

THE BACKGROUND AND THE UNDERLYING CAUSES OF DINUZULU'S SECOND BANISHMENT FROM ZULULAND

S.J. Maphalala
Dlangezwa High School

After Cetshwayo's deposition at the end of the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879 he was allowed to return to Zululand in 1883. He was, however, to have authority only over a part of Zululand. The other part was given to his British-supported enemy, Zibhebhu. Consequently, the ground for unrest was laid because war soon broke out between the Usuthu and the Mandlakazi. The Civil War continued until February 1884, when Cetshwayo died in a kraal near Eshowe. In an attempt to avenge his father's death and to regain the Usuthu lands taken by the Mandlakazi, Dinuzulu solicited Afrikaner aid. In May 1884, a party of Afrikaners from the Transvaal under Coenraad Meyer recognised Dinuzulu as the new king. Consequently, the Usuthu, supported by the Afrikaners, decisively crushed Zibhebhu's forces at the Battle of Tshaneni on 5 June 1884. Unfortunately the British authorities were against the revival of the Zulu kingdom, hence the annexation of Zululand in May 1887 and the resettlement of Zibhebhu in the Ndwandwe district giving him virtual free reins to molest Dinuzulu. This was the background to the Usuthu revolt of 1888 which, after an unjust trial, led to the banishment of Dinuzulu and his uncles Ndabuko and Shingana to St. Helena.¹

Dinuzulu's second banishment in 1909 can be understood by looking at the conditions of his return from St. Helena, his reconciliation with Zibhebhu in 1898 and the subsequent reaction from the Minister for Native Affairs in Natal, the succession to the Mandlakazi tribe, and the warning by James Crosby about the Zulu dissatisfaction in 1905.

As far back as 1894, the British government had arrived at a decision to repatriate the Zulu exiles. The postponement of the execution of that decision was only brought about by repeated representations from the Natal government.² The terms and conditions of Dinuzulu's return had also been laid down by the British government in 1894. It was decided that Dinuzulu was to be taken into the service of the government of Zululand and that his position would be that of government induna. It also appears that it was not envisaged that he should return to his main kraal because a house was to be provided for him at a site to be selected by a governor. While doing his duty as a government induna a salary of £500 was to be given to him. He was to be made to understand that he was not returning to Zululand as Paramount Chief but was to respect and obey those officers of the government who were placed in authority over him.³

The position assigned to Dinuzulu by the government and the salary attached to it was to be held during the pleasure of the government. It was to be strictly dependent on the manner in which he behaved and obeyed the laws laid down for his guidance.⁴

For more details on the Usuthu revolt of 1888 see: A.J. van Wyk: *Dinuzulu en die Usutu—opstand van 1888*, unpublished M.A. dissertation, UOVS, 1971.

2. G.H. 1562: Prime Minister — Governor, 17.1.1895.

3. G.H. 1286: Report *in re* Dinuzulu, Attorney General — Minister of Justice, 12.2.1907.

4. *Ibid.*

However, that salary was not to be withdrawn without the authority of the Secretary of State. As government induna, Dinuzulu was to be employed in Zulu matters that might arise and be brought to the notice of the governor's representative in Zululand, such as questions of inheritance and others in which it might be desirable to obtain independent evidence and opinions.⁵ It was, however, emphasised that Dinuzulu was to be chief over the people living in the division demarcated for the Usuthu tribe. However, he was not to have the same authority as his father had or rule over the same district.⁶ He was expected to govern the Usuthu tribe by the same laws and form of government as other chiefs of tribes in Zululand. He was also, like those chiefs, to be under the laws of the government of Zululand.

These conditions were discussed in numerous despatches between Lord Ripon, British Colonial Secretary (1892 to 1895), Sir Walter Hely-Hutchinson, governor of Natal (1893 to 1901), and Sir Marshal Clarke, British resident in Zululand (1893 to 1897). Referring to Dinuzulu Lord Ripon pointed out in a despatch of April 1895 that the position to be assigned to him was a subject which had received very careful consideration.⁷ To instal Dinuzulu as a tribal chief having authority over a strictly defined district inhabited by his most devoted followers would equally have been open to objection, whatever the advantages which such a plan might seem at first sight to offer.⁸ The internal politics in Zululand were such that under the arrangement referred to, Dinuzulu, however desirous at the outset to work under it, might in the course of time have been drawn into a false and embarrassing position in respect to the government.

Lord Ripon emphasised the importance of taking Dinuzulu into the position of government induna and advisor. He also stressed the importance of a house being provided for Dinuzulu in the neighbourhood of Eshowe and of what he called the liberal salary of £500 per annum being attached to Dinuzulu's office.⁹

In his confidential letter of 29 October 1897 to the governor of Natal, Joseph Chamberlain, British Secretary of State for the colonies stated that the Natal government would observe that the conditions upon which Dinuzulu returned tallied generally with conditions laid down by Chamberlain's predecessors.¹⁰ They were also made known to Dinuzulu before he left St. Helena.

On his arrival in Durban on 6 January 1898, a memorandum embodying the conditions both in English and Zulu was handed to him.¹¹ Zululand had already been annexed by Act 37 of 1897. Dinuzulu arrived at Eshowe on 10 January 1898 and a furnished house was given to him. In Circular no. 5 of January 25, 1898, Sir Charles Saunders, the Chief Magistrate and Civil Commissioner in Zululand, informed all the magistrates in Zululand that at an interview held before the Secretary for Native Affairs, J L Hulett, on 22 January 1898 at Eshowe, the Zulu chiefs Dinuzulu, Ndabuko and Shingana were given permission to return to their respective homes. Ndabuko and Shingana were Dinuzulu's uncles who were also bannished to St. Helena after the

5. G.H. 1308: Notes of Interview between His Excellency the Governor and the Envoys from Dinuzulu, at Government House on the 20th June 1906.

6. *Ibid.*

7. G.H. 1287: Report *in re* Dinuzulu, Attorney General - Minister of Justice, 12.2.1907.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*

11. *Ibid.*

revolt of 1888. Charles Saunders was, however, not able to give a date of their departure at that stage.¹² Dinuzulu stayed at Eshowe until June 1898.

In April 1898 thousands of Zulus crowded round Dinuzulu expressing their joy in seeing him back in Zululand. However, Sir Charles Saunders viewed the gathering with alarm. He consequently recommended that an order be issued prohibiting the massing of men except under certain restrictions.¹³ He pointed out that the position was a delicate one, as it had been from the day the chiefs arrived.¹⁴ What the British and the Natal governments forgot was that the Zulus in general had never been informed not to regard Dinuzulu as their king. The Zulus were unaware of the rigid conditions regarding Dinuzulu's return from St. Helena. It was therefore not Dinuzulu's fault if his people were still regarding him as their king.

On June 1898, Ndabuko was reported to be seriously ill and it was Dinuzulu's desire to leave Eshowe the following day. Sir Charles Saunders had no objection to Dinuzulu leaving. However, it was not until after 6 June 1898 that Dinuzulu left Eshowe. On 4 June there was a meeting at the office of Sir Charles Saunders which Dinuzulu was to attend. The aim of the meeting was to bring about a reconciliation between Zibhebhu and Dinuzulu at the request of the latter.¹⁵

Those present at the meeting were Sir Charles Saunders, the Secretary to the Chief magistrate and Civil Commissioner, M Oftebro, clerk and interpreter to the Chief magistrate and Civil Commissioner, and Mgqibelo, an induna to the Chief Magistrate and Civil Commissioner's office. Dinuzulu was accompanied by most of his staunchest followers, namely Qwabalanda, Ndabezimbi and others. Zibhebhu was accompanied by Gadeni and others.¹⁶

Sir Charles Saunders opened the meeting by pointing out that it had been a source of great gratification to him to hear that both Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu were anxious to become reconciled and forget the past. He stated that people quarrelled and people who had quarrelled often became greater friends than ever after such an event. He also expressed the earnest hope that the meeting might open the way to that result being attained for the benefits of both chiefs and their followers.¹⁷

Zibhebhu, who addressed Dinuzulu as "my child", said he understood Dinuzulu wanted to see and speak to him. He was there to listen to Dinuzulu's words. Zibhebhu had sent messengers to Dinuzulu when the latter first arrived at Eshowe. The aim was to greet Dinuzulu and his uncles, Ndabuko and Shingana and also to renew the friendship that had existed in the olden times. Dinuzulu had thanked Zibhebhu for the message, but Ndabuko and Shingana had sent him no reply. Zibhebhu stated that it must be clear that what Dinuzulu was to say was to be from his heart: that Dinuzulu was then not to be led astray by evil advisers.¹⁸ He also explained that he had not quarrelled with Dinuzulu personally. However, no good would result at that stage from discussing the merits of the quarrel that had existed between their factions.¹⁹ Were Ndabuko and Shingana present at the meeting, Zibhebhu might ask them questions.

12. *Ibid.*

13. *Ibid.*

14. *Ibid.*

15. G.H. 1561: Minutes of a meeting held at the office of the C.M. & C.C., Eshowe, Saturday, 4 June 1898.

16. *Ibid.*

17. *Ibid.*

18. *Ibid.*

19. *Ibid.*

Dinuzulu was a mere child at the time of Cetshwayo's banishment. Consequently, he knew nothing about the origin of the quarrel.²⁰

Zibhebhu was sorry that Ndabuko was absent from the meeting. He would have asked Ndabuko why he had taken Dinuzulu, who had been placed in Zibhebhu's charge by Cetshwayo. As far as Zibhebhu was concerned Dinuzulu rightly belonged to him according to the traditions of their houses: Mpande had placed Cetshwayo in Maphitha's²¹ hands and in like manner Cetshwayo had placed Dinuzulu in Zibhebhu's hands.²² However, Ndabuko and Shingana took Dinuzulu away from Zibhebhu. The reason they gave was that Dinuzulu's mothers were yearning for him. But, instead of taking Dinuzulu to his mothers, they placed him with the indunas. Zibhebhu remonstrated saying the child had been placed in his charge by his father and by what right was he removed? He received no answer. His protest were ignored.²³ Zibhebhu reiterated that as to the blood that had been spilt, he only defended himself. Every man when attacked, even by a leopard, attempted to defend himself. Zibhebhu also stated at the meeting that if Dinuzulu was in earnest that the past should be forgotten and determined not to be misled by evil advisers, there was nothing to fear. It was the people who brought about disturbances. Zibhebhu was blaming Dinuzulu in no way because the latter took up a quarrel created by others. Dinuzulu was Zibhebhu's child and the latter regarded him in no other light.²⁴

In regard to Zibhebhu's claim that he had merely acted in self-defence in 1888 it is worth mentioning that Dr A J van Wyk has pointed out that on 2 January 1888 Zibhebhu had assembled 1 000 armed followers at Addison's magistracy and was urging the removal of the Usuthu "squatters." On their way from the magistracy, the Mandlakazi were in a bellicose mood. They purposely walked on the Usuthu's planted fields and consequently destroyed their young crops.²⁵

Dinuzulu pointed out that he had very few words to say. Zibhebhu sent messengers to greet his brothers and Dinuzulu on their arrival at Eshowe. At that time Dinuzulu did not know whether to regard Zibhebhu's messengers as spies or not. However, Zibhebhu's behaviour and actions since the return of the exiles encouraged Dinuzulu to believe that Zibhebhu was in earnest in sending the message to him. Consequently Dinuzulu had then sent messages to thank Zibhebhu for the manner in which he had greeted him. Dinuzulu's messengers were treated well, although Zibhebhu had then stated that he was surprised at receiving the message from Dinuzulu alone. Zibhebhu expected to receive a message from Ndabuko and Shingana as well. However, they sent no messages.²⁶

Dinuzulu stated that he bore no animosity. The past should be forgotten and the quarrel terminated. He admitted that he had only taken up the quarrel created by others.²⁷ However, this was later refuted by Mankulumana, the principal induna to Dinuzulu, who asserted: "After Cetshwayo's death his son, Dinuzulu, continued to fight with Zibhebhu."²⁸ The main aim was to avenge Cetshwayo's death and to regain

20. *Ibid.*

21. Maphitha was Zibhebhu's father.

22. G.H. 1561: Minutes of a meeting held at the office of the C.M. & C.C., Eshowe, Saturday, 4.6.1898.

23. *Ibid.*

24. G.H. 1561: Minutes of a meeting held at the office of the C.M. & C.C., Eshowe, Saturday, 4.6.1898.

25. A.J. van Wyk: *Dinuzulu en die Usutu-opstand van 1888*, pp.83-87.

26. G.H. 1561, *Ibid.*

27. *Ibid.*

28. G.H. 1308: Notes of Interview between His Excellency the governor and the Envoys from Dinuzulu at Government House on the 20th June, 1906.

Usuthu lands taken by the Mandlakazi. Dinuzulu stated at the meeting that he was sorry that Ndabuko and Shingana were absent making it impossible for Zibhebhu to question them as to the cause of the quarrel. Dinuzulu claimed to have known nothing about how the quarrel arose, for as Zibhebhu had stated, he was a child at the time. He only took up the quarrel. With regard to the blood that had been shed, Dinuzulu also maintained that he had only defended himself. He reiterated, however, that there was nothing strange in people who had quarrelled and been at war with each other becoming best friends.²⁹ Dinuzulu was advocating such a reconciliation. "We are the last people who ought to quarrel and if you are in earnest, in the desire that we should become friends, let it be so. I bear no malice."³⁰ Zibhebhu expressed his entire satisfaction with the spirit of reconciliation: "I see by your words my child you are a man. If you only withstand evil advice all will be right."³¹

Sir Charles Saunders stated that he could only express his entire approval of the conduct of both Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu at the meeting. He congratulated them both at the satisfactory nature of the interview. He trusted that that reconciliation would terminate the strife and ill-feeling that had existed between the Usuthu and the Mandlakazi for such a long time. He concluded by saying that the Natal government desired that the two factions "should become reconciled."³² However, we will see later on, that was not to be.

Zibhebhu and Dinuzulu conversed freely and in a friendly manner on matters in general. After the meeting had ended they and their followers left the chief magistrate's office. On going outside they and their followers saluted each other in a friendly manner.³³ On departing from the precincts of the Chief magistrate's office, they did so in a body — Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu riding up the main street of the township side by side followed by their staunch adherents.³⁴

To those who had followed the vicissitudes of the two factions for the last fifteen years, the spectacle of the heads of the Usuthu and the Mandlakazi factions associating in that manner was most interesting and surprising.³⁵ That meeting of reconciliation was, according to the Zulu custom, to be followed by certain ceremonials indicating, in a measure, washing or purification after the blood that had been spilt.³⁶ Those ceremonials were to be held in the presence of the most important men of each faction. That function was to take place in about three months' time. Only after those ceremonials would the reconciliation be completed. However, the news of the reconciliation was spreading fast among the Zulus and was being received with great jubilation. On 6 June, Dinuzulu left Eshowe for the main kraal, Osuthu, while Zibhebhu remained at Eshowe for a short while.

The Natal government received the news of reconciliation with apprehension. The Minister for Native Affairs pointed out that he could not but feel an intense anxiety as to the future result of that reconciliation.³⁷ He stated that Sir Charles

29. G.H. 1561: Minutes of a meeting held at the office of the C.M. & C.C., Eshowe, 4.6.1898

30. *Ibid.*

31. *Ibid.*

32. *Ibid.*

33. *Ibid.*

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Ibid.*, The C.M. & C.C. — Sec. for Native Affairs, 6.6.1898.

36. *Ibid.*

37. G.H. 1561: The Minister for Native Affairs — C.M. & C.C., 10.6.1898.

Saunders's intimate knowledge of Zulu character, of Zulu loyalty to the Royal House, and of Zulu aspirations must necessarily cause certain misgivings in his own mind.³⁸

According to the Natal government, it was to rest upon Sir Charles as Chief Magistrate and Civil Commissioner together with the other magistrates in Zululand, to exercise extraordinary vigilance over whatever communications might pass between Dinuzulu and the various chiefs in Zululand.³⁹ It is interesting to note that that "extraordinary vigilance" was to lead to Dinuzulu's second banishment. Fabrications and distortions by some Natal officials were to be the order of the day regarding Dinuzulu's activities in Zululand.⁴⁰

The Natal government feared the people would at once consider that Dinuzulu held a paramount position in the country, and that with the approval of the Natal government.⁴¹ It would be impossible to convince the people that the Natal government meant that Dinuzulu was only to be recognized as an ordinary Chief. In that matter actions would always speak louder than words.

The Natal government told Sir Charles Saunders that no license in the smallest particular was to be allowed Dinuzulu. In the opinion of the Natal Government the safety and well-being of the people then rested upon the "hand of iron" being skilfully gloved in velvet.⁴²

With regard to Zibhebhu, the Natal government felt that he had long suffered the hardship imposed upon him by being detained at Eshowe. Zibhebhu had always considered that detention unjust, considering his loyalty to the British authorities.⁴³ The Natal government was also of the opinion that the Zulu mind could never understand the apparently anomalous conduct of the British authorities.⁴⁴ The latter's motives and actions were accordingly often misconstrued. The fact that Zibhebhu had recognized Dinuzulu meant that he had removed his faith from the British authorities. Zibhebhu considered that the ruling power had injured Dinuzulu and he would now be regarded as part and parcel of the Royal House of his people.⁴⁵ The Natal government viewed that development with great misgivings as it was to result in unity among the Zulus. That the Natal government wanted to prevent at all cost.

The jealousies between the chiefs in Natal had ever been the Natalian's greatest safety. While in Zululand the ordinary chiefs might have their differences and quarrels, yet they intuitively held strong allegiance to the Royal House.⁴⁶ While members of that house were divided, the chiefs and the Zulu people remained divided. However, when union of interests centred in one principal head, tribal differences were for the time being forgotten.⁴⁷

The act of reconciliation between Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu done in public and in the presence of Sir Charles Saunders, as Chief Magistrate and Civil Commissioner, should have already produced its effect on the Zulu mind all over Zululand and possibly the whole of Natal. ⁴⁸ It was held in Zulu opinion to mean recognition by the

38. *Ibid.*

39. *Ibid.*

40. G.H. 1286: Report *in re* Dinuzulu, Attorney General — Minister for Native Affairs, 10.6.1898.

41. G.H. 1561: Minister for Native Affairs — C.M. & C.C., 10.6.1898.

42. *Ibid.*

43. *Ibid.*

44. *Ibid.*

45. *Ibid.*

46. *Ibid.*

47. *Ibid.*

48. *Ibid.*

Natal government of Dinuzulu's paramount position over all other chiefs. The Natal government felt that the wisdom of reconciliation between Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu was open to very grave doubt. Sir Charles Saunders was instructed to use his mature experience and to watch the course of events in Zululand with utmost care.⁴⁹

The "extraordinary vigilance" with regard to the communication between Dinuzulu and the other chiefs in Zululand was temporarily interrupted by the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War in 1899. In 1901 Zululand was placed under martial law with Col H Bottomley in command. Dinuzulu and the Zulus were armed with a view to bringing the war to a speedy end. Thousands of Afrikaner stock were looted and hundreds of Afrikaners forced to surrender their arms. Early in 1902 Dinuzulu was also ordered to send 250 Zulus to the Vryheid district where he was joined by the Baqulusi of Chief Sikhobobo. All these activities led to the murder at Mthashana (Holkrantz) on 6 May 1902.⁵⁰

The "iron hand" advocated by the Natal government in 1898 was once again used against Dinuzulu in 1903. In that year rumours were being spread that Dinuzulu might take up arms at any moment against the Natal government. The reason being advanced for these rumours was that Dinuzulu never surrendered the weapons captured from the Afrikaners by his men during the Anglo-Boer War.⁵¹ It was also in 1903 that Dinuzulu suffered from a chest complaint and requested to consult a Zulu woman who was skilled in such matters, living among the Baqulusi near Hlobane in the Vryheid district. However, that request was turned down on the advice of both Arthur John Shepstone, the magistrate at Vryheid, and the magistrate of Nongoma.⁵² It was also ruled that all his correspondence from outside was to be shown to the same magistrate.⁵³

The Land Commission of 1904 aroused bitterness among the Zulus as a whole. The Zulus were used to living in wider space. They resented the Land Commission and reasoned that when their children had grown up, the 17 acres per head provided for them in the reserves, would be too small. The delimitation also made no provision for the graves of the Zulu ancestors.⁵⁴ That resentment was immaterial as long as the Zulus were not united. Subsequently, Zibhebhu demanded the return of his cattle which, he stated, were owed to him by King Cetshwayo and he therefore held Dinuzulu responsible for the debt.⁵⁵ This was 6 years after the genuine reconciliation between Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu. Dinuzulu decided to build a fort on top of a hill about a mile from Osuthu as a precautionary measure. He also mobilised his national guard, (Inkomendala) in case of confrontation with Zibhebhu. However, the Natal government bitterly resented Dinuzulu's precautionary measures. In condemnation of Dinuzulu the government pointed out that he had no right to erect fortification and train warriors without the authority of the government.⁵⁶

49. *Ibid.*

50. S.J. Maphalala: *The murder at Holkrantz (Mthashana), 6 May 1902* (Historia, vol. 22, 1, 1977).

51. S.J. Maphalala: *The Participation of the Zulus in the Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902*, (M.A. UNIZUL, 1978), pp. 135-6.

52. *Ibid.*

53. The Trial of Dinuzulu on charges of high treason at Greytown, Natal, 1908-9, p.ii (Reprint).

54. S.J. Maphalala. *Zulu Relations with the Whites during the nineteenth century: A broad perspective* (Historia, vol. 25.1.1980).

55. J. Stuart: *A History of the Zulu rebellion in 1906, and of Dinuzulu's arrest, trial and expatriation*, (Oxford 1937), p.113.

56. *Ibid.*

The threat of Zibhebhu was foiled by his death on August 27, 1904. That was a great loss to the Natal government. *The Times of Natal* described Zibhebhu as a person who was very much trusted by the government and stated that the Zulus regarded him as the enemy of the Royal House. The paper also praised Zibhebhu as having been one of the most law abiding Zulus.⁵⁷

On the death of Zibhebhu the Mandlakazi tribe was informed that the people could appoint the successor themselves. It was understood by the tribe that this would be done by majority vote. Three parts of the Mandlakazi tribe decided in favour of Msentele. The latter was without doubt the rightful heir to Zibhebhu.⁵⁸ His mother was paid for by the Mandlakazi tribe. He was recognised by all the influential chiefs and indunas in Zululand as the rightful successor to Zibhebhu. However, that did not please Sir Charles Saunders, Sikizana, the old induna, and a few of Zibhebhu's brothers.⁵⁹

Owing to the great scheming of Sir Charles Saunders and the cleverness of Sikizana, a commission was subsequently appointed composed of Charles Saunders and two magistrates. That commission of three was really a commission of one. Sir Charles Saunders did all the interpreting and translating himself to the shorthand writer.⁶⁰ Msentele's party expressed dissatisfaction about this.⁶¹ The important fact, however, was that the Natal government was convinced that Msentele was the rightful heir but owing to the Usuthu party support for him, the commission appointed Bokwe, a child of the seventy-fifth wife of Zibhebhu. Bokwe was only 18 months old. The commission also appointed as regent Mchitheki, "the kitchen boy of Mr Saunders," as the Zulus put it, who was only 16 to 17 years old.⁶² Naturally the principal power fell in the hands of Sikizana who could be manipulated by Charles Saunders.

Msentele was eventually told to call all his witnesses, which he did, calling all the influential chiefs and indunas of Zululand, irrespective of parties.⁶³ However, because the principal witnesses belonged to the Usuthu tribe, Charles Saunders probably came to the conclusion that the reports were true about Msentele joining the Usuthu party. He also probably felt that the feud between the Mandlakazi and the Usuthu would end and that would give more prestige to Dinuzulu and unify the Zulu people.⁶⁴ The matter of Zibhebhu's succession caused dissatisfaction in the whole of Zululand. It upset all the old Zulu laws and traditions. It also caused a united front among the Zulus. The first proof was the Zulu's refusal to pay the poll tax.⁶⁵

From the time the poll tax Act was passed in 1905, messengers from Natal and elsewhere were frequently received by Dinuzulu at Osuthu. The object of their mission was to discuss the poll tax with Dinuzulu because the Natal government authorities never bothered to explain to the Zulus what it was all about. In one case, however, two of those messengers were arrested and one of them, a young man, told the Natal authorities that he had gone to Dinuzulu in connection with poll tax.⁶⁶ Later it was

The Times of Natal, 6.9.1904; R.R.R. Dhlomo, UDinuzulu (Pietermaritzburg 1968), p.94
C.J. Binns, *Dinuzulu: The Death of the House of Shaka* (London 1968), pp.175 - 6.

58. S. Marks: *Reluctant Rebellion: The 1906 - 8 Disturbances in Natal* (Oxford, 1970), p.163.

59. *The Natal Mercury*, 2.12.1905.

60. *Ibid.*

61. *Ibid.*

62. *Ibid.*

63. *Ibid.*

64. *Ibid.*

65. *Ibid.*

66. G.H. 1286: Report *in re* Dinuzulu, Attorney General - Minister of Justice, 12.2.1907.

also established that Chief Tilonko had sent messengers to Dinuzulu in connection with the full explanation about the poll tax. The Natal government became very suspicious of the visits of those messengers to Dinuzulu especially because they were not reported by Dinuzulu to the magistrate at Nongoma.⁶⁷

James Crosby who had lived in Zululand for more than 20 years stated: "All the years I have been in the country I have never seen the natives so united on anything as on this poll tax ... I have never known the natives so dissatisfied as they are at present, and have they not cause to be?"⁶⁸ He asked the Natal government whether it realised that there were many parts in northern Zululand where there had been scarcity of food and starvation nearly every year. Cattle were not so plentiful as they were when the Zulus could live on the milk.⁶⁹ He suggested the formation of a "Native Council" similar to the one in Basutoland at that time. He also urged the Natal government to give the Zulus an interest in the country and let their grievances be heard before they were made to pay a poll tax that they did not understand.⁷⁰ He concluded by saying: "Take away those wire fences you place round the head of the Native Affairs Department; let every native get his real or fancied grievances heard."⁷¹ James Crosby can indeed be regarded as one of the prophets of the Bhambatha rebellion of 1906.

In spite of the dissatisfaction about poll tax in the whole of Zululand and Natal, Dinuzulu made certain that all his Osuthu tribesmen paid their tax.⁷² They began paying on January 17, 1906, well before the deadline of 31 May.

The Bhambatha rebellion broke out only 18 years after the 1888 revolt in Zululand. It was at Eshowe where the unjust trial had been conducted in 1888. After the Bhambatha rebellion Dinuzulu received a jail sentence at Greytown in Natal. It is interesting to note that General Louis Botha of the Transvaal, even before the arrest of Dinuzulu, had already become critical of Dinuzulu's complicity in the Bhambatha rebellion.⁷³ In a letter which he wrote to F R Moor, the Prime Minister of Natal, on 6 December 1907, Botha explained that the release of Dinuzulu was going to help improve relations between the Zulus and the English.⁷⁴ General Botha later sent C J Meyer, who had been messenger of the Afrikaners since the days of Mpande and Cetshwayo, to Dinuzulu to interview the latter about his involvement in the Bhambatha rebellion. This was agreed to by the Natal government. C J Meyer's findings were that Dinuzulu had only one object, and that was to live on friendly terms with the Natal government.⁷⁵ Indeed, Dinuzulu felt very much grieved at being blamed for all the irregularities in the country while he was doing his utmost to fulfill his duty towards the Natal government.⁷⁶ Consequently, General Louis Botha's goodwill towards Dinuzulu must be viewed in this light.

It is therefore important to conclude that the destruction of the Zulu kingdom in 1879 led to the following: Zibhebhu, supported by the British, being used in destroy-

67. G.H. 1341: R.M. Nongoma - C.M. & C.C., 5.10.1903.

68. *The Natal Mercury*, 2.12.1905.

69. *Ibid.*

70. *Ibid.*

71. *Ibid.*

72. The trial of Dinuzulu on charges of high treason at Greytown Natal, 1908-9, p.IV.

73. P.M. Vol. 103 - Minute Confidential Prime Minister's Correspondence 170/07, Botha Moor 6.12.1907.

74. *Ibid.*

75. G.H. 1287: C.J. Meyer - Louis Botha, 3.11.1907.

76. *Ibid.*

ing the Royal House; Dinuzulu, supported by the Afrikaners of the Transvaal, being installed as the king of the Zulus; the British annexing Zululand in 1887 and eventually sentencing Dinuzulu and his uncles to St Helena after an unjust trial in 1888. Dinuzulu's return from St Helena was never welcomed by the Natal government. No matter how hard he tried to live on friendly terms with the Natal government, he remained a threat to the latter because Zulus still rightly regarded him as their king. Consequently the Natal government's attempts to frustrate reconciliation between Dinuzulu and Zibhebhu, followed by lack of recognition for Msentele, the rightful heir to the Mandlakazi chieftaincy, can be understood in this light. Lack of a just and proper policy towards the Zulus, and not Dinuzulu's evil influence, led to the Bhambatha rebellion in 1906. Finally, Dinuzulu was sentenced to four years' imprisonment in 1909. He was released in 1910 and spent his last few years in the Transvaal where he was not regarded as a threat to the peace.