither Rhodes nor Harriette referred to the issue of putting pressure on black people to enter the labour market. Nevertheless, Harriette thought that the A.P.S. was failing in its duty¹⁰¹ and she commented privately that the A.P.S. had become the 'Rhodes Protection Society'.¹⁰² To save the A.P.S. from itself, Harriette launched into a vigorous anti-Rhodes campaign. She had leaflets printed and sent to the press.¹⁰³ She told Fox Bourne that, while the A.P.S. existed, it should not have been left to her to protest against Rhodes' 'infamous accents'.¹⁰⁴ Fox Bourne, for his part, disavowed personal animus but was angered and hurt by Harriette's widely disseminated attack on the Society. Her 'ultimatum' had been published in the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Echo* as well as the small circulation *Anti-caste*, the journal of the Humanitarian Society, and her views were made known in the 'good little *Star*'.¹⁰⁵

Fox Bourne may have had more misgivings about the Company than Harriette was

97. N.A., Col.Coll: Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 1 and 24 Dec.1890; R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/200: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 19 Dec.1890; C.150/201: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 25 Dec.1890.

98. *Aborigines Friend*, report of A.G.M. of May 1891; *South Africa*, 23 May 1891.

99. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/202: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 25 May 1891.

100. *South Africa*, 13 June 1891.

101. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.150/203: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 1 June 1891.

102. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 26 May 1891.

103. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 3 June 1891.

104. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 26 July 1891.

105. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to mother, 3 and 10 June 1891; Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 27 July 1891; *Anti-caste*, June 1891. See, too, Appendix 2, Biographical notes: Impey.

prepared to grant.¹⁰⁶ Certainly the alliance between the A.P.S and the Chartered Company did not survive the controversies over the Ndebele war of 1893. In 1894 Rhodes denounced the A.P.S. as the 'Aborigines Destruction Society' and claimed that it had been responsible for Lobengula's execution of his *induna*, Lodi.¹⁰⁷ In 1891 Rhodes was not the only point of contention between Harriette and the A.P.S.¹⁰⁸

Some A.P.S members suspected Bishopstowe influence, citing the failure of the restoration of Cetshwayo.¹⁰⁹ Confusion about the accounts of the Zulu Defence Fund exasperated Fox Bourne, but the accounts were scrutinised by Westlake and a small balance was handed to Harriette. The committee came to an end in July 1891. There was no need of a committee while Harriette was in England.¹¹⁰ In the following year there was a little irritation over Sannie Koopman, a South African woman, evidently a member of a touring choir, imprisoned in Chesterfield. Prompted by Harriette, Fox Bourne took up her case - only to find that she had been released some weeks before Harriette asked for Fox Bourne's intervention.¹¹¹

Contributing to the tension was the old problem of different emphasis. Harriette had one area of concern: Zululand. The A.P.S. had many. Its concern was world-wide and, even in Africa, there were many areas which were much more crucial and more topical, for example, Central Africa. As Fox Bourne commented:

'I think that you, having one object in view, hardly recognise the difficulties of those who are bold enough to attempt to run several hobbies on one train.'

But Harriette and the Society had too much in common for any split to become permanent. Reconciliation followed dispute.¹¹² In later years Harriette's interests widened, and Fox

106. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 12 June 1891: letter of Fox Bourne.

107. *South Africa*, 3 Feb. 1894.

108. N.A., Col.Coll: F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 30 May 1889.

109. For example, Sir Robert Fowler and, presumably, William Forster.

110. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. Afr.S 18 C.150/203: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 1 June 1891; N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 26 July 1891; *Aborigines Friend*, Feb. 1892, report of a meeting of the Zulu Defence Committee on 24 July 1891, and audit of accounts signed by J. Westlake, 11 Aug. 1891.

111. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. 18 C.150/204: H.E. Colenso to Fox Bourne, 26 Oct. 1892; N.A., Col.Coll: Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 31 Oct. and 4 Nov. 1892; *South Africa*, 'The African Choir', 20 June 1891.

112. N.A., Col.Coll: Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 24 Dec. 1890.

Bourne did become an opponent of the Chartered Company.¹¹³ Nevertheless Harriette, as she told Ripon, judged it wise to 'remain distinct' from the A.P.S.¹¹⁴

Harriette could expect support from those who sympathised with her father's theological position. The converse also applied and, with some notable exceptions, this excluded the clergy of the established church. One exception was Canon Wilberforce,¹¹⁵ the emancipator's grandson, but also the son of 'Soapy Sam' who had been one of Bishop Colenso's strongest opponents. The younger Wilberforce made the acquaintance of Frances Ellen shortly before her death.¹¹⁶ Sir George Cox sympathised, but his role in the Colenso story was coming to an end. The *Life* had been published, but he found it 'most saddening' that it was a financial failure.¹¹⁷ His attempt to become Bishop of Natal also failed.¹¹⁸ For the most part, Harriette's clerical supporters were non-conformist ministers, especially Unitarians, such as P.H. Wicksteed,¹¹⁹ in whose church she preached. Wicksteed believed that Colenso would have been in a stronger moral position if he had left the Church of England.¹²⁰ This the family would not accept. They thought it absurd to allege that Colenso's theological views disqualified him as Bishop; and they believed that his decision to remain in the Church was a great act of moral courage.¹²¹ But, what matters here, is that there was sufficient regard for Colenso among Unitarians to command some attention for what his daughter had to say. Harriette defended her father's decision to remain in the Church of England but did not allow herself to be drawn into theological contention. She reassured a Church of England supporter in Natal with the comment that she had not joined the Unitarians. They had joined her in Zulu affairs. Unitarian pulpits were frequently the platforms from which she

113. See below, Chapter Eight, for an account of her lectures during 1895-1897. N.A., Col.Coll: Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 28 Apr. and 8 Nov.1896, circular announcing meeting on 5 May 1897 in Manchester, and Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 10 June 1898.

114. C.O.427/15/22120: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 12 Nov.1892.

115. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 27 May 1891. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

116. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to Wilberforce, 1 Jan.1887 and Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 6 Jan.1887.

117. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. File 35, KCM.1841/30: G. Cox to F.E. Colenso, 4 June 1892; N.A., Col.Coll: G. Cox to H.E. Colenso, 20 Mar.1890.

118. C.O.179/173/20263: Mr Pace to C.O., 10 Oct.1888. Minutes by Ebden, 15 Oct., Herbert, 16 Oct., and Knutsford, 18 Oct.1888. See below, Chapter Six.

119. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 25 July (1890, int.ev.); H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 7 Oct.1892.

120. Rees, *Colenso Letters*, pp.377-78.

121. *Ibid.*, N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to F. Gregg, 12 Feb.1812.

spoke.¹²²

In England, by 1890, women were more and more active in the spheres of local and central government and more vocal in their demands for political power.¹²³ Women prominent in such movements were interested in Harriette as a public figure and in her campaign.¹²⁴ She was, for example, invited to an 'at home' given by Miss Swanwick¹²⁵ and used the opportunity to 'catch more people for Zulu work'. Harriette was already known to women concerned for women's rights. The *Women's Penny Paper*,¹²⁶ which boasted that it was the only paper conducted and printed by women, had published the reports from Eshowe by Harriette which Frank and Hancock forwarded to the paper. It published an interview with Harriette shortly after she arrived and reported on her early lectures.¹²⁷ An important figure for Harriette was Annie Leigh Browne. A Unitarian and a woman of means, she was interested in women's role in local government and in the general question of sex equality.¹²⁸ She advised and helped Harriette in lobbying MPs and other influential people. She had circulars printed and distributed.¹²⁹ She tried to arrange a meeting with W.T. Stead, the pioneer of investigative journalism and then editor of the *Review of Reviews*.¹³⁰ On her own initiative, Annie Leigh Browne remonstrated with Sydney Webb, then a Colonial Office official, and was distressed to find that 'so keen a socialist' was unsympathetic. She sent Zulu material to Hugh Price Hughes, the Methodist leader, without much effect.¹³¹ She herself subsequently regretted that it was the Zulu cause, not the cause of women, that

122. See below, pp.215-16.

123. P. Hollis, *Ladies Elect: Women in English Local Government* (Oxford, 1987) is one recent work which discusses the increasingly public role of women and their claim to a place in local government. 'Women Workers in the Liberal Cause', an unsigned article in *The Westminster Review*, 1897 is part of the contemporary discussion. (Photocopy sent to author by Cecillie Swaisland.)

124. For a Bunyon comment on the status among contemporary women Harriette might have commanded had she remained in Britain, see N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 1 July 1911.

125. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

126. *Women's Penny Paper*: Front page logo; and 'Eshowe Trials' by H.E. Colenso, published in instalments, 1888-89. (Photocopy sent to author by Nan Albinski.)

127. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 Jan.1890; *Women's Penny Paper*, 22 Feb.1890.

128. N.A., Col.Coll: Stansfeld Trust. Report for 1896; A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 24 July 1890. Hollis, *Ladies Elect*, pp.317-19, 321-22, 333-34.

129. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 214): A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, card, n.d. listing MPs to whom 'whips' had gone; A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 19 Feb.1891.

130. N.A., Col.Coll: Peers (from *Review of Reviews*) to H.E. Colenso, 23 July 1890.

131. *Ibid.*, A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 25 July 1890 (re Hughes); 9 July (no year) re S. Webb.

mattered most to Harriette, a view which was probably shared by Ms Muller of the W.P.P.¹³² Harriette also met Miss Conybeare who crusaded against prostitution and helped with the Zulu issues. Harriette, for her part, agreed to correspond with the British Continental and General Federation for the abolition of the State Regulation of Vice, but she does not appear to have been a keen supporter of this cause.¹³³

There was at least one woman who welcomed Harriette because she remembered not the controversies, but the kindness of Bishop Colenso. Mary Barker wrote appreciatively of his exertions on behalf of her grandchildren when their father, her son, a medical doctor, was murdered on his way to help the wounded at Majuba.¹³⁴

One of the results of Harriette's visit to England was the lifelong friendship of Alice Werner. Academic reputations dim quickly, but, in her day, Alice Werner was a distinguished pioneer scholar who ended her career as a Professor of Swahili and Bantu [sic] Languages at the School of Oriental [and African] Studies in London.¹³⁵ She was also a writer and a poet as well as a skilled linguist who had already published poetry and articles when her friendship with Harriette began.¹³⁶ It was not clear at that time what would be the main direction of Alice's life, and her sister, Mary, feared that she might dissipate her talents, as their father had done.¹³⁷ Both Alice and Harriette were the daughters of gifted fathers and each knew the grief caused by the death of a sibling, a sister in Harriette's case, while a gifted brother of Alice died in West Africa¹³⁸. Alice seems to have responded to the firm purposefulness of Harriette's life. In 1891 she collaborated with Harriette in the publication of an article which set out Harriette's ideas.¹³⁹ Alice wished to study the language and culture of the people of Africa, and the only role then open to her was that of a missionary. She accepted Harriette's advice to join the missionary enterprise at Blantyre. But the role of a disciplined missionary was

132. *Ibid.*, 19 Feb.1891.

133. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes, for individuals mentioned in this paragraph.

134. N.A., Col.Coll: M. Barker to Dear Sir, 1 Oct.1890.

135. *Dictionary of National Biography: Missing Persons* (Oxford, 1993-1994).

136. A. Werner, *A Time and Times. Ballads and Lyrics of East and West* (London, 1886).

137. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 209): M. Werner to H.E. Colenso, n.d.

138. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd.70: H.E. Colenso to A. Werner, 2 Oct.1891. See dedication 'In memoriam J.R.W., Elmina, 6 August 1891' in A. Werner, *The Natives of British Central Africa* (London, 1906).

139. H.E. Colenso, & A. Werner, *White and Black in Natal* (London, 1892), a reprint from *The Contemporary Review*, February 1892.

no life for a woman of the intellectual power, range, and distinction of Alice Werner and, again on Harriette's advice, she left the mission after only a short experience.¹⁴⁰ Harriette encouraged her to concentrate on the study of African languages.¹⁴¹ The Colensos lent Alice money to help her move away from Blantyre, and Alice spent more than a year at Bishopstowe with the Colenso sisters before she returned to Britain.¹⁴² She drew on what she experienced and learned there in her later publications, both in her anthropological studies and her fiction.¹⁴³ Alice remained a firm friend of Harriette and paid Harriette and Agnes - and their father - high tribute.¹⁴⁴ She probably learned from them something of the empathy and insight into black attitudes which distinguished her scholarly and literary writings - and indeed her own teaching of African languages subsequently. If so, then some Colenso influence was conveyed through Alice to those who read her works of scholarship and of fiction and to those English men and women whom Alice Werner taught and who worked in Africa in the early twentieth century.¹⁴⁵

While in Britain, during both her visits, Harriette was drawn into the company of even more eminent women. Some she sought, hopeful that they might help; others she spurned because she felt that they would not. Olive Schreiner belonged to the first category, Flora Shaw to the second. But Harriette's desire to meet Olive Schreiner did not bring the two women into a close relationship.¹⁴⁶ In temperament they were miles apart, and the important Schreiner association in Harriette's life came later, when she did to Olive Schreiner's brother what she had done to Harry Escombe: secure his services for the

140. K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd.82: H.E. Colenso to M.J. Werner, 1 Dec.1894; Dd.85: H.E. Colenso to A. Werner, 10 Mar.1894, and Dd.86: 19 May 1894.

141. *Ibid.*, Dd.65: H.E. Colenso to A. Werner, 21 Sept.1893.

142. Alice arrived at Bishopstowe in December 1894 (see K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd.82: H.E. Colenso to Mrs Werner, 1 Dec.1894) and left 26 Feb.1896 (see N.A., Col.Coll: A. Werner to H.E. Colenso, 13 Jan.1897). For the financial help the Colensos gave her, see K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. Dd.84: H.E. Colenso to A. Werner, 28 Feb.189; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers, Mss. Afr. S.12855, scrap book: letter of A. Werner in *Literary Guide*, 17 Aug.1933; and her dedication to Agnes and Harriette Colenso, 'in memory of many happy days at Bishopstowe' in A. Werner, *Captain of the Locusts* (London, 1899).

143. The number and range of Alice Werner's publications are impressive. See, for example, *British Library Catalogue* and *Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals*.

144. A. Werner, 'Harriette Colenso', 'Some Recollections of Bishopstowe', and 'John William Colenso', typescripts in K.C.A.L.; obituary notice of Agnes in *The Times* (copy in K.C.A.L.), article on Colenso in *The Daily News*, 23 Jan.1914, and 'Colenso of Natal' in *International Review of Missions*, Oct.1933.

145. See H. Vischer, 'Preface' to A. Werner, *Structure and Relationship of African Languages* (London etc, 1930). See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

146. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to O. Schreiner, 13 Feb.1897, and O. Schreiner to H.E. Colenso, Monday (possibly Feb.1897).

defence of Dinuzulu.¹⁴⁷ Flora Shaw's interest and approach was too jingoistic and perhaps too shallow for Harriette. While Harriette pleaded for justice to the Zulu people, Flora Shaw was attacking the A.P.S and achieving journalistic success by the publication of articles on South Africa in which she advocated 'including', though not 'forcing', the black man to offer his labour to the white.¹⁴⁸ In addition, Harriette had a thin correspondence with 'that vivacious lady', Lady Florence Dixie, whose association with the Colensos dated from the Anglo-Zulu War; but Lady Florence, never very reliable, was now out of touch with Zulu affairs.¹⁴⁹ Harriette also met Mary Kingsley, the West African explorer, late in her campaigning.¹⁵⁰

Harriette was brought into touch with politically active and alert women mainly through the relatively new network of Women's Liberal Associations and its National Federation.¹⁵¹ A Liverpool correspondent suggested to her shortly after her arrival that the 'Ladies of the Gladstonian Liberal Ladies' Clubs in and around London' would provide her with 'a fertile field of operations'.¹⁵² These associations, whose history is gradually being recounted,¹⁵³ had some importance in the contemporary political scene¹⁵⁴ and they served Harriette well, not least by giving her a means of reaching out to the provincial cities. The A.P.S. was concentrated in London and had no local branches.¹⁵⁵ By contrast, since canvassing and electioneering were part of their function, some of the local Women's Liberal Associations were vigorous and - though quarrelsome - helpful to Harriette. To them it was probably the fact that she was criticising the actions of the Conservative government that made her most valuable in the early 1890s. In 1893 she was a delegate at the annual meeting of the National Women's Liberal Federation, but it was not an experience she wished to repeat in 1896.¹⁵⁶

147. See *i.a.* Binns, *Dinuzulu*, pp.249-50.

148. F. Shaw, 'Dry Nursing the Colonies' in *Fortnightly Review*, Sept.1889; *Aborigines Friend*, 1890 p.35; and F. Shaw, *Letters from South Africa* (London, 1893).

149. R.H.L., Br.Empire Series S.18 A.S.P. C.130/51: Fr.El. Colenso to Chesson, 27 Oct.1885; N.A., Col.Coll: Lady Florence Dixie to H.E. Colenso, 28 Apr.1890.

150. See above, Chapter One and below, pp.354 and 380.

151. R. Fulford, *Votes for Women: the Story of a Struggle* (London, 1957), p.94.

152. N.A., Col.Coll: W. Irons to H.E. Colenso, 16 Feb. and 10 Mar.1890.

153. For example, P. Hollis, *Ladies Elect* (Oxford, 1987), pp.57-65.

154. Gladstone Papers, 44514, f.234: W. Lawson to W.E. Gladstone, 6 May 1892.

155. N.A., Col.Coll: C. Impey (Editor of *Anti-Caste*) to H.E. Colenso, 7 Apr.1893.

156. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.L. Browne, 9 June 1896.

Harriette welcomed links with the women relatives of politicians. Kate Courtney, the wife of Leonard and the sister of Beatrice Webb (the noted Fabian socialist), frequently received Harriette when she called to consult her MP husband.¹⁵⁷ Harriette was often in touch with the mother, sister, and wife of James Bryce, the prominent Liberal politician and a member of the cabinet 1892-95.¹⁵⁸ Miss Conybeare who gave Harriette active support was related to a radical and highly controversial MP.¹⁵⁹ Harriette wrote to Mrs Osborne Morgan, wife of the Welsh Liberal MP,¹⁶⁰ and was in touch too with Lady Frederick Cavendish, whose husband was murdered in Phoenix Park, Dublin, in 1881.¹⁶¹ The formidable Jane Cobden-Unwin falls into this category, for she was the daughter of Richard Cobden, the leading exponent of Free Trade principles and committed pacifist of previous decades. Her husband, T. Fisher Unwin, was a prominent publisher who launched a number of *avant garde* and creative writers. On the left wing was Hypatia Bradlaugh Bonner, the daughter of Charles Bradlaugh, whose outspoken atheism caused a furore in the 1880s when he refused to take the customary oath on taking his seat as an MP. Interestingly, not all the women with whom Harriette had dealings while she was in Britain were Liberal party or even left-wing in their political orientation. Mrs Lyell, her mother's friend, and 'the English mother' of the Colenso sons when they were in Britain, was in fact the mother of a Conservative MP, Leonard Lyell, who inherited his uncle's - Charles Lyell's - title. Leonard Courtney had defected from Gladstone over the Home Rule issue in 1886 and was a Liberal Unionist, although his influence, such as it was, depended on his reputation as a man of integrity rather than on party allegiance.¹⁶² Some women with whom Harriette corresponded cannot easily be placed in any political niche. There was, for example, Miss Pryke, later Mrs Fuller of Norwich, who was among the circle of friends of Frank and Sophie Colenso. She assisted in arranging a visit to Norwich for Harriette.¹⁶³ Dora Lees (née Livesey), a well-loved schoolfriend of Frances Ellen and evidently a woman of wealth, wrote to Harriette, invited her to visit,

157. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

158. *Ibid.*, N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 12 June 1891, and letters of 1891 and 1892 from the wife and sister of James Bryce.

159. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

160. N.A., Col.Coll: E. Osborne Morgan to H.E. Colenso, 17 June 1891.

161. Ripon Papers, Add.Mss.43636 ff.234-5: Lucy Lady Frederick Cavendish to Lord Ripon, 8 Nov.1892.

162. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. for the individuals mentioned in this paragraph.

163. N.A., Col.Coll: F.W. Chesson to H.E. Colenso, 21 Mar.1887; Miss Pryke to Sophie Colenso, 7 Feb.1887; to H.E. Colenso, 2 July and 3 Aug.1890.

and arranged a meeting for her.¹⁶⁴

Most of Harriette's associates drew her more closely to the Liberal party, thus strengthening a tendency already apparent.¹⁶⁵ However much the A.P.S. might claim to be non-party in its approach to the problems of empire, its leading figures gave their loyalty to the Liberal party.¹⁶⁶ Sir R.N. Fowler was a prominent exception.¹⁶⁷ Though the Colensos had in the past been critical of both Conservative and Liberal government, it was clear to Harriette that she had more to hope for from a Liberal victory in the elections of 1892 than from continued Conservative rule. She agreed willingly to help the electoral campaign of D. Naoraji¹⁶⁸ in Finsbury and agreed to be a delegate at the national conference of the Women's Liberal Federation in 1893.¹⁶⁹

Among the associations which invited Harriette to lecture were the Manchester Geographical Society¹⁷⁰ and the Tyneside Geographical Society.¹⁷¹ As geographers, their members were presumably interested in the affairs of a far away colony and Manchester had already invited W.Y. Campbell.¹⁷² Being a colonist had other consequences for Harriette. It was natural that she should, in England, renew or maintain associations with people that she had known in the colony, or who had strong links with it. Some were personal friends. Harriette stayed, for example, with Esther Clarke,¹⁷³ Frances Ellen's friend, and she visited Mrs and Miss Durnford at Portsmouth.¹⁷⁴ There were some who had been associated with her in regard to Zululand, for example, Campbell who was in Britain in the early 1890s.¹⁷⁵ Some were officials. Harriette was

164. *Ibid.*, B. Walker to A.M. Colenso, 9 July 1890.

165. R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. and Sophie Colenso, 23 June 1885.

166. N.A., Col.Coll: W.Y. Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 8 Dec.1885; Swaisland, 'Aborigines Protection Society', pp.21-22.

167. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

168. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 8 July 1892. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

169. See below, pp.229-230.

170. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 6 June 1890.

171. See below, p.217.

172. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

173. Esther Clarke was the sister of the soldier whom Frances Ellen and Helen Shepstone had nursed during his fatal sickness in Natal.

174. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K.Giles, 25 Sept.(1890? int.ev.). The Durnfords mentioned here may have been the estranged wife of A.W. Durnford and his daughter.

175. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: W.Y. Campbell to H.E. Colenso, 31 May and 15 Aug.1890, 27 Feb., 29 Mar. 21 and 22 Apr.1892.

in touch with Colonel Cardew¹⁷⁶ when he came to Britain, and she received at least one letter from Sir Arthur Havelock and called on him.¹⁷⁷ Then there was a man like E.P. Mathers who, after ten years as a journalist in Natal, was now in London as the editor of the new journal *South Africa*.¹⁷⁸ This seems to have been the mouth-piece of Donald Currie, the rival of Rhodes. Interestingly, Harriette gained some coverage from its columns, especially in the early years, though not as much as she would have liked.¹⁷⁹

SECTION D: The Levels of her Campaigning

When Harriette arrived in Britain early in 1890, it was, in theory, still possible to approach the Privy Council again on behalf of Dinuzulu. In January 1889 the Privy Council had given permission to Dinuzulu to appeal against the decision of the Natal Supreme Court in regard to the legality of his removal from Natal to Eshowe.¹⁸⁰ This permission still held and had not been invalidated when, in July 1889, the Privy Council rejected another appeal, this one against the proceedings of the Court of the Special Commissioners in Zululand.¹⁸¹ But, given all the expense and the doubts about success, Harriette was well-advised to turn her back on the Privy Council. The application was abandoned.¹⁸²

Harriette's vigorous and varied advocacy of the uSuthu was conducted simultaneously on three levels of activity, all of them interrelated. In regard to all three the change of government in Britain in 1892 was crucial; for the context and climate of opinion was transformed.¹⁸³ At one end of the scale, Harriette knew that it was important to reach the men at the top. She made representations to the Colonial Office in person and by letter, on her own, and in association with the A.P.S. On the other hand, much of her time was occupied in grass roots campaigning. She tried to reach as many people as

176. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 20 May 1892; F. Cardew to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb. 1892.

177. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 22 Feb. (1895, int.ev.).

178. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

179. *South Africa*: Natal and Zululand both featured prominently in the years prior to the grant of Responsible government.

180. See above, pp.137-39.

181. See above, pp.167-69.

182. H.E. Colenso, *England and the Zulus* (London, 1890); Z.G.H.728/264/1890: Sutton and Ommaney (solicitors to the Crown Agents) to the Crown Agents, 12 Mar. 1890.

183. See, for example, N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 8 July and 12 Aug. 1892.

possible through her lectures and sermons, reports or letters in the press, articles in periodicals, and her own pamphlets and leaflets. Thirdly, there was the crucial area that lay between the other two: the area of parliamentary interest. Without parliamentary support, a government could not continue in office. A snap debate could topple a government that had lost its *élan*. Even if this did not happen, there were other ways in which critics could be awkward. It damaged the image and, therefore, the prospects of a government if nuisance debate spoilt its legislative programme, or if its own representatives made a poor showing in debate. What follows is a discussion of Harriette's activities at each of these levels, with some elucidation of the interaction that occurred, and the effects that were achieved.

1. Campaigning at the Top: Harriette and the Colonial Office

As Harriette called at the Colonial Office and sent in her letters and pamphlets, several things became clear: an interview with the Secretary of State once granted could not easily be repeated; even successful representations took time to be implemented; moreover there was no prospect of representations being successful, if they were not supported. A show of public and parliamentary backing was essential, whatever the political circumstances of a government. As usual, and as Harriette knew, she was contending against the antipathy of local officials¹⁸⁴ and the apathy of the British public.¹⁸⁵ Local officials, through their replies to enquiries, would counter Harriette's submissions; but, at the same time, Harriette was committed to moving vigorously against any anti-uSuthu initiatives of local officials. What mattered was how much support she could arouse in Britain. Here the Zulu cause competed with a host of domestic and foreign issues in claiming the attention of the British public. The question of Zululand was not a topical issue.¹⁸⁶

Three features of Harriette's dealings with the Colonial Office under the Conservatives seem worthy of comment. One is her interview with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The second is that the men in the Colonial Office knew how watchful and critical Harriette was, and this affected their decisions about the Exiles at St Helena. The third is the vigorous contention by correspondence over the proposed demarcation of

184. *Ibid.*, 1 Sept.1892.

185. *Ibid.*, F.C. Dumat to Escombe, 5 July 1889; K.M. Lyell to S.F. Colenso, 4 Nov.1890; Kate Ryley to H.E. Colenso, 15 June 1890.

186. *Ibid.*, Fox Bourne to H.E. Colenso, 23 May 1889 and 25 Jan.1895.

locations in the Ndwandwe district.

Escorted by her uncle, Charles Bunyon, Harriette called at the Colonial Office on 11 February 1890 within the first few days of her arrival. She saw Knutsford and de Worms, who came a little late. As the Colensos had already lost their once favourable opinion of Knutsford, she did not hope for much.¹⁸⁷ But the interview was not all labour lost. Knutsford was personally courteous. He saw Harriette, he assured her that he would consider any further requests she might wish to make, and he made some concessions. What Harriette gained immediately was emphasis on Dinuzulu's desire for learning and recognition of the right of the Exiles, under official scrutiny, to exchange letters and gifts with friends and supporters. A little later she scored a point against Osborn by emphasising that Dinuzulu had surrendered in Pietermaritzburg, not at Eshowe.¹⁸⁸

In regard to lessons for the Exiles, Knutsford granted their right to have these, but not their right to the teacher requested by Miss Colenso, *i.e.* Magama Magwaza Fuze. When a Natal newspaper took over a London report¹⁸⁹ that suggested that Knutsford might allow Magama Magwaza Fuze to go to St Helena, Mitchell, who had already lodged objections privately, fired off a quick telegram of protest. It was unnecessary. Knutsford had decided against the man Mitchell called 'notorious', but the telegram is a useful indication of attitudes.¹⁹⁰

The question of communication with the Exiles was obviously an important one for both their friends and those hostile to them. The Colonial Office agreed that the Exiles were entitled to send and receive messages and parcels. All communications had to go through government offices, and letters were to be accompanied by translations, if necessary. It was a clumsy procedure, but at least it meant that the Exiles were not to be held

187. Holland had shown an interest in Zululand while a member of the parliamentary opposition. I.M. Cumpston, 'The Discussion of Imperial Problems in the British Parliament, 1880-1885', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, vol.13 (1963). R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: Fr.El. Colenso to F.E. Colenso, 15 Feb.1887. Fr.El. Colenso sent Holland a copy of *The Ruin of Zululand*.

188. N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 139): Notes of interview at the C.O., 11 Feb.1890.

189. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 15 Feb.1890: interview with H.E. Colenso.

190. Z.G.H.728/265/1890: H.E. Colenso to C.O., copy, 11 Mar.1890, answered in C.O. to H.E. Colenso, 18 Mar.1890, following Mitchell to C.O., telegram, 15 Mar.1890.

incomunicado.¹⁹¹ A certain amount of illicit or circuitous communication went on also when a well-disposed St Helena resident could be found.¹⁹² The exchange of letters and despatch of parcels reminded officials of the existence of the Exiles and of the possible reverberations of controversy over their treatment and our other Zulu issues. Both the Colonial Office and Harriette drew attention to communications from St Helena when this was thought advantageous.¹⁹³

Where Harriette and the uSuthu headmen in Zululand, Mankulumana and Mgamule,¹⁹⁴ were continually balked was over the question of having messengers and couriers pass between Zululand and St. Helena. Medicines,¹⁹⁵ the ingredients and instructions for making headrings,¹⁹⁶ and money¹⁹⁷ could be sent to the Exiles through official channels; but medicine men, headring-makers, and couriers with the money were all banned.¹⁹⁸ Pleas from the uSuthu in Zululand,¹⁹⁹ the Exiles,²⁰⁰ and Harriette, even when accompanied by explanations of the importance of having the artist in medicine²⁰¹ and on headrings²⁰² accompany the ingredients, all fell on deaf ears. Admittedly, not all the minutes in the Colonial Office were hostile, at least over the question of headrings. Olivier, for example, sympathised with the Exiles' desire to have the services of an experienced headring maker: he would want anyone working on his own hair at least to have practised on a sheep!²⁰³

-
191. C.O.247/138: Grey-Wilson to Knutsford, confidential, 16 Apr.1890 with minute by J. Bramston, 10 May 1890; (The individual registration numbers of documents in the C.O.247 (St Helena) files are not available to me.) Z.G.H.728/265/1890: C.O. to H.E. Colenso, 18 Mar.1890.
 192. N.A., Col.Coll: M. Burchell to H.E. Colenso, 17 Mar. and 29 Oct.1896.
 193. C.6070, p.47, no.31: R.L. Antrobus to C.O., 16 Apr.1890. See also, C.O.247/138: R.G.W. Herbert to C.O., 16 Apr.1890. H.E. Colenso, *Zulu Letters from St Helena* (London, 1895).
 194. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.
 195. K.C.A.L., Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044: letters by Magera to the Exiles on behalf of uSuthu headmen and messengers; cf. C.O.427/11/7946: Mitchell to C.O., no.42: 23 Mar.1891.
 196. C.O.247/139: Grey-Wilson to Fairfield, private, 10 July 1891. Minute by Fairfield, 11 Aug.1891.
 197. C.O.247/142, no.55: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 14 June 1893. Minute by R. Antrobus, 7 July 1893.
 198. C.O.427/9/18290, no.96: Mitchell to C.O., 20 Aug.1890. Minutes, especially R.G.W. Herbert, 18 Sept.1890 and Knutsford 19 June 1890.
 199. K.C.A.L., Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044: letters written by Magera to the Exiles on behalf of uSuthu headmen.
 200. C.O.247/139: Grey-Wilson to Fairfield, private, 10 July 1891, enclosing letter from Exiles, 9 July 1891; N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 139): H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 19 Sept.1891.
 201. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 139): H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 19 Sept.1891.
 202. C.O.247/139, no: 74: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 28 Dec.1891. Minute by S. Olivier, 18 Jan.1892; N.A., Col.Coll. (Old Ref: Box 139): H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 19 Sept.1891.
 203. C.O.427/12/23200, no.119: Mitchell to C.O. C.O.247/139, no.74: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 4 Nov.1891. Minute by S. Olivier, 2 Dec.1891.

How effective Colonial Office goodwill would be was always a problem for Harriette. After her interview with Lord Knutsford, Harriette took a little time to decide whether or not to take advantage of Knutsford's offer to give his consideration to any other cases which she might wish to urge. She surprised the Colonial Office by telling them that she had decided not to accept the offer. Her reason was that Osborn was still in a position of authority, and she was afraid that she might worsen the plight of any uSuthu prisoner for whom she pleaded. Fairfield was perplexed. He thought her attitude 'inconsistent with common sense' but conceded that it might be genuine. In protesting against the 'present officials' in Zululand Harriette had registered another point against Osborn, though this was not to have any immediate effect.²⁰⁴

In dealing with the Exiles, the officials in the Colonial Office were plainly aware of Harriette Colenso and wary of her. When they first heard that she was coming to England there was concern that she might call at St Helena *en route*. Officials knew that, whatever the letter of the existing laws, there would be agitation if she were denied access to the prisoners. Hence they decided to instruct the Governor of St Helena that Miss Colenso should be allowed to see the prisoners. One mail was missed in the despatch of this message but, fortunately for the Colonial Office, Harriette travelled directly to Britain.²⁰⁵ Other problems remained. Attention was given to the prison regulations for the Exiles. In the proposals of the Governor of St Helena, it was suggested that the attendants were to be treated as though they, too, were prisoners. Reminding his colleagues of the promises that had been made to Miss Colenso, Fairfield doubted whether they could do this.²⁰⁶ The regulations were amended.²⁰⁷

Then there was the question of whether or not Zulu visitors to St Helena should be allowed. A rumpus arose over the desirability of a law to prohibit such visits. In the Colonial Office Sydney Webb thought a ban would stir criticism. R.G.W. Herbert, however, feared that returning visitors and messengers might spread 'a rebellious and restless spirit' among the Zulu. Knutsford thought that Miss Colenso might be behind the

204. C.O.427/10/7151: H.E. Colenso to Knutsford, 16 Apr.1890. Minute by Fairfield, 17 Apr.1890.

205. See above, pp.176-77; C.O.427/6/789: Mitchell to C.O., 17 Dec.1889. Minutes by Fairfield, 9 and 11 Jan.1890 and R.G.W. Herbert (date obscure).

206. C.O.247/138, no.11: Grey-Wilson to C.O. re Prison Regulations, 19 Feb.1890. Minute by Fairfield, 15 Mar.1890.

207. *Ibid.*, no.55: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 15 Aug.1890, enclosing amended regulations.

agitation and favoured legislation. His insistence that the St Helena council pass an ordinance to this effect caused uproar in the council which sat till midnight. The ordinance prohibited the landing in St Helena of any black from Natal or Zululand without permission from the authorities in South Africa. The ordinance held the captain, or the owner or charterer, of the vessel responsible and stipulated the fine to be imposed on an offender. The Union Steamship line lodged a protest, and the Bishop of St Helena expressed himself strongly. To him the measure was discriminatory in that it denied to some British subjects freedom of movement within the empire.²⁰⁸ Knutsford would not give way, even though, within the Colonial Office, he scoffed at the idea of a 'Zulu invasion of St Helena' and made possible lower fines than those originally prescribed.²⁰⁹ Though the costs of passage would have inhibited such visits to St Helena anyway, the law may have had a deterrent effect. It was only much later that Harriette secured for her Bishopstowe men, Mubi, and then Magema, permission to visit the Exiles.²¹⁰

In addition, Mitchell, the Governor of Natal and Zululand, jibbed against proposals that would involve government expense. He was obstructive about allowing pregnant women²¹¹ among the Zulu party at St Helena to return to Zululand to be replaced by other companions. There were more difficulties of a different kind about the exchange of male attendants, until after the change of government in Britain.²¹²

In St Helena the establishment for the Exiles included the posts of guardian and assistant guardian. Apart from the temporary tenure of the Revd Baker, a St Helena man, and perhaps Joseph Anderson, the 'guardians' were whites from Natal and Zululand. By and large the four men who held the post during the seven-year exile do not seem to have been an impressive group. Saunders, younger brother of the man who was then magistrate at Eshowe and destined to be chief magistrate in Zululand, was apparently indifferent to his

208. C.O.247/138: Grey-Wilson to C.O., confidential, 29 Sept.1890. Minute by Knutsford, 29 Oct.1890.

209. C.O.247/138: Union Steamship Company to C.O., confidential, 5 Nov.1890.

210. See below, Chapter Eight.

211. C.O.247/138, no.56: Grey-Wilson to Secretary of State (African 398), Sept.1890. Minutes by Fairfield, 3 Oct.1890 and R.G.W. Herbert, 4 Oct.1890.

212. C.O.247/142, no.29: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 21 March, 1893. Minute by R.L. Antrobus, 11 Apr.1893; no.35: 5 Apr.1893, enclosing report of the guardian, 3 Apr.1893.

charges. Anderson, his successor, was described as 'drunken';²¹³ Bertram Spenser Cressy seems to have been a curious and unsatisfactory character whom Dinuzulu allegedly despised;²¹⁴ while Harriette does not seem to have been impressed with Madden who anyway thought the Exiles spoilt.²¹⁵ For much of the time, the assistant guardian was A.J. Daniels. He had a long association with Dinuzulu, punctuated by sharp quarrels, and he is one of the peripheral figures in Zulu history whose career might bear closer scrutiny. For a time, at St Helena, he held the position which Harriette would have liked for Magama.²¹⁶

But at least the existence of a guardian pointed to the good intentions on the part of the Colonial Office. Regular reports were required from the guardians, and these were read, scrutinised, and commented upon in the Colonial Office. In an early report the acting guardian, Joseph Anderson, reported favourably on Dinuzulu: his 'craving for progression', his love of music, his abstemiousness in eating, and possession 'of the embryo of Christianity and civilisation'. The chiefs had a carriage and horses, had attended a concert at the invitation of the Governor and a picnic arranged by the Admiral, and had been invited to a cricket match. Anderson's wife was teaching the Zulu women sewing.²¹⁷ Visits to St Helena of *H.M.S. Raleigh* caused much excitement, especially when Admiral Bedford invited the Exiles to visit the flagship, and they were fascinated by its guns.²¹⁸

After 1892 medical reports were required too. When Shingana was reported ill F. Graham in the Colonial Office minuted, in real or mock alarm, that if he died at St Helena the Colenso party would accuse the Colonial Office of having 'judicially murdered him'.²¹⁹ Moreover, Dinuzulu did not need to rely only on the official guardians for the learning

213. C.O.247/142, no.35: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 5 Apr.1893, enclosing report of J. Anderson. Minute by R.L. Antrobus, 19 May 1893.

214. C.O.247/144, no.44: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 2 July 1894. Minute by R.L. Antrobus, 4 Aug.1894; C.O.247/146, no.4: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 4 Jan.1895.

215. M. Young (ed), *The Reminiscences of Amelia de Henningsen (Notre Mère)* (Cape Town, 1989), pp.173-74.

216. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. Marks, *Reluctant Rebellion*, p.254 and footnote.

217. C.O.247/139, no.27: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 20 Apr. enclosing report of J. Anderson, 1 Apr.1891. Regular reports are to be found in the St. Helena Files. See illustration, p.xxiv.

218. C.O.247/142, no.35: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 5 Apr.1893, enclosing report of the guardian, 3 Apr.1893.

219. C.O.247/140: Governor of St Helena to C.O., 11 Apr.1892. Minute by F. Graham, 10 May 1892.

and understanding of the ways of the Victorian society that he sought. Clergymen of the Island tutored him, first the Revd Baker, then the Revd Barraclough.²²⁰ In addition, Dinuzulu had at his side the interesting figure of Paul Mthimkhulu or Paul Radebe. He was Christianised man from the Cape who had been summoned to Cetshwayo, stayed with Dinuzulu, 'prayed' at Ceza, went with Dinuzulu and his *izinduna* to Bishopstowe, conducted services at Eshowe, and accompanied Dinuzulu into exile on St Helena.²²¹ Mitchell thought him capable of fabricating 'ingenious falsehoods' for English consumption but had not been able to prevent his accompanying Dinuzulu.

When it came to the general well-being of the Exiles, there were times when Mitchell's stringency irritated the Colonial Office, even under Knutsford and de Worms. Mitchell had a reputation for being a 'fanatical economist'. As Governor of Zululand he, on occasion, objected to the amount which the Governor of St Helena was spending on horses, carriages, and entertainment for the Exiles. Mitchell, so ran one Colonial Office minute, should be reminded that they were keeping the Exiles in St Helena not to please themselves but to please him. Moreover, Dinuzulu, as a free man, would one day return to Zululand. In the contretemps between Mitchell and Grey-Wilson, the Colonial Office supported Grey-Wilson who, given the poverty of St Helena, was probably pleased to have some Zululand funds to spend in the Island.²²² The funds being expended, roughly £1000 a year, came from the revenue of Zululand, in which the largest single item was the hut tax paid by Zulus in Zululand.²²³

In a pragmatic and erratic way the Colonial Office accepted and applied to the Exiles the principle about which Harriette was so clearly convinced. The Exiles belonged to two worlds: that of their own tribal *mores*, and that which was permeated by the conventions and attitudes of whites. They deserved consideration in regard to both. What strengthened

220. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. C.O.247/140, no.5: Governor of St Helena to C.O., 6 Jan.1892 with enclosures. C.O.247/138, no.56: Letter of Revd Mr Baker, quoted by Antrobus in minute of 8 Oct.1890 on Grey-Wilson to C.O., confidential, 29 Sept.1890.

221. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

222. C.O.247/139: Grey-Wilson to Fairfield, private, 10 July 1891. C.O.247/140, no.25: Grey-Wilson to C.O. 2 May 1892, with reply of C.O., draft, 16 July 1892, and minute by Fairfield, 30 June 1892; no.62: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 24 Nov.1892, with minutes by Ripon, 18 Feb. and Fairfield, 11 Feb.1893; C.O.247/142: Governor, St Helena to C.O., 21 Mar.1893. Minute by Ripon, 28 Apr.1893.

223. C.O.247/140, no.62: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 24 Nov.1892.

the claim to consideration for tribal customs was the argument expressed by Herbert: to show consideration for the customary practices of the Exiles would discourage interference.²²⁴ The Exiles were to receive Zulu medicines.²²⁵ They should be enabled to care for headrings. Zulu customs, for example, in regard to pregnancy should be observed.²²⁶ A report that Ndabuko was indifferent to learning and for a time spurned European clothing did not make everyone in the Colonial Office scorn him:²²⁷ better a Zulu of traditional worth than a 'negro gentleman'. On the other hand, the Colonial Office was interested in Dinuzulu's eagerness for learning and in his progress. Colonial Office officials knew that Dinuzulu would one day return to Zululand a free man.²²⁸ It seemed appropriate that Dinuzulu should have opportunities for learning and that the Exiles should be allowed to participate in the social activities of the Island. What is more, it had been claimed that exile was a mitigation of sentence.²²⁹ It would therefore jeopardise the credibility of the Colonial Office for the Exiles to accumulate grievances, or for their health to be endangered. On the other hand, the Colonial Office did not want to see Dinuzulu exploited for propaganda. Mitchell suggested that Dinuzulu be educated in England. Knutsford turned this down. It was, he said, impossible while Miss Colenso 'lives and lectures'.²³⁰

Proposals involving the separation of Dinuzulu from his uncles were sometimes made, and they aroused discussion. It was suggested during Knutsford's term that two separated households should be established in St Helena, but the idea fizzled out until much later.²³¹ Then there was the idea that Dinuzulu should go to England. It was mooted during Knutsford's term and revived later as a kind of alternative to the suggestion coming

224. C.O.247/138, no.56: Grey-Wilson to C.O., confidential, 29 Sept.1890. Minute by R.G.W. Herbert, 5 Oct.1890.

225. K.C.A.L., Dinuzulu Correspondence 1.044: Magera to Exiles, letters of 1890 and 1891.

226. C.O.247/139: Grey-Wilson to Fairfield, private, 10 July 1891, enclosing letter from Exiles to H.E. Colenso, 9 July 1891; draft of letter from C.O. to H.E. Colenso, 19 Aug.1891; Fairfield to S. Webb, 11 Aug.1891; no.74: Governor of St Helena to C.O., 28 Dec.1891 with minutes by S. Olivier, 18 Jan.1892 and Fairfield, 18 Jan.1892; C.O.247/142, no.35: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 5 Apr.1893, enclosing guardian's report which refers to the arrival of a hairdresser.

227. C.O.247/138, no.56: Grey-Wilson to C.O., confidential, 29 Sept.1890. Minutes by Fairfield, 3 Oct.1890 and R.G.W. Herbert, 4 Oct.1890.

228. C.O.247/140, no.40: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 12 July 1892, with report of Anderson, 30 June 1892. Minute by S. Olivier, 5 Aug.1892.

229. C.O.247/140, no.25: C.O. to Governor of St Helena, 16 July 1892.

230. Antrobus Papers, Mss.Afr.S.223: Knutsford to Antrobus, 1 Mar.1892.

231. C.O.247/139, no.9: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 28 Jan.1891. Minutes by Fairfield, 30 Mar. and 7 Apr.1891.

from Dinuzulu that all three Exiles should be allowed to visit Britain.²³² Harriette was opposed to any separations of Dinuzulu from his uncles.²³³ To her, it was crucial that the trio at St Helena should be kept together. In her mind, they were representative of the cohesion of the Zulu people. She believed that if Dinuzulu were separated from his uncles, he would jeopardise his standing among the Zulu people. She wished, as Antrobus phrased it, 'to keep ... [Dinuzulu] as Zulu as possible'. Her opposition scotched the proposal that only Dinuzulu should visit England. She might have been right in her assessment of the Zulu reaction, but there is another possibility. Harriette, in her eagerness to persuade officials to her way of thinking, might have failed to serve the best interest of Dinuzulu because she asked for too much. Though officials enjoyed a story of how Dinuzulu gulled Miss Colenso out of a sovereign with an allegedly false plea of poverty,²³⁴ there was more official dislike of Ndabuko than of the younger man.²³⁵ Given this kind of attitude, officials were more likely to let Dinuzulu come to Britain on his own than as the central figure of a larger party. It might have helped Dinuzulu in his later troubles if, as a young and intelligent man of pleasing physical appearance, he had been able to have a personal impact on sympathisers in Britain. Harriette later favoured the idea of bringing Dinuzulu to Britain for ophthalmic treatment; but, in fact, the idea of a visit to Britain was for Dinuzulu always simply a tantalising prospect that never materialised.²³⁶

Harriette was constantly concerned about the condition of the Exiles at St Helena; but in the last months of the life of the Conservative government a new issue arose. This was the question of the demarcation of locations in the Ndwandwe district and the problem of what this portended. Reports reached Harriette that a demarcation commission was at work and that the uSuthu were disquieted. She received this news *via* Bishopstowe, and through Magema and Escombe's offices. She was alert, anxious, and identified immediately with the uSuthu protest.²³⁷ Harriette was determined that the maximum attention should be

232. C.O.247/142, no number: Grey-Wilson to C.O., forwarding packets of Zulu letters to H.E. Colenso under flying seal, *viz.* Dinuzulu to H.E. Colenso, 17 Mar., 12 and 13 May 1893.

233. *Ibid.* Minute by R.L. Antrobus, 3 June 1893.

234. C.O.427/9/16803: Mitchell to C.O., confidential, 28 July 1890. Minute by R.L. Antrobus, 26 Aug. 1890.

235. C.O.427/17/417: Hely-Hutchinson to C.O., 16 Dec. 1893. Minute by G.V. Fiddes, 18 Jan. 1894.

236. C.O.247/148, no.68: Grey-Wilson, enclosing medical report, 6 Oct. 1896. Minute by H.W. Just, Oct. 1896. A visit to Carlsbad was contemplated shortly before Dinuzulu's death. See N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to P. Seme, 1913.

237. H.E. Colenso, *Trouble and Troubles*.

paid to the demarcation commission. She had three reasons for this. The immediate one was that she feared a repetition of the mistakes and disturbances of 1888. Then, as correspondence developed, she became afraid that there was going to be a similar kind of confusion about where precisely boundaries lay that had so bedevilled the Zulu situation in the past. She was quick to pounce on what seemed to be 'discrepancies' or indications of confusion and uncertainty about what was Mandlakazi land and why some land was labelled 'Zibhebhu' in one map and 'Mandlakazi' in another. But the pivotal point in all her objections was the fear that the demarcation portended a restoration of Zibhebhu to the Ndwandwe.²³⁸ If such a restoration happened in the circumstances of the early 1890s, it could hardly fail to be a Mandlakazi triumph and to bring about the collapse of the uSuthu hopes. The locations would be clearly defined, the officials determined, and the uSuthu probably helpless in the absence of the three leaders exiled at St Helena. For Harriette, what was at stake was the survival of the uSuthu and the prospect of achieving her cherished end, for them, for Natal, and for Britain.

Her letters to the Colonial Office, backed as they were by the supporting letters from the A.P.S., were one of the main prongs of Harriette's attack against the demarcation.²³⁹ Somewhat perplexed by the vehemence of the attack, the Colonial Office met objection with explanation, but found the issue of the demarcation and of Zibhebhu an embarrassment from which it would gladly have been free.²⁴⁰ The reason for this was that Harriette, now that there had been a new twist in the Zulu situation provided by the demarcation, and given the favourable political climate of a Conservative government approaching demise, was able to stir parliamentary activity on the question of Zibhebhu. The later discussion of Harriette's parliamentary campaigning will elucidate further her opposition to the demarcation.²⁴¹ She could not prevent the marking out of boundaries, but all the officials had to recognise that there was public scrutiny.²⁴² When *imizi* were moved, money payments were made as a *bansela*, despite the opposition of local officials

238. C.O.427/12/25: A.P.S. to C.O., 31 Dec.1891. *Aborigines Friend*, Feb.1892; Letter of A.P.S. to Lord Knutsford, 25 Jan.1892; *Ibid.*, June 1892, H.E. Colenso's speech in moving a resolution.

239. H.E. Colenso, *Trouble and Troubles and Aborigines Friend*, Feb.1892: Letters concerning the demarcation of locations in the Ndwandwe case.

240. See, for example, the lengthy minutes by Fairfield. C.O.427/12/22970: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 28 Nov.1891 (minute dated 3 Dec.1891) and on C.O.427/12/22596: Mitchell to C.O., 27 Oct.1891 (minute also dated 3 Dec.1891).

241. See below, pp.253-57.

242. A Blue Book C.6684 was compiled and presented to parliament.

to the payment of compensation.²⁴³ The local officials who had hoped to accomplish Zibhebhu's repatriation - or 're-intrusion', as Harriette preferred to call it - as an immediate consequence of the demarcation were disappointed.²⁴⁴

The advent of the Liberals to power in August 1892²⁴⁵ reacted on Colonial Office attitudes to Harriette, to the A.P.S., and to the Exiles. There was not a complete reversal or transformation of policy, but there was a perceptible change of emphasis. Greater goodwill and concern for the Exiles resulted in the arrival in St Helena of a headring-maker and new attendants²⁴⁶ in exchange for old. Hostility to Miss Colenso and the A.P.S. was no longer automatic. Neither Ripon nor Buxton was a Society man, but Ripon wanted to know who the prominent A.P.S men were, and Buxton communicated with Fox Bourne.²⁴⁷ Apart from their party allegiance, both Ripon and Buxton had a personal background which would have encouraged Harriette's sympathisers to hope for better things.²⁴⁸ A decade earlier, Ripon had confronted the opposition of white Anglo-Indians over the question of the powers of Indian judges to try whites, and had not capitulated completely.²⁴⁹ Buxton had strong family associations with the anti-slavery movement and was a committee member of the Anti-Slavery Society.²⁵⁰ Minutes written by the permanent officials show some concern that the new masters might go too far in adopting or accommodating Colenso ideas. They debated among themselves what should be the attitude of the new Secretary of State to the question of Osborn's continuance in office and the inauguration of change in Zululand. Yet clearly, the hard animosity that had strengthened over the years of Knutsford's tenure of office was now

243. C.O.427/13/13885, no.51: Mitchell to C.O., 14 June 1892. Minute by Knutsford, 14 July 1892. C.O.427/14/15487: Mitchell to C.O., confidential, 4 July 1892. C.O.427/14/20356, no.81: Mitchell to C.O., 20 Sept.1892. Minute by Buxton, 23 Oct.1892.

244. C.O.427/12/22596, no.118: Mitchell to C.O., 27 Oct.1891. Minute by Knutsford, 15 Dec.1891. Compare the more pro-Zibhebhu attitude in the minutes on C.O.427/12/9108: Osborn to C.O., 5 May 1891.

245. The Liberal Ministry lasted from 11 August 1892 to 24 June 1895.

246. C.O.427/16/2052, no.5: Mitchell to C.O., 9 Jan.1893; C.O.427/17/3466: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 1 Mar.1893; C.O.247/140: C.O. to H.E. Colenso, 9 Nov.1892; C.O.247/142, no.29: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 21 Mar.1893 and no.35: 5 Apr.1893.

247. Ripon Papers, Add.Mss.43553, ff.1-4: Buxton to Ripon, 9 Sept.1892, and f.11: Buxton to Ripon, 8 Oct.1892.

248. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

249. 'The New Colonial Minister' in *South Africa*, 20 Aug.1892, for comment on the strong line Ripon had then taken.

250. T. Fowell Buxton, leader of the anti-slavery movement in succession to William Wilberforce, was the paternal grandfather of S.C. Buxton. N.A., Col.Coll: F. Banks to H.E. Colenso, Sept.1892.

crumbling.²⁵¹ Harriette had been warned that the permanent officials would probably still be influential and would probably be hostile to her ideas. They were certainly opposed to a possibility of making Osborn a scapegoat of a policy which had formerly enjoyed official sanction. They would not 'throw him to the lions' but, given their new superiors, they were now ready to look anew at Zululand and to recognise the need for a change of policy.²⁵² The frequency and nature of Harriette's interviews with Buxton and Ripon, the decisions about the treatment of the Exiles at St Helena, and the general transformation of the controversy over Zululand: these reflected the more favourable disposition of the men at the top.

Harriette had only one interview at the Colonial Office while Knutsford was still in power. Between the Liberal assumption of power and her own departure, Harriette had three interviews with the top Colonial Office men. She saw Buxton in October 1892,²⁵³ Ripon and Buxton in November 1892,²⁵⁴ and Buxton again in the following August.²⁵⁵ True, the Liberals did not see Harriette as soon as they assumed office, but she was zealous in submitting pamphlets containing her views.²⁵⁶ These had been studied in the Colonial Office by the time officials turned to the task of drawing up the despatches and drafting the letters that would begin a policy of change. What is more, the questions Harriette was discussing at the Colonial Office were different. By late October and in November 1892, for example, she was concerned about and discussed the question of what should be Dinuzulu's position in Zululand after his return.²⁵⁷ Buxton had

251. C.O.427/14/16322, no.67: Mitchell to C.O., 16 July 1892. Minutes by Fairfield, 20 Aug.1892; by R. Meade, 21 Aug.1892; and by Buxton, 23 Aug.1892.

252. C.O.427/14/18470, no.71: Mitchell to C.O., 18 Aug.1892. Minute by Fairfield, 20 Sept.1892. C.O.427/14/17056: Mitchell to C.O., 26 Aug.1892. Minute by Fairfield, 26 Aug.1892.

253. Ripon Papers, Add.Mss.43553, ff.3 *et seq*: Buxton to Ripon, 10 Oct.1892; ff.23 *et seq*: Buxton to Ripon, 16 Oct.1892; ff.28-31: Buxton to Ripon, 20 Oct.1892. C.O.427/15/21063: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 28 Oct.1892 with minutes, especially Buxton, 14 Nov.1892.

254. C.O.427/15/22120: H.E. Colenso to Ripon, 12 Nov.1892; C.O.427/15/21063: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 28 Oct.1892. Minute by Ripon, 16 Nov.1893.

255. C.O.427/17/13345: H.E. Colenso to Ripon, 5 Aug.1893. Minute by Buxton, 8 Aug.1893.

256. C.O.427/15/17243: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 27 Aug.1892, enclosing first part of pamphlet; C.O.427/15/17595: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 5 Sept.1892, enclosing *The Zulu Impeachment of British Officials in 1887-8 Confirmed by Official Records in 1892 and Mr Commissioner Osborn as One Cause of Confusion in Zulu Affairs*; C.O.427/17/3490: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 1 Mar.1893, enclosing first part of pamphlet, and C.O.427/17/3907, H.E. Colenso to C.O., 7 Mar.1893, enclosing full pamphlet *The Present Position among the Zulus with Some Suggestions for the Future*; C.O.427/17/13345: H.E. Colenso to Ripon, 15 Aug.1893.

257. C.O.427/15/21063: H.E. Colenso to Buxton, 28 Oct.1892.

thought Harriette in a very reasonable frame of mind in October,²⁵⁸ but in November he thought she was asking too much. Ripon thought Buxton had misunderstood Harriette. Miss Colenso was not asking that Dinuzulu should be supreme in Zululand. She envisaged that appeal should lie from Dinuzulu to the British Resident. Harriette had tried to convince the Colonial Office that Dinuzulu should be the immediate and the centralising subordinate of the British authority in Zululand.²⁵⁹ In August 1893 she raised with the new Secretary of State and his staff the question which she had refused to raise under Knutsford: the cases of the lesser uSuthu who had been convicted and sentenced for their participation in the disturbances of 1888.²⁶⁰

While change was being considered, Ripon was the more determined that the Exiles should be well treated - 'not extravagantly but not meanly'.²⁶¹ Reports of poor health alarmed him, especially as the Exiles kept Harriette informed of their state of health. He decided that they should be moved from one part of St Helena to another: away from the cold wet area of Rosemary Hall to the drier, warmer region where Maldivia was located.²⁶² The projected move did not please the chiefs and there was a rumpus when they moved. But the Secretary of State's decision was well intentioned.²⁶³

The change of government in Britain made Zibhebhu's future in Zululand even more problematic. He would certainly not be restored prior to the general review of Zulu issues which the new Secretary of State intended. Ripon hesitated too about the proposed locations and removals in parts of the Ndwandwe district. He tried to please humanitarians by suggesting the payment of some kind of compensation to those who would be removed in accordance with the proposals of the boundary commission, but this roused the ire of local officials in Natal and Zululand who deplored a suggestion which implied the rights of the Supreme Chief were in some way limited. It was more acceptable to him to pay a

258. Ripon Papers, Add.Mss.43553, ff.28-31: Buxton to Ripon, 20 Oct.1892.

259. C.O.427/15/22358: H.E. Colenso to C.O., 16 Nov.1892. Minutes by Buxton, 23 Nov.1892 and Ripon, n.d., (Nov.1892, int.ev.).

260. H.E. Colenso, *Cases of Six Usutu*.

261. C.O.247/140, no.62: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 24 Nov.1892. Minute by Ripon, 18 Feb.1893; C.O.247/142, no.29: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 21 Mar.1893. Minute by Ripon, 28 Apr.1893.

262. C.O.247/140, no.49: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 30 Sept.1892, letter from Exiles to H.E. Colenso, and C.O. to H.E. Colenso, 9 Nov.1892; C.O.247/142, no.9: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 21 Jan.1893 enclosing medical report; no.22: Grey-Wilson to C.O., 1 Mar.1893.

263. C.O.247/142, no.35: Grey-Wilson to C.O., Apr.1893, enclosing guardian's report, 3 Apr.1893.

bansela.²⁶⁴ Though it had strange facets, controversy over the Ndwandwe was by no means easy or unimportant. The events of 1888 had shown that the peace of Zululand depended on the way demarcation was handled, while the problems of determining who was loyal to whom, and how much land he should have, were vexed and trying ones. But such problems were transcended, and could be transformed, by the much more critical issue: whether or not a new polity should be introduced in Zululand, and what should be the role of the Exiles and of Zibhebhu in that polity.

When Harriette left England in August 1893 these were the matters that were being considered in the Colonial Office. Already crucial decisions relating to them had been made. That they were taken, and how they affected Harriette's hopes and prospects of success, are discussed in Section E.

While Harriette made her direct submissions to the Colonial Office she was busy too with her efforts to win public and parliamentary support. These efforts had their own effect on the Colonial Office attitudes and decisions in regard to Zululand. Harriette's activity and impact on public and parliament are discussed in the following sub-sections.

A. Platform and Pulpit

Harriette 'moved about in all directions' in her efforts to arouse public indignation on behalf of the Zulu. She chatted at tea parties or drawing room gatherings, she spoke at concerts, conducted services, and delivered formal lectures to the elite. Meetings varied from a public meeting called by the mayor of Sheffield in response to public requisition to ten minutes with Band of Hope children. Lantern slides, maps, leaflets, and photographs illustrated her talks.²⁶⁵

By 19 April Harriette had delivered a long address to the National Liberal Club where she was escorted by Frank. She attacked the officials and urged the need for an impartial enquiry. Some members of the audience crossed swords with her, but Frank outlined the

264. Correspondence was thick and minutes lengthy. See especially C.O.427/15/24671: Mitchell to C.O., 29 Nov.1892. Minutes by Fairfield, 9 and 11 Jan.1893; Buxton, 12 Jan. and 10 Mar.1893; Ripon, 11 and 23 Mar.1893.

265. A. Werner, 'Recollections of Harriette E. Colenso'. Mss of her lectures are available in K.C.A.L., Col.Coll. (Harriette Colenso), File 4, and in the Natal Archives, Colenso Collection.

need for impartial enquiry.²⁶⁶ For 21 May she had two invitations on the one day. In the afternoon she was invited to the annual meeting of the International Arbitration and Peace Association where she spoke impromptu and impressively. In the evening there was the annual general meeting of the A.P.S. Here, she was one of a number of speakers and seconded a resolution moved by the Reverend John Mackenzie calling for more steps to promote the welfare of the aborigines.²⁶⁷ On the next day Harriette attended a Women's Suffrage meeting and was asked to speak on 2 June.²⁶⁸ At a meeting of the Central National Society for Women's Suffrage Harriette moved a vote of thanks to Lady Sandhurst for what had been achieved in the last twenty-five years.²⁶⁹ She summed up her activities for Katie Giles on 6 June:

‘I have now been to two women's suffrage meetings and spoken at one of them (in the *Daily Graphic* about two days ago) to 3 peace and arbitration meetings and spoken at 2 of them. These are all drawing room meetings - chiefly of ladies - I am "larning of them".’

She was invited to lunch at Miss Swanwick's where she would meet the Unitarian brother, Francis Newman, of the more famous cardinal.²⁷⁰ Earlier her ‘bag’ at a ‘huge crush’ at the Westlakes was ‘2 MPs - one Lord’.²⁷¹ She addressed a gathering in the home of Dora Livesey (née Lees), her sister's friend.²⁷² She spoke briefly at the Universal Peace Congress in Westminster Hall in mid-July 1890 and was well received: her father's name invited respect.²⁷³

She was soon invited into pulpits. P.H. Wicksteed, the leading Unitarian, invited her to his chapel in Little Portland Street. He escorted her to the meeting and exhorted the audience to write to their MPs. Agnes, who, with friends, had been part of the audience,

266. *South Africa*, 19 Apr.1890.

267. N.A., Col.Coll: Invitation card to the 54th Annual Meeting at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, listing speeches. *South Africa*, 24 May and 7 June 1890, for full text, which included her assertion that she was ‘a colonist speaking for my fellow colonists on behalf of the natives.’

268. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 22 May 1890.

269. *South Africa*, 7 June 1890. Evidently a small portrait of Harriette appeared in the *Graphic* in connection with this meeting. I have not been able to trace it in the *Index to Pictures of a South African Interest in The Graphic*. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

270. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 22 May 1890 and 6 June 1890. For Swanwick, see Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

271. N.A., Col.Coll: 7 May 1890.

272. *Ibid.*, B. Walker to A.M. Colenso, 9 July 1890.

273. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 1828): printed Programme for the Universal Peace Congress, Westminster Town Hall, 14 to 19 July where Fox Bourne may have presented a paper. *Ibid.*, Revd Clement Pike to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct 1890; T. Snape to H.E. Colenso, 26 Feb.1891; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 July 1890.

wrote of how appreciative her listeners had been and that Harriette was to 'do it again' on 27 July in the Highgate Unitarian Church, where the minister promised her an audience of 400.²⁷⁴ In the following month she spoke at Richmond, where the Reverend Farrington told other Unitarian clergy of her.²⁷⁵

Speaking engagements of different kinds crowded in. There were three or four lectures arranged for September in many places. A lecture was contemplated at Norwich.²⁷⁶ Meetings were also being arranged at Bradford and Preston, and she planned to speak at the Women's Liberal Association at Portsmouth.²⁷⁷ She offered her audience a number of 'Zulu' titles, depending on whether her lecture was to be long or short. Third class railway expenses and her board and lodging were what she asked.²⁷⁸ By the end of September she had moved north. She had four lectures arranged for Manchester.²⁷⁹ The most important was her lecture of 1 October to the Manchester Geographical Society. Founded in 1884, the Society was then at a high point of popularity. Harriette's was a well attended meeting with an audience of perhaps more than 500. It was for Harriette a successful occasion.²⁸⁰ She spoke, too, at the Upper Brook Street Free Church, probably to the Sunday school as well as the adults. She evoked a strong and sympathetic response, especially among the followers of the Revd John Trevor, who became founder of the Labour Church movement. There were meetings in other cities.²⁸¹

After her triumph at the Manchester Geographical Society, Harriette wrote that she had

-
274. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 20 June 1890, and on back of letter from W.Y. Campbell, 23 June 1890; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 25 June 1890; E. Pryke to H.E. Colenso, mentioning account in *Echo*; R. Gardner to H.E. Colenso, 5 Aug.1890.
275. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 20 June and 29 July 1890; Revd J.W. Trevor to H.E. Colenso, 15 Aug.1890.
276. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 2 June and 6 Aug.1890; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 2 Oct.1890; cf. H. Spurgeon to H.E. Colenso, 8 and 10 Sept.1890; H.H. Snell to Miss Pryke, 1 Sept.1890.
277. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 20 June and 6 Aug.1890; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 27 Aug. and 25 Sept.1890; S. Byles to H.E. Colenso, 5 Aug.1890; I.O. Ford to H.E. Colenso, 27 Sept.1890; A.S. Clark to H.E. Colenso, 2 Aug.1890.
278. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Ward, 2 Sept.1890.
279. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 Sept.1890.
280. H.E. Colenso, *Zululand Past and Present Address to the Manchester Geographical Society*, 1 Oct.1890; N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 2 Oct.1890; E. Sowerbutts to H.E. Colenso, 10 July 1890, and latter letters concerning publication of her lecture in the *Journal of the Manchester Geographical Society* viz. 6 Nov.1890, 23 Jan.1891, 14 Feb.1891 etc. On popularity and purpose of Manchester Geographical Society, see B.M. Ratcliffe, 'Manchester Merchants and West Africa' in *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 1979, p.305.
281. N.A., Col.Coll: J.W. Trevor to H.E. Colenso, 15 and 17 Aug., 6 Oct. and 11 Nov.1890. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

an invitation for Winchester that might work in well with Coventry,²⁸² and the possibility of an audience at Norwich. But she was not going to Lowestoft. There the teachers of the Christian young men did not think politics safe food.²⁸³

Harriette visited Liverpool, and seems to have preached at Southport as well as addressing the Women's Liberal Association there and at neighbouring centres.²⁸⁴ On 8 October she delivered an address to the Tyneside Geographical Society at a meeting which was chaired by one of Newcastle's MPs, Mr Stephens. Comment in *South Africa* on this meeting was unfavourable: Miss Colenso was too extreme.²⁸⁵ A meeting at Durham was also suggested.²⁸⁶

On 12 October 1890 Harriette gave two lectures in London. The South Place Ethical Society was running a series of Free Sunday Afternoon Lectures on National Life and Thought, and Harriette was invited to speak on Zululand.²⁸⁷ Her lecture was published later in a collection of South Place lectures.²⁸⁸ The South Place Ethical Society attracted speakers and thinkers of high calibre and Harriette was thus in distinguished company.²⁸⁹ In the evening she addressed the Progressive Association of Pentonville which, she was told, was 'in accord with the South Place Ethical Society'.²⁹⁰ She lectured on 'The Story of the Zulus' in the Penton Hall, Pentonville Road, where a collection was taken to cover expenses.²⁹¹

October 1890 was a month when Harriette moved to and from London frequently. She was in Norwich within a day or two of her South Place meeting to lecture to the New City Improvement Society and the Octagon Club. Miss Pryke, who had spent time at

282. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 2 Oct.1890.

283. *Ibid.*

284. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 2 Oct.1890; K. Ryley to H.E. Colenso, 29 July 1890. *South Africa*, 11 Oct.1890.

285. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 2 Oct.1890; G.E.T. Smithson to H.E. Colenso, 19 Sept. and 4 Oct.1890. *South Africa*, 18 Oct.1890.

286. N.A., Col.Coll: W. Price to H.E. Colenso, 8 Oct.1890.

287. *South Africa*, 11 and 18 Oct.1890.

288. H.E. Colenso, 'Zululand' in *British Africa, being the Lectures given in the South Place Institute 1895-1898* (London, 1901).

289. N.A., Col.Coll: South Place Ethical Society, Sept.1890, guest list of speakers *i.a.* Frederick Harrison, Karl Pearson, G. Holyoake, Leslie Stephen.

290. *Ibid.*, G. Margierson to H.E. Colenso, 29 Sept.1890.

291. *Ibid.*, Notice of meeting. The Progressive Association: a Society for Ethical Culture.

Bishopstowe, sustained her interest in the Zulu people and herself lectured on 'Our Treatment of the Zulu People', arranged Harriette's visit. Harriette spoke on the topic 'Some Zulu Experiences'. She preferred this to 'Life among the Zulu' because she did not wish to focus attention on herself. She delivered her lecture in the large Dissenting Church that could seat 900.²⁹² Mr F.S. Verney, a leading Liberal and future parliamentary candidate, took the chair.²⁹³ A few days later Harriette spoke at the Octagon Club. While in Norwich she called on some of her maternal relations, but they do not have a large role in her stay.²⁹⁴

Harriette was in London on 22 October to lecture to the Little Litchford Street Chapel.²⁹⁵ The Hampstead Liberal and Radical Club arranged an evening of entertainment, in which musical recitals as well as Harriette Colenso were featured for Thursday 23 October 1890. Non-members paid a small fee.²⁹⁶

At the end of the month she moved north again. On 27 October she lectured at Bradford - 'a capital meeting - 200 women and only 2 men!'. The wife of the local MP, Mrs Illingworth, took the chair. Her husband had visited South Africa earlier that year.²⁹⁷ Harriette was at Leeds on the following day where, she was told, her name needed no comment. The meeting of 28 October 1890 rallied more support.²⁹⁸ Harriette's host for her Leeds visit was Miss Isabella Ford. She kept in touch with Harriette and more than a year later she wrote to Ripon on the Zulu question. The Liberals were still in opposition when Miss Ford suggested to Ripon that he take up the Zulu issue in the House of Lords. He declined to do so. The question, so he told Miss Ford, would arouse no interest.²⁹⁹ As was the case with Chamberlain, so with Ripon: as a result of Harriette's efforts both

292. *Ibid.*, flyer advertising lecture at Norwood on 14 Mar.1888; E. Pryke to H.E. Colenso, 25 July and 3 Aug.1890; H. Spurgeon to H.E. Colenso, 8 and 10 Aug.1890.

293. F. Verney did not seek election in 1892; he was the unsuccessful Liberal candidate in 1895 (*McCalmont's Parliamentary Poll Book of All Elections, 1832-1918*).

294. N.A., Col.Coll: Snell to Pryke, 1 Sept.1890; R.H.L., Fr.Col. Papers: F.E. Colenso to S.J. Colenso, 20 Oct.1890.

295. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 6 Oct.1890; C. Pike to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct.1890.

296. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 145): Printed notice of meeting.

297. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 29 Oct.1890; S. Byles to H.E. Colenso, 5 Aug.1890. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. Two of the other MPs in the party were Dr G.B. Clark and Mr Conybeare.

298. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 29 Oct.1890; A.H. Cannon to H.E. Colenso, 18 Aug.1890.

299. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: I.O. Ford to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb.1890.

men had their attention drawn to the question of Zululand before they took over responsibility for the Colonial Office. On 30 October 1890 Harriette had an engagement at Wolverton in Buckinghamshire which she could reach relatively easily from London.³⁰⁰

She was invited to Preston where the pulpit of the Percy Street Unitarian Chapel was offered to her. The clergyman, R.S. Clarke, 'a bachelor, happily or unhappily', met her at the W.H. Smith stall, handkerchief in his hand. He arranged accommodation for her elsewhere.³⁰¹ A layman, who claimed that he had left the Church of England because of Colenso, bestirred himself to arrange for her to speak in the Congregational Church at Stoke Newington.³⁰² She seems to have addressed an unidentified 'Argosy' meeting in St John's Wood on 3 November 1890 from which a resolution was sent to Mr C.E. Brodie Hoare, the Conservative MP for Hampstead.³⁰³ By 4 November 1890, she had kept 24 engagements and had 16 appointments to keep. She had yet to visit Coventry, Sheffield, Nottingham, Cambridge, and Northampton.³⁰⁴ On 6 November 1890 she was at Coventry.³⁰⁵ On the next day she wrote from Birmingham. She described the excellent meeting and good attendance she had had 'despite the wet'.³⁰⁶

On 8 November 1890 she wrote from Sheffield. After a small but energetic meeting in the Channing Hall, a committee was set up to arrange a larger meeting, over which the mayor was to preside. That took time to arrange.³⁰⁷ In the meanwhile, Harriette was by no means idle. On 9 November the Revd Blazeley invited her to his pulpit in Rotherham where she had good congregations morning and evening.³⁰⁸ In the evening of Tuesday 11 November 1890 Harriette lectured to the Women's Liberal Association in the Masonic Hall at Nottingham, while the Friends (Quakers) arranged a drawing room meeting the

300. *Ibid.*, Holmes to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct.1890; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 30 Oct.1890; H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 31 Oct.1890.

301. *Ibid.*, R.E. Clarke to H.E. Colenso, 16 Oct.1890. *South Africa*, 15 Nov.1890.

302. N.A., Col.Coll: J. Glistner to H.E. Colenso, 13 and 30 Oct.1890.

303. *Ibid.*, P. Schofield to H.E. Colenso, 15 Nov.1890. Hampstead was the seat Knutsford vacated on his elevation to the peerage.

304. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 4 Nov.1890.

305. *Ibid.*, M. Cash to H.E. Colenso, 13 Nov.1890.

306. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 7 Nov.1890.

307. *Ibid.*, E. Manning to H.E. Colenso, 4 Nov.1890.

308. *Ibid.*, Revd W. Blazeley(?) to H.E. Colenso, 30 Oct.1890; H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 10 Nov.1890. The name of the correspondent is difficult to read.

following day. The resolutions passed were forwarded to MPs, while Mrs Cowen continued with talks on the Zulus after Harriette's departure and, evidently a keen photographer, saw to illustrations for Harriette's later lectures.³⁰⁹ In the meanwhile, the Cambridge and County Liberal Club, prompted by a relative of her brother Robert's wife, had invited her for 13 November 1890. The lecture was to last for an hour and then to be followed by discussion.³¹⁰ A lecture was arranged for the Assembly Rooms at Wood Green on 16 November 1890.³¹¹

Harriette was invited to Northampton on the initiative of Charles Bradlaugh. On Tuesday 18 November 1890 she addressed a meeting of the Northampton Liberal and Radical Association in the Baptist Chapel schoolroom on 'Our Duty to the Zulus', and on the following Sunday preached from the pulpit of the Revd J. Street. As a sequel, resolutions were passed and forwarded to the local MPs, in this instance the already converted Bradlaugh and to Labouchere, who agreed that the treatment of the Zulus had been like that of other African people 'most unjust'.³¹²

At the end of November 1890 Harriette returned to Sheffield for the public meeting that was called by the mayor following a requisition from 200 people, itself the work of a very active Colenso Committee. This was a big meeting which attracted much local attention, and some local opposition. Resolutions were passed and sent both to the Secretary of State and to the local MPs. The Secretary of State was asked to reconsider the sentences. The local MPs were asked to support Hanbury and Bradlaugh when they raised the issue in parliament.³¹³ Harriette then returned to London to address the Peckham Central Progressive Association where she was invited by G. Morley.³¹⁴

309. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: A. Cowen to H.E. Colenso, 3 and 20 Nov.1890; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 18 Nov.1890, on reverse of invitation card to Drawing Room meeting on 12 Nov; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 7 Dec.1890; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 29 Jan.1891.

310. *Ibid.*, A. Cowen to H.E. Colenso, 3 Nov.1890; A. Rye to H.E. Colenso, 30 Sept.1890.

311. *Ibid.*, Appelforth to H.E. Colenso, 19 Nov.1890.

312. *Ibid.*, large poster announcing meeting for Tuesday 18 November; T. Ashdowne to Charles Bradlaugh, 29 Sept.1890; T. Ashdowne to H.E. Colenso, 14 Nov.1890; F. Stinson to H.E. Colenso, 11 Nov.1890; Revd J. Street to H.E. Colenso, 13 Nov.1890.

313. *Ibid.*, B. Greaves to H.E. Colenso, 14 Nov.1890; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 27 Nov. and 7 Dec.1890. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

314. N.A., Col.Coll: G. Morley to H.E. Colenso, 27 Sept. and 29 Nov.1890.

Though she spent most of December 1890 in London, Harriette had two engagements that took her north and south. On 10 December 1890 she was at Leicester. Here, as at Sheffield, the mayor presided and the local press was attentive. Harriette, so she told her mother, was 'lapt in luxury' and had 'no adventures'.³¹⁵ On 21 December she was invited to preach at the Unitarian Chapel in Bournemouth.³¹⁶

Her engagements in London included an address to a Bethnal Green Unitarian Chapel in the East End on 3 December,³¹⁷ to the Hatcham Liberal Club in New Cross Road on 6 December,³¹⁸ and to the Free Christian Church at Kentish Town on 8 December.³¹⁹ The most notable of her engagements was arranged by her friend Miss A.L. Browne. On 15 December Dr Clifford, the noted Baptist, chaired a meeting of the Paddington Women's Liberal Association which met in the Praed Street Chapel near Edgware Road. Harriette spoke on 'Our Duty to the Zulus'. There was no charge unless one wished to reserve a seat for 6d or 1/-.³²⁰ Two days later she met a gathering of journalists in Chancery Lane when she spoke to the United Democratic Club.³²¹

December had its ups and downs. The Sunday Lecture Society turned her down on the grounds that she was too political,³²² but she was invited again to Manchester.³²³ The dissension between herself and Fox Bourne followed on the criticism she voiced at an A.P.S meeting where she implied that righting the wrongs of the Zulu should not be thrust aside by indignation over what was reported about Stanley in the Congo.³²⁴

In the new year, when her lectures were resumed, it was evident that Harriette was acquiring a circle of admirers without being the leader of a movement. In April 1891 she

315. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 10 Dec.1890; Revd J. Page Hopps to H.E. Colenso, 24 Nov.1890.

316. *Ibid.*, F. Osler to H.E. Colenso, 1 and 11 Dec.1890.

317. *Ibid.*, H. Gore to H.E. Colenso, 24 and 31 Dec.1890.

318. *Ibid.*, G. Morley to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1890; B.J. Hall to H.E. Colenso, 18 Nov.1890; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 7 Dec.1890.

319. *Ibid.*, C. Pike to H.E. Colenso, 23 Oct.1890.

320. *Ibid.*, A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 5 Oct.1890; Secretary of the Paddington W.L.A. to H.E. Colenso, 25 Nov.1890. *South Africa*, 20 Dec.1890. *Women's Penny Paper*, 20 Dec.1890.

321. N.A., Col.Coll: D.J. Sweeney to H.E. Colenso, 18 Nov. and 16 Dec.1890; Holding to H.E. Colenso, 19 Nov. and 7 Dec.1890.

322. *Ibid.*, A. Nichols to H.E. Colenso, 24 Dec.1890.

323. *Ibid.*, S.C. Templar to H.E. Colenso, 9 Dec.1890.

324. See above, p.190.

received a card of honorary membership from the Social and Political Reform Association.³²⁵ The Balloon Society which catered for scientific interests invited her to become an honorary member.³²⁶ A number of individuals whom she met in the course of her lectures became committed and continuing helpers. They included Miss E. Conybeare and Mrs Cowen, both of whom themselves lectured on South African affairs, and Miss I.O. Ford of Leeds as well as the Revd J. Street of Northampton and later Birmingham. Some of those who met her in the 1890s or even merely heard her continued to support her efforts on behalf of Dinuzulu in the early twentieth century.³²⁷

On 13 January 1891 Harriette was billed to speak at the Croyden Socratic Club. Her subject was 'The Zulus', a specific issue. Two weeks later the Society invited Annie Besant to speak.³²⁸ Her subject was 'theosophy'. The juxtaposition brings out the contrast between the two women and something of Harriette's character. Harriette was clear about the essentials of her faith and about concentrating on a particular issue. Annie Besant was primarily the leading figure in a movement which many consider esoteric and eclectic.

During January 1891 Harriette had a meeting with the Deptford Liberal Association.³²⁹ A visit to Bristol was being discussed, and arrangements were being made for her visit to Wales.³³⁰ She received an invitation to attend a Thursday evening meeting of the Liberal and Social Union held in the rooms of the Society of British Artists, and offered the choice of several Thursdays over the next months.³³¹ She had 'charming little meetings' at Swansea. One of them was to the W.L.A where she won firm support.³³² Then she visited Cardiff. Here a well publicised meeting was supported by non-conformists and liberals, but not by vicar or mayor. The meeting passed a resolution and forwarded it to the sitting MP, Sir Edward Reed.³³³

325. See fn.338 below.

326. S. Marks, 'Harriette Colenso and the Zulus', *Journal of African History*, vol.4, 3 (1963).

327. For Conybeare, Cowen and Ford, see Appendix 2, Biographical notes. I have no information about Revd Street other than that he was a Unitarian Minister at Northampton and then Birmingham.

328. N.A., Col.Coll: T. Smith to H.E. Colenso, 7 Jan.1891.

329. C.O.427/12/2023: A.E. Peppercorn to C.O., 28 Jan.1891, forwarding resolution of 26 Jan.1891.

330. N.A., Col.Coll: Revd G. Jones to H.E. Colenso, 2 and 9 Feb.1891.

331. *Ibid.*, J.S. Stacey to H.E. Colenso, 23 Jan.1891.

332. *Ibid.*, C. Perkins to H.E. Colenso, 29 Jan.1891.

333. *Ibid.*, Revd O. Jones to H.E. Colenso, 2 and 9 Feb.1891; E. Reed to H.E. Colenso, 3 Feb.1891.

In her alternations to and from London she delivered one of the Saturday night lectures at the 'Working Men's College - Mr Maurice's you know' in Great Ormonde Street on 14 February 1891.³³⁴ She address the Kennington Liberal and Radical Club on 16 February, with D. Naoraji presiding.³³⁵ The Leamington Women's Liberal Association wished to hear her.³³⁶ Early in March 1891 she attended a meeting of the Liverpool Peace Society and then went to Birkenhead to address the members of the Women's Peace Society.³³⁷ A few days later she addressed the Markham Square Mutual Improvement Society. The Colonial Office and the local MP received a resolution in which the members asserted that they 'united with Miss Colenso' in calling for justice to the Zulu people.³³⁸

She seems to have spent part of April in London and part in the provinces. She was invited to address the West London Social and Political Reform Association with the illuminating motto of 'Light more Light'.³³⁹ During April Harriette went to York. Here, once again, she had a 'tea party and talk' and preached a 'new' sermon, written on the train, to a capacity congregation of 250.³⁴⁰ Mrs Spence Watson, presumably the wife of Spence Watson the organiser of the late nineteenth century Liberal party, invited Harriette to Gateshead-on-Tyne, although she may not have found as many to hear her lectures as she would have liked.³⁴¹

On Friday 13 May Harriette delivered an evening lecture to the Balloon Society in St James Hall, Piccadilly, where she told her audience of the succeeding acts of the Zulu tragedy, concentrating on the last 'in the hope that when they heard it they would do their part to give the sorrowful story a happy ending.'

334. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 29 Jan.1891; 15th Annual Report of Working Men's College which bills H.E. Colenso to speak on 'Zululand' on 14 Feb.1891. *Daily News*, 16 Feb.1891; *Women's Herald*, 28 Feb.1891.

335. N.A., Col.Coll: Jno Hatch to H.E. Colenso, 12 Feb.1891.

336. *Ibid.*, M. Hately to H.E. Colenso, 14 Jan.1891.

337. *Ibid.*, F. Thompson to H.E. Colenso, 22 Feb.1891; T. Snape to H.E. Colenso, 26 Feb.1891; M. Biggs to H.E. Colenso, 29 Jan.1891; William Lowton to H.E. Colenso, 2 Feb.1891.

338. *Ibid.*, J. Stacey to H.E. Colenso, 23 Jan.1891; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 28 Feb.1891.

339. *Ibid.*, T. Ratcliffe to H.E. Colenso, 16 Mar.1891; Certificate of Membership by virtue of a Committee Decision of 22 April 1891.

340. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, on postcard, 22 Apr.1891.

341. *Ibid.*, Mrs Spence Watson to H.E. Colenso, 8 Apr.1891; C. Binks to H.E. Colenso, 10 Apr.1891.

South Africa in commenting on a previous meeting, felt that the officials had not merited the attacks Harriette had made on them. Another contributor to the discussion at the Balloon Society meeting opined that, in accordance with the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, the Zulu were unlikely to last, but there were cries of objection. A participant, a Zulu man referred to as Mr William Dingiswayo, alluded to the actions of Stanley's officers in the Congo. In replying to the comments Harriette indicated that she did not condemn all officials, that she wanted Dinuzulu to be used as an official, and that she had the backing of many colonists in her request - and, as a kind of postscript, she remarked that the Boers were not as black as they were painted.³⁴²

On 3 June Harriette gave what she thought 'a new lecture'³⁴³ and on 4 June she attended Miss Cons' gathering at the Old Vic and had a lecture to give nearby that evening, with one at the polytechnic in mind.³⁴⁴ Influenza struck her down, but she continued with her programme.³⁴⁵ In August 1891 she was at Windermere, arranging a lecture at Ambleside, where, so she told her mother, the audience could stand 'or rather sit' through two hours, if her talk was illustrated.³⁴⁶ Early in September 1891 at Nottingham she visited an industrial school for young criminals - 'nice little monkeys'.³⁴⁷

In September 1891 Harriette was invited to take the chair at a meeting of the Balloon Society. Harriette agreed. 'I am very near-sighted but I will put on my spectacles and do my best to fill the chair properly.' The theme was 'The Native Races of South Africa' and the speaker was Mr Miller, former agent and secretary of the Swazi king. Here she seconded a resolution which called for a commission of enquiry, and the resolution was forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies in London and to the Colonial Secretary in Natal. She was later disquieted about the way the meeting was reported in *South Africa*.³⁴⁸

342. *South Africa*, 23 May 1891.

343. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 4 June 1891.

344. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 3 June 1891.

345. *Ibid.*, F.E. Colenso to H.E. Colenso, 11 June 1891; H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 13 June 1891.

346. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 19 Aug.1891; H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 21 Aug.1891; Miss Ryley to H.E. Colenso, 25 July 1891.

347. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, 8 Sept.1891.

348. *Ibid.*, Handwritten report of meeting, originally in Box 145. H.E. Colenso to Lefevre, 27 Sept.1891; Lefevre to H.E. Colenso, 6 Oct.1891.

Harriette's activities in October are elusive, but she was certainly busy - and mobile - in November. It was a matter of 'back from Leicester yesterday, off to Manchester in ten minutes'.³⁴⁹ *The Inquirer* announced that she was to lecture in Heath Street on 4 November at 6 o'clock: admission free, but reserved seats 1/-.³⁵⁰ She revisited Leeds.³⁵¹ She preached at the Zion Chapel in Settle on Sunday 15 November at a service called 'Miss Colenso's (sic) Service'. Her theme was 'The sad story of the Zulus'. On the following day she addressed a 'capital crowded meeting' at Settle,³⁵² where she was too busy to visit Frances Ellen's friend, Dora Lees, who lived nearby.³⁵³ She found too that a bad headache compelled her to 'give up poor Liverpool'.³⁵⁴ But she did manage to revisit Southport. She addressed a Sunday school meeting attended by grey-headed adults as well as children and gave a lantern lecture on Monday 23 November.³⁵⁵ She intended another such lecture at Formby³⁵⁶ on the following day. The members of the Southport Women's Liberal Association forwarded to the Colonial Office and the local MP (G.P. Curzon) a request for enquiry and remission of sentences.³⁵⁷ She made another very busy visit to Bournemouth³⁵⁸ and re-visited Norwich,³⁵⁹ where she lectured on 9 December, with another meeting on the following day.³⁶⁰

The Revd J. Street, Unitarian minister, formerly of Northampton, had moved to Birmingham and invited Harriette thither. She preached twice in Birmingham late in January 1892, once to an audience of 600. Then there was a 'capital' meeting on mission work with a smaller one at Altrincham. Whatever the general public response in Birmingham, Joseph Chamberlain, Unitarian upbringing notwithstanding, was not recruited as a supporter. Harriette was told that he would act only if he thought it in his own

349. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 5 and 18 Nov.1891

350. *The Inquirer*, 30 Oct.1891.

351. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 19 Nov.1891.

352. *Ibid.*, *The Sad Story of the Zulus*. Hymns to be sung at Miss Colenso's [sic] Service in the Zion Chapel, Settle, November 15th, 1891, see Appendix 3, H.E. Colenso to S.F. Colenso, postmark 17 Nov.1891.

353. *Ibid.*, D. Lees to H.E. Colenso, 10 Feb.1892.

354. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 19 Nov.1891.

355. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 23 Nov.1891.

356. *Ibid.*

357. *Ibid.*, 23 Nov.1891. C./O.427/12/22855: K. Rigby to C.O., 25 Nov.1891.

358. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 29 Nov.1891.

359. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 23 Nov.1891.

360. *Ibid.*, G. Sewell to S.J. Colenso, 15 Dec.1891; H.E. Colenso to A.M. Colenso, 10 Dec.1891.

interests. She was due to speak at Bowden in Cheshire on her father's missionary work.³⁶¹ She spoke at Altrincham on 26 January 1892. Some whose sympathies she aroused there formed a fund which, by May 1893, had resulted in the purchase and dispatch of a printing press to Bishopstowe.³⁶²

At the end of the month, she lectured at Oldham once more, using her lantern slides.³⁶³ Subsequently she accomplished her visit to Liverpool where, however, she thought the W.L.A. not a strong body.³⁶⁴ Harriette wrote to the St Helena party about her public agitation. She listed the places at which she had spoken. Not surprisingly she described herself as the 'over-burdened one'.³⁶⁵

There was more activity in February 1892. She lectured at Bowden in Cheshire³⁶⁶ and re-visited Leeds.³⁶⁷ On 16 February there was a lecture in London³⁶⁸ and, on the following day, a meeting was arranged by her cousin Mabel Turner (née McDougall).³⁶⁹ Harriette was planning to give a lecture at St Paul's School.³⁷⁰ She made up for her previous cancellation of arrangements by visiting Liverpool for an afternoon lecture on Friday 19 February, although she may not have been given as many opportunities to speak as she would have liked.³⁷¹

In March she was probably busy concentrating on lobbying MPs. In the following month there was a drawing room meeting arranged by E. Maurice, the son of F.D. Maurice, mentor and critic of Harriette's father.³⁷² She was invited to take the chair at a meeting

361. *Ibid.*, H. Rylands to J. Street, 24 Jan.1892; A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, n.d., fragment; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 28 Jan.1892; C. Morris to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb.1892.

362. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 28 Jan.1892; (Old Ref: Miscellaneous): Printed letter from Edge Mount, Altrincham (no signature) of thanks to subscribers dated 27 May 1893. It recalled the setting up of the fund at the home of Mr Jesse Haworth. Edge Mount was the home of Claude and Julia Morris; C. Morris to H.E. Colenso, 21 May 1893.

363. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 28 Jan.1892; T. Hand to H.E. Colenso, 25 Jan.1892. *South Africa*, 13 Feb.1892.

364. N.A., Col.Coll: Claude Morris to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb.1892.

365. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 170): H.E. Colenso to the Exiles, 6 Feb.1892.

366. *Ibid.*, C. Morris to H.E. Colenso, 4 Feb.1892.

367. *Ibid.*, I.O. Ford to H.E. Colenso, 21 Feb.1892.

368. *South Africa*, 6 Feb.1892.

369. N.A., Col.Coll: A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 26 Feb.1892.

370. *Ibid.*, J. Melville to H.E. Colenso, 18 Feb.1892.

371. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 26 Feb.1892.

372. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 8 Apr.1892; C.E. Maurice to H.E. Colenso, 25 Apr.(no year). Werner, 'Recollections of Harriette Colenso'.

of the Pioneer Reform Club, whose president, Stackpool E. O'Dell, was a prominent phrenologist.³⁷³ In addition, there was a nice little Band of Hope meeting - for adults as well as children to which she was invited by T. Davies, an associate of her brother, Robert.³⁷⁴

In May 1892 the annual general meeting of the A.P.S. once more gave Harriette a platform. In welcoming the Brussels General Act, she nevertheless drew attention to the plight of the Exiles, perhaps overemphasising the dampness and discomfort of their living arrangements.³⁷⁵ She was busy in June. She preached twice on 12 June and her appearance on 19 June, possibly at the Highgate Unitarian Church, where she had been invited to repeat her visit by Revd A. Spears was announced in the *Daily News*.³⁷⁶ In June she wrote of lectures being arranged at Torquay and Carlisle.³⁷⁷ She was at Carlisle in the third week of July, delivering three addresses on one Sunday. Here there was talk of getting up a public meeting. In wishing her a better meeting at Stockton, W.H. Lambelle remarked that her address was much talked about and that he had written to Lord Carlisle.³⁷⁸ The lecture at Stockton may have been the jumping off ground for a visit to Scotland. Certainly Revd Mr Macrae hoped she would visit Dundee and suggested other lectures at Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen. He hoped, however, that there would be others to help her arrange the lectures.³⁷⁹

The change of government did not see Harriette resting on her laurels. P. Alden invited her to Mansfield House.³⁸⁰ In October 1892 she was at Liverpool where she addressed the girls of the Edgehill Training College and a small collection was taken.³⁸¹ A visit to Durham was contemplated.³⁸² November 1892 was the month when Harriette had a further impact in Manchester, where Charles Schwann and his wife became her firm

373. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: S.E. O'Dell to H.E. Colenso, 30 Mar.1892.

374. *Ibid.*, T. Davies to H.E. Colenso, 14 Mar.1892; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 21 Apr.1892.

375. *Aborigines Friend*, June 1892.

376. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 13 June 1892; F. Cardew to H.E. Colenso, 21 June 1892; Revd A. Spears to H.E. Colenso, 31 May 1892.

377. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 13 June 1892.

378. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, a fragment, n.d. (July 1892, int.ev.); W. H. Lambelle to H.E. Colenso, 25 July 1892.

379. *Ibid.*, D. Macrae to H.E. Colenso, 5 Aug.1892; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, n.d. (1892, int.ev.). Werner, 'Recollections of Harriette Colenso' for reference to a lecture to Glasgow socialists.

380. N.A., Col.Coll: P. Alden to H.E. Colenso, 17 Sept.1892. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes.

381. N.A., Col.Coll: Miss Hale to H.E. Colenso, 25 Oct.1892.

382. *Ibid.*, A. Hill to H.E. Colenso, 27 June 1892.

adherents. As chairman of the Manchester Liberal Association, Charles Schwann forwarded a resolution to the Colonial Office. This asked that the Exiles should be returned, but added 'not necessarily to their former positions'. Mrs Schwann - as Lady Schwann - took a prominent post in collecting funds for Harriette in later decades.³⁸³

In November 1892 Harriette was invited to attend the general conference of women workers at Bristol.³⁸⁴ She certainly spoke to the W.L.A at Tunbridge Wells, from where she received the thanks of the organiser and a small donation.³⁸⁵ When arrangements were made for her to speak at Bow at the end of the month, she was told that neither the vicar nor the local MP could take the chair. Instead it would be taken by the county councillor a man who would be sure to draw a working class audience. Resolutions went forward from this meeting to Gladstone, Ripon, and Buxton, and there was a paragraph in the local paper which was forwarded to all the leading papers.³⁸⁶ She may have addressed a Sheffield W.L.A in December.³⁸⁷

In the course of her lecturing engagements, Harriette had become aware of the problems of Saul Msane and a group of Edendale singers who, having quarrelled with employers, were stranded in England. Harriette made representations for them - even, indirectly, to the Archbishop of Canterbury - and collected money.³⁸⁸ Sometimes they sang at the meetings which Harriette addressed. In January 1893, for example, a meeting was held in the United Methodist Free Church at Bromley. A Zulu quintet sang, and then Harriette spoke on Zulu affairs. She assured her audience that the Zulus were a magnanimous people, and when Buxton acknowledged the resolution sent to him from the meeting, he told her supporters that the Colonial Office was sympathetic. Reconciliation seemed possible.³⁸⁹ She was invited to Midhurst, the home of Jane Cobden-Unwin, during

383. *Ibid.*, E.T. Lancashire to H.E. Colenso, 13 Sept 1892. *South Africa*, 29 Oct.1892.

384. N.A., Col.Coll: E.J. Goodeve (of the Bristol and Clifton Ladies' Association for the Care of Girls) to H.E. Colenso, Nov.1892.

385. *Ibid.*, S. Unwin to H.E. Colenso, 15 Oct.1892; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 17 Nov.1892; Mrs Jones to H.E. Colenso, 18 Nov.1892;

386. *Ibid.*, W.H. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 11, 18 and 25 Nov., and 12 Dec.1892.

387. *Ibid.*, E. Maxfield to H.E. Colenso, 11 Dec.1892.

388. See Appendix 2, Biographical notes. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to J.H. Pickerill, n.d.; Miss Benham to H.E. Colenso, 7 and 14 Dec.1892, 4 and 5 Jan. and 7 Feb.1893; Mrs Stewart (of Lovedale) to H.E. Colenso, 3 Sept., 2 and 5 Nov.1892. *Natal Advertiser*, 6 Apr.1893.

389. N.A., Col.Coll: United Methodist Free Church Monthly, No.4, Jan.1893.

January 1893 to help with an entertainment for the Zulu choir.³⁹⁰ That Harriette was an effective speaker who aroused sympathy seems indicated by the fact that the Pioneer Reform Association wished to hear her again. She was invited to speak on 28 January 1893.³⁹¹

It may be due to more than simply the accident of the survival of evidence that Harriette's engagements seem to have been less frequent in the early days of 1893. The elections were several months in the past. Partly for that reason some of the drive in the activities of the W.L.As may have eased. In addition, disappointment at the failure of a parliamentary move for the franchise for women and dismay at the attitude of W.E. Gladstone may have intensified the preoccupation of members of the W.L.As with their own affairs. Harriette was herself waiting to see what benefits would flow to the Zulus from the change of government in Britain, and it may be that invitations slackened because she had already been heard by the associations or audiences willing to hear her.

There were, however, still meetings. There was a lecture at Hampstead where resolutions were passed³⁹² and, possibly another lecture (or, maybe, the same meeting) in a congregational church near the lodgings in which the Colenso women lived.³⁹³ There is mention, too, of a meeting in Kensington.³⁹⁴ In May 1893 Harriette spoke once more at the annual general meeting of the A.P.S.³⁹⁵ On 16 May she was invited to the Marylebone W.L.A.³⁹⁶ while her sister-in-law, Sophie, arranged at her home a meeting of a society which she had recently joined, called the Christian Kingdom Society. Harriette addressed a gathering of about 30 women.³⁹⁷

One of Harriette's last engagements to speak in public before she left England was at the annual meeting of the National Women's Liberal Federation at Holborn where she appeared as the delegate for Rochdale (where she was later invited to visit). Harriette

390. *Ibid.*, Jane Cobden-Unwin to H.E. Colenso, 29 Nov.1892; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 20 Jan.1892.

391. *Ibid.*, S.E. O'Dell to H.E. Colenso, 2 Nov.1892.

392. *Ibid.*, T. Hands to H.E. Colenso, 12 Apr.1893.

393. *Ibid.*, A.M. Colenso to K. Giles, 30 Mar.1892.

394. *Ibid.*, Revd F. Sloper to H.E. Colenso, 22 Apr.1893.

395. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 12 May 1893.

396. *Ibid.*, Mrs Kilgour to H.E. Colenso, 12 May 1893.

397. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, n.d. (May 1893, int.ev.).

moved a resolution on Zulu matters, once more inveighing against the fatal policy of 'breaking up' the Zulu nation. She was seconded by Miss E. Conybeare, sister of the radical MP and herself a campaigner for the abolition of the Contagious Diseases Act. Miss Conybeare, who had visited South Africa, visited the Colensos in Britain and showed herself willing to speak out in the Zulu cause.³⁹⁸ Certainly some individuals continued to speak on Zulu matters after Harriette's departure, for example, Mrs E. Kensett at Horsham.³⁹⁹

From this survey of Harriette's public speaking some general observations can be made. Harriette's programme was strenuous and occasionally interrupted by influenza and headaches. It brought her before a variety of audiences whose interests were sometimes intellectual, sometimes social or political, and sometimes religious. In addition, there are suggestions that, even during the first visit, Harriette's appeal was stretching beyond the 'members of the middle class'. If the supporters of the A.P.S. and the Liberal ladies were in the main 'middle class' folk, some of her audiences were composed of those who adopted or accepted the description of 'working men' or 'working women' or 'working classes', e.g. the students of the Working Men's College,⁴⁰⁰ or the women who gathered at the conference of women workers at Bristol.⁴⁰¹

For Harriette, the crucial question was whether or not the public indignation she aroused would affect the decision-makers, and what that effect would be. Broadly speaking, the Colonial Office under Knutsford and de Worms reacted differently from the Colonial Office once Ripon and Buxton took over. What happened at Sheffield during the Conservative government taught the Colonial Office that it was best to avoid inviting prolonged controversy by attempting an official explanation. The official reply to the Sheffield resolutions included the point that the people of Zululand were well and happy.⁴⁰² This brought Harriette into print with the assertion that, if the Zulu people were quiet, this was due to other factors than content with official policy, and she listed a number of other somewhat inconsistent reasons among them Osborn's absence, the

398. *Ibid.*, 12 May 1893; A. Cowen to H.E. Colenso, 17 May 1893. *Natal Advertiser*, 28 June 1893.

399. N.A., Col.Coll: E. Kensett to H.E. Colenso, 14 June (1893?).

400. See above, p.223.

401. See fn.384, and comment in Werner, 'Recollections of Harriette Colenso'.

402. C.O.427/10/24096 and 24614: B. Greaves to C.O., 9 and 12 Dec.1890, forwarding memoranda and resolution. Minutes by Fairfield, 13 Dec.1890 and R.G.W. Herbert, 15 Dec.1890.

uSuthu promise to herself, and the absence of uSuthu men who were earning a living in neighbouring states.⁴⁰³ Later the Colonial Office acknowledgments tended to be brief. A stock phrase was that Lord Knutsford 'had nothing further to add to' or 'was unable to concur with' what had already been said in parliament or Blue Books.⁴⁰⁴ When the Liberals took over, there was a change of reaction, but it was not one of a sudden reversal. Olivier, for example, mocked at the Greville Church resolution and speculated jeeringly that they might do in Ireland what they were attempting in Zululand: remove 'kraals' from areas of conflicting allegiance.⁴⁰⁵ Later Buxton was patronising about the resolution that came from Horsham. As became the women supporters of the Liberal government, the resolution was appreciative and conciliatory. It welcomed the news of Sir Marshal Clarke's appointment to Zululand and hoped that Dinuzulu would be restored under conditions that were conducive to good government. Here, thought Buxton, was a resolution rather more intelligent than the general run of Colenso motions.⁴⁰⁶

The change of government in mid-1892 reflected and fostered a general change in the political climate of Britain that reacted favourably on Harriette's grass roots campaigning. The Horsham resolution shows how different features of the Zulu questions were now at the forefront of discussion. Emphasis shifted from recriminations about the past to the discussion of changes in the future. There was the question of whether or not Dinuzulu should return. The Exiles' request to visit Britain was a subsidiary matter. There was also the question of the position which he should hold when he did return. With the Liberals in power, more attention could be given to Harriette's long term objective.

ii. Press, Periodicals and Pamphlets

Harriette appealed to the public, not only on platforms and in pulpits, but also through the press, in periodicals, and by means of her pamphlets. In all three, she achieved significant rather than major success in arousing interest in her cause.

On 13 February 1890 the *Pall Mall Gazette* announced her arrival. It did so in an article which used two of the new techniques of journalism: the interview and illustration, with

403. N.A., Col.Coll: H.E. Colenso to Editor, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 16 Jan.1891.

404. See *i.a.* *Aborigines Friend*, May 1890, p.69.

405. C.O.427/17/6115: F. Sloper to C.O., 13 Apr.1893. Minute by S. Olivier, 14 Apr.1893.

406. C.O.427/17/13791: E. Greening to C.O., 11 Aug.1891. Minute by Buxton, 13 Aug.1893.

a picture of Dinuzulu and Ndabuko appearing in the newspaper account.⁴⁰⁷ A reporter from the *Star* called to see her. In addition, the *Women's Penny Paper* sent a representative to interview her in Frank's home, published the result, and aroused the interest of an MP, Mr A. Webb.⁴⁰⁸ The *Daily News* on 12 July 1890 published a letter from Harriette on famine conditions in Zululand and irritated the Colonial Office into indignant condemnation of Harriette's letter as 'disingenuous' and 'full of ingenious perversions', while Harriette herself was described as 'this misguided lady'.⁴⁰⁹ On 16 February 1891 the *Daily News* published an account of a lecture by Harriette which brought her the offer of another audience and of attention in a Worcester paper.⁴¹⁰ *South Africa*, which had reported in full her earlier lecture to the National Liberal Club, published an account of her October lecture to the South Place Ethical Society,⁴¹¹ and she was invited to write for *Greater Britain*, and for the *Women's Herald* (successor to the *W.P.P.*).⁴¹² In January 1891 she wrote to the editor of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph* and refused to accept Knutsford's assurances about the condition of Zululand.⁴¹³ In September 1891 she wrote to the editor of the *Daily News* to give her own reasons for the quiet in Zululand.⁴¹⁴ She responded in the same way in the *Women's Herald*. On 29 August 1891 it published a report of 'a wonderful change' in Zululand and greatly improved conditions. On 19 September Harriette published her own reasons for the apparently improved conditions. These included the absence of Osborn, who was on leave and in England in 1891, the censures passed on officials, and the fact that the uSuthu had promised her they would be patient. She argued that Escombe's views on the loyalty of the uSuthu had been vindicated.⁴¹⁵ Later her campaign about demarcation in the Ndwandwe district involved her in sending letters of protest to the British press. The *Star*,

407. *Pall Mall Gazette*, 13 Feb.1890.

408. N.A., Col.Coll: C. du Molynes to H.E. Colenso, 22 Feb.1890; H.E. Colenso to K. Giles, 13 Feb.1890, A. Webb to H.E. Colenso, 7 Mar.1890.

409. C.O.427/10/13616: H.E. Colenso to Editor, *Daily News*, 12 July 1890 and minutes by Fairfield and S. Webb, 12 July 1890.

410. N.A., Col.Coll: J.A. Stevenson to H.E. Colenso, 18 Feb.1891 and A.L. Browne to H.E. Colenso, 17 Feb.1891.

411. *Ibid.*, (Old Ref: Box 87): Copy in A.M. Colenso's script of the account in *South Africa*, 18 Oct.1890.

412. *Ibid.*, Editor of *Greater Britain* to H.E. Colenso, 15 Apr.1891; E. Conybeare to H.E. Colenso, 22 Apr.(no year given).

413. *Ibid.*, H.E. Colenso to Editor, *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*, 16 Jan.1891.

414. K.C.A.L., Zulu Pamphlets, 5562: H.E. Colenso to Editor, *Daily News*, 11 Sept.1891.

415. *Women's Herald*, 29 Aug. and 19 Sept.1891.