

https://dspace.org/

The Swaziland question and a road to the sea 1887-1895

Garson, N. G. (Noel George)

2015-01-27
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/16791

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

decisive. The intervention of Warren as British Commissioner appointed under the London Convention and backed by ~~a power of~~ 5,000 troops, and the demarcation on the spot of its western boundary, completed early in 1885, forced the Republic finally to relinquish the hope of westward expansion. But the pressure of the interests of the Cape Colony, in uneasy and short-lived partnership with philanthropic opinion in England headed by the Rev. John Mackenzie, had been necessary to stir the imperial factor into thwarting Kruger's efforts to overcome the paper restrictions of the London Convention by provisionally annexing territory on the pretext of maintaining law and order and in the hope that the British government would stand down face of the fait accompli.

While the Road to the North was a live issue in the negotiations preceding the London Convention, the possibility of the Republic's expanding eastwards toward the Indian Ocean was not. But as a result of Robinson's advice, offered against Derby's reluctance to contemplate further responsibilities, the provisions of the London Convention relating to encroachments and the appointment of Commissioners were made applicable to the eastern boundaries of the Transvaal as well.[16] Article IV of the Convention stipulated further that any treaties which the Republic might conclude with tribes beyond its eastern and western borders, or with foreign Powers other than the Orange Free State, were to be approved by the British government in order to be valid. Any expansion of the Republic which might be attempted through treaties with neighbouring tribes bringing them under the Republic's control in the manner which the Deputation had suggested in November 1883 was in this way made subject to the veto of the British government. The remaining provision of the London Convention with a bearing on the later efforts of the Republic to

---

(16) Robinson's article, Fortnightly Review, XLVII, p.286. "I had difficulty in getting the word "eastern" inserted in the Article 2. The Government, however, at length yielded the point, but would not go a step further and agree to the appointment of a Commissioner on the eastern frontier as had been sanctioned for Bechuanaland on the west".

extend the frontiers eastward was Article XII, by which the powers recognised the independence of the Swazi as they had in the Pretoria Convention. No alteration in the status of the Swazi appears to have been contemplated or pressed for in the negotiations leading up to the London Convention.[17]

(4) The Governments and Swaziland 1881-1886

The Swaziland question in the form in which it will be studied here can be said to have emerged in 1887. It is necessary, however, to point out certain features of the situation in Swaziland which became apparent before then, and to consider the early reactions of the Republican and British governments to altering conditions in Swaziland in relation to its status under the Conventions of 1881 and 1884.

In their report, the British Commissioners who beaconed off the boundary between Swaziland and the Transvaal in 1880 referred to the habit developed by the Boers on the frontier of entering Swaziland in the winter months to graze their stock.[1] The presence of these "winter graziers" in the western uplands of Swaziland was also referred to by Sir Evelyn Wood in his report on a visit to Swaziland in September 1881 to explain to Umbandine the position of Swaziland under the Pretoria Convention.[2] Umbandine's first reaction to this pressure on his western frontier was to complain of Boer encroachments. Up to 1884 these complaints were addressed to the British Resident in the Transvaal, but thereafter Swazi messages to Natal became more frequent.[3] His complaints having little practical effect, Umbandine was forced to accept the annual entry of the "trekboers" into Swaziland and he began to issue licences to them. By July 1888 350 grazing licences had been issued and Umbandine had in the meantime also recognised the rights of other Europeans in Swaziland by conceding mineral, land and other rights to

---

(17) C 3841, C 3914, C 3947 and Z.A.R. Officieele Bescheiden, op.cit., passim.

(1) C 2695, p.26. The graziers generally remained in Swaziland from mid-April to October.

(2) Boyce, op.cit., p.5; Wood, op.cit., vol.II, pp.135-7; C.Williams, op.cit., p.158.

(3) C 3182, pp.61ff.; C 3419, p.32, complaint of Boer encroachments by Swazi messengers to Natal, in June 1882. In November 1882 Umbandine was informed that his complaints should be addressed to the British Resident in the Transvaal. (C 3486, p.33)

them.[4] But the trekboers, representing the advancing frontier of pastoral farmers which is a dominant theme in South African history, provided the earliest evidence that if the independence of the Swazi meant that Europeans were to stay out of their country and acquire no rights there, it was not to be achieved by paper guarantees on the part of the governments concerned.

In December 1883 Robinson recommended that a police force be established on the Swaziland border to preserve the integrity of the country, and that Umbandine should contribute to its maintenance. Early in 1884 complaints from Europeans acting on Umbandine's behalf reached Hudson, the British Resident in the Transvaal that the Boers were contemplating an invasion of Swaziland.[5] A British official, Rutherford, armed with the Republic's denials of such intentions and warned that his government undertook "no responsibilities in respect of Swaziland, its independence being assured by the Convention", was sent to investigate. In his report Rutherford absolved the government of the Republic and its officials from the intention to occupy Swaziland, despite the belligerent talk of the Boers on the frontier. He referred to rumours of the presence of gold in Swaziland and the likelihood of "the undesirable adventure element of all nationalities", already present in the Eastern Transvaal, entering the country.[6]

Robinson, forwarding the report to Derby in April 1884, recommended the appointment of a Commissioner in Swaziland under Article II of the London Convention. Derby's reply was non-commital, but he asked whether Umbandine would be prepared to pay for a Commissioner supported by a force. Umbandine's answer was a refusal forwarded by D. Forbes, one of the earliest mineral concessionnaires in Swaziland who, Rutherford reported, was advising Umbandine. But the Swazi king continued to complain of encroachments.[7] In December 1885

---

(4) Boyce, op.cit., p.8.
(5) C 3841, p.105. These invasion rumours were repeated almost every year until 1889.
(6) C 4037, pp.110-16, Rutherford's report, 25 March 1884.
(7) Ibid., p.109, Robinson's comments; pp.119-20, Derby to Robinson, 21 May 1884; C 4214, p.94, D.Forbes to Robinson, 12 Aug.1884. Below, pp. 17-9, for Joubert's activities in Swaziland.

Robinson suggested that a British officer be sent to Swaziland to "ascertain the facts" regarding Boer encroachments, as the allegations made by Swazi messengers in Natal conflicted with the denials of the Transvaal government. He recommended that the officer should find out whether Umbandine would be prepared to pay for a border agent, as no answer had been received to an inquiry addressed to Forbes in the previous May. Robinson's suggestion was made after the Republic had discounted further "invasion" rumours and denied that the Commandant-General, P.J.Joubert, had attempted to persuade the Swazi to accept a Boer protectorate in the previous May.[8]

In December 1885 Forbes forwarded a request from Umbandine to the Colonial Office for the establishment of a British Protectorate over his country to forestall any other power making a claim to it, until he saw his way clear to pay for a Resident.[9] In June 1886 Havelock, Bulwer's successor as Lieutenant-Governor of Natal, reported to Robinson that Umbandine had told the Rev. J.Jackson of the Anglican Mission in Swaziland that he and his people were not willing to contribute to the maintenance of a Resident.[10] But in the same month, the Forbes Reef Gold Mining Company which had begun mining operations in Swaziland under a mineral concession from Umbandine, offered to contribute £500 p.a. towards the cost of maintaining a British representative there. The offer was acknowledged, but not acted upon.[11]

In August 1886, Havelock himself, after forwarding the complaints of Swazi messengers to British officials in the Zulu Reserve to the High Commissioner, recommended the appointment of a British representative in Swaziland. But Robinson, having received no reply to his own recommendation made eight months earlier, did not endorse Havelock's advice and merely observed that Swaziland

---

(8) C 4645, pp.77-8, Robinson to Derby, 23 Dec.1885; p.4, Bower (Imperial Secretary) to Forbes, 30 May 1885.
(9) Ibid., pp.70-1.
(10) C 4913, pp.109-10.
(11) C 4913, pp.71-2 (Faviell, a London Director of the Forbes Reef Company, to Colonial Office, 8 June 1886, and Colonial Office to Faviell, 8 July, 1886).

was "an independent State" with the king "alone responsible for its government" and entitled to take measures of his own to prevent European encroachments and filibustering.[12]

Havelock's predecessor, Bulwer, had recommended the establishment of a British protectorate over Swaziland in January 1886, in a memorandum on the Zulu question.[13] He pleaded for the extension of British authority over the whole of Zululand and Swaziland to prevent the Boers from further occupying native territory, which they had already succeeded in doing in the area which the British government recognised as the New Republic in 1887. A resolution of the Natal Legislative Council in October 1886, on the policy of the British government in the Zulu question similarly included a request for the establishment of a protectorate over Swaziland.[14] But British policy toward Swaziland in the late 1880's remained unaffected by this mild pressure from Natal. While the appointment of a British official in Swaziland was possible under the London Convention, the proclamation of a British protectorate without the consent of the Republic would have been a breach of that agreement. This consideration probably prevented a unilateral proclamation of a British protectorate in view of the possibility of such a breach of the Convention leading to the repudiation by the Republic of other articles of the agreement to which both Powers attached more weight than they did to Swaziland.[15]

The procedure adopted by the British authorities when they received complaints of Boer encroachments from or on behalf of the Swazi between 1882 and 1887 was to forward them to Pretoria for the comments of the Republic's officials who consistently denied that any "irregularities" were taking place on the Swazi border or in Swaziland itself. These "assurances" were then

---

(12) C 4980, pp.20,22. (Havelock to Robinson, 23 Aug.1886 and Robinson to Havelock, 6 Sept.1886) and p.30. Also, p.155, Havelock to Secretary of State, 20 Dec.1886, enclosing an address from the Legislative Council on the Zululand question, including a request "that a Protectorate, as desired by the Swazi nation, be extended over Swazi land".

(13) C 4913, p.16; 1 Jan.1888. See also previous note.

(14) C 4980, pp.30, 64,71. In August 1885 the Legislative Council had recommended the extension of British authority over "the countries to the north of Zululand, between the South African Republic and Portuguese frontiers". (C 4645, p.10) This referred to the Swazi, the Tonga, and Zambaan and Umbogisa. See below, X. Chap. II (2).

(15) For example, article IV.

accepted until fresh complaints arrived, when the same motions were gone through again. This suggests that the British government was not anxious to intervene in Swaziland and was content to keep up appearances by making formal representations without pressing any charges. But whether the allegation of encroachments by Boers were justified or not, and if they were, whether the government of the Republic was a party to infringements of the London Convention by its subjects are questions less easily answered from the evidence provided in the official correspondence between the governments.

Technically the Republic might have been accused of a breach of article II of the London Convention by failing to prevent the entry of the Boer winter graziers into Swaziland after 1884. The British government had originally placed Umbandine's complaints about the trekboers before the Boer authorities in 1882, when the allegations had referred to their taking Swazi cattle, interfering with boundary beacons and "encroaching" - a term which might then have been intended to refer to their actual presence in Swaziland. In any event, the subject was not pursued after the Pretoria government had denied the "irregularities" and furnished the statement of a local official as proof.[16] When Rutherford visited Swaziland early in 1884 he was instructed to warn Umbandine against encouraging the encroachments of which he complained by offering the Boers rights to land on easy terms.[17] But neither the right of the Swazi king to make such grants nor that of individual Boers to seek them was questioned by the British government. In August 1885 when the Republic denied the rumours of an invasion and of Joubert's intention to establish a protectorate, the annual ~~invasion~~ incursion of the winter graziers on the strength of the licences issued by the Swazi king was admitted.[18] The British government did not attempt to argue that the Boer authorities could or should have prevented their subjects from entering Swaziland on the basis of rights

---

(16) C 3419, pp.32, 75-6; C 3486, pp.11, 20, 21-3. The local official was the "Commissioner of Natives" on the eastern frontier, J.Ferreira.
(17) C 4087, p.60.
(18) C 4645, p.11, Kruger to Robinson, 14 Aug. 1885.

quired from the Swazi king. The presence in Swaziland of the trekboers was clearly not regarded as an encroachment in terms of the London Convention. Kruger took the view that he was bound to prevent only those Boers entering Swaziland who did so against the will of the Swazi king.[18A]

Leyds maintains that the Republic nevertheless tried to prevent the annual movement of the trekboers into Swaziland. He refers to a circular sent to Transvaal landdrosts in January 1885 informing them that their government was opposed to burgers entering Swaziland as being contrary to the interests of the Republic and instructing them to warn the burgers to that effect.[19] But it is improbable that the Boer authorities made any serious effort either to stop licensed winter graziers from entering Swaziland, or to prevent other Boers from going there to obtain licences. The licensed graziers increased in number between 1885 and 1888 and as the circular to the landdrosts was not followed by any practical measures it can only be regarded as a move to keep appearances correct. Moreover, Boer ~~But~~ officials were among those who obtained grazing rights in Swaziland. Joubert, the Commandant-General, and J.C.Krogh, the landdrost of Wakkerstroom, visited Swaziland in May 1885 and through Swazi messengers to Zululand Bulwer later learned that both had acquired grazing rights.[20] Finally, if there were any "irregularities" in the form of cattle-stealing and the moving of boundary beacons, which is a point difficult to establish, there is no evidence that Ferreira as "Commissioner for Natives" did anything to curb them and he also appears to have acquired interests in Swaziland.[21]

While the Republic did not seriously attempt to prevent or control the incursions of the trekboers into Swaziland, it does not appear to have given

---

(18A) C 5089, p.26, Kruger's message to the Swazi, March 1886.

(19) Leyds, op.cit., p.239n. Leyds explains that the circular was issued because of "the difficulties engendered by the condition of affairs in Bechuanaland, and the false accusation that there the movement was sponsored by the Government ...". This is an additional reason for taking his testimony with a pinch of salt, as there is evidence to support the view that Boer officials were involved in the penetration of the republics of Stellaland and Goshen. (Joubert was involved. Walker, op.cit., pp.401, 406.)

(20) C 4645, p.42, Bulwer to Robinson, 8 Sept.1865. On 14 July 1885, Kruger informed Robinson that Joubert's visit had been private, but Krogh's official, having been made on the request of Umbandine. (C 4645, p.11) Joubert's son, J.F.Joubert, also had grazing rights in Swaziland. (Mouton, op.cit., p.372.)

(21) C 6201, p.39, referring to his representing Harington in the Private Revenue Concession. See also pp. 53-4 below.

thee any special support or to have encouraged them to occupy Swaziland with the aim of confronting the British government with a fait accompli, as was attempted in Goshen in Bechuanaland.[22] The rumoured Boer "raids" on or "invasions" of Swaziland did not materialise. The accusations made in 1885 that Joubert had attempted to persuade Umbandine to place the Swazi under Boer protection were denied by the Republic and a counter-accusation was levied that a son of Sir Theophilus Shepstone had been active in trying to get the Swazi king to declare himself in favour of a British or Natal protectorate.[23] Kruger's statement in July 1885 that Joubert's visit to Swaziland in May had been private could not be challenged by the British authorities. But the visit was known to other officials in Pretoria. In a private letter to the Republic's diplomatic representative in Europe, Beelaerts van Bl[illegible]nd, Leyds explained that Joubert had gone to Swaziland to keep "the hand of friendship" extended to the Swazi and to discuss the beaconing of the frontier.[24] Joubert's own explanation, given five years later, was that he had merely warned Umbandine against granting mineral concessions and allowing liquor to be imported, and so ensuring the destruction of his people and the over-running and governing of his country by European diggers. He added that Umbandine must have taken this as a threat, for his response had been to send unfounded complaints to Natal.[25]

In October 1886 Swazi messengers to Natal repeated the allegation that Joubert and other Boers had attempted to get Umbandine to sign a cession of Swaziland to the Republic.[26] Joubert had visited Swaziland as a member of a boundary commission authorised by the Executive Council in July 1886 and early in 1887 Robinson raised the question once more. The Republic denied all the charges made against Joubert and furnished proofs which were eventually accepted.[27]

---

(22) Walker, History of South Africa, p.403.
(23) C 4645, pp.3-4 (telegrams between Robinson and Kruger, May 1885); p.11, Kruger's despatch 14 July 1885.
(24) L.A. 250, Leyds to Beelaerts, 3 May 1885.
(25) Mouton, op.cit., p.376, quoting from a report of Joubert's speech in London in December 1890, at a dinner held by Sir Donald Currie, a British business man with interests in South Africa.
(26) C 4980, pp.147-8.
(27) Ibid., p.172; C 5089, pp.13-14, Robinson's despatch; pp.22 (Bok (State Secretary) to High Commissioner, 18 Feb.1887), 29, report of the Boundary Commission, 11 Nov.1886, on Joubert's activities. See also Mouton, op.cit., pp.375-6; Symington, op.cit., p.66.

Joubert achieved little to strengthen the position of his government in Swaziland in 1885 and 1886. Assuming that Joubert did attempt to obtain the rumoured deed of cession, his success would have counted little against the likelihood of the British government's refusing to recognise it. Joubert shared with Leyds the fear that the British government might annex Swaziland, and his activities there in 1885/6 represented a cautious effort to keep the Republic's finger in the Swaziland pie whilst awaiting events, rather than an attempt to bring about surreptitiously a Boer occupation of the country with which to confront the British government. Similarly the correspondence between Leyds and Beelaerts does not suggest a policy contemplating an occupation of Swaziland. Leyds remarked in October 1886 that owing to the proximity of the Eastern Transvaal goldfields to Swaziland, he wished to keep the British government out of the native country. Beelaerts thought that if the British government broke the London Convention, this might lead to a revision in the Republic's favour of the whole agreement - a small price (the independence of Swaziland) for great gains. Beelaerts was certainly unaware of any policy on the part of the Republic to penetrate Swaziland.[28] Before 1887 the Republic does not seem to have had a clearly formulated policy toward Swaziland under the Conventions of Pretoria and London, and until that year the initiative in the correspondence between the governments on the territory was taken by British officials and not by the Republic.

Its independent status having been fixed and recognised by the governments of Britain and the Transvaal in 1881 and 1884, Swaziland itself suffered a few years of "unsalutary neglect" at their hands before the situation which was partly created by their agreeing to remain aloof brought about their intervention.

---

(28) L.A. 250, Leyds to Beelaerts, 30 Oct. 1886, and Beelaerts to Leyds, 13 Oct.1886. Mouton, op.cit., p.377, for Joubert's fear of an English annexation coming about through the work of "intriguers".

CHAPTER TWO

The Swaziland Question, the Trans-Pongola Territories and Tongaland 1887-1889

(1) The Europeans in Swaziland: Offy Shepstone and the Joint Government

The example of the winter graziers illustrated that the independence of Swaziland under the Conventions did not prevent individual Europeans from entering the country and acquiring rights from the Swazi king. In the early 1880's the De Kaap and Barberton goldfields of the Eastern Transvaal attracted a mining population and interest in the mineral possibilities of Swaziland caused prospectors and less respectable adventurers from these places to enter the native country. Before the end of 1884 Umbandine had granted the mineral rights over all Swaziland to two pioneer prospectors, T. McLachlan and J.Forbes.[1] By 1885, however, the Swazi king had adopted the more lucrative policy of granting smaller mineral concessions to whoever applied for them, until in December 1888, in granting an "unallotted minerals" concession, he completed the alienation of mineral rights.[2]

Umbandine's policy of granting grazing licences to the trekboers became a part of his general concessions policy which he applied to land and farming rights as well, these being leased for varying periods of years or granted in perpetuity. This process was halted in July 1889 by the grant of an "unallotted lands" concession, which completed the alienation to concessionnaires of the land of the Swazi.[3] Meanwhile Europeans who had come to Swaziland showed themselves anxious to acquire "monopolies" as well. These ranged from monopolies for specific and often absurd manufacturing and commercial enterprises and exemptions from customs and other duties, to rights which were among the essential attributes of government such as that empowering the holder

(1) Mathers, Golden South Africa, pp.59-60, 219; D.Forbes (junior), My Life in South Africa, p.89.
(2) Boyce, op.cit., p.60.
(3) Ibid., pp.63-4.

to collect the king's revenue.[4] The concessions era in Swaziland, the manner in which the grants were made, their classification and their significance for the later history of Swaziland are subjects which have claimed a good deal of attention.[5] But for the present purpose these points will be disregarded and the procedure followed of considering those aspects of the situation in Swaziland which directly affected the policies of the governments.

The first result of the attraction of concessions was the establishment ~~in Swaziland~~ of a more or less permanent European population in Swaziland after 1886. This white population was permanent in the sense that the presence there of Europeans was a constant feature of the situation in Swaziland from the late 1880's; but it is probable that many of them did not become bona fide residents of the country and often returned to places like Barberton after acquiring speculative concessions or retiring disappointed or disillusioned. By 1892 there were 750 Europeans resident in Swaziland, of which 450 were stated to be British subjects. The greater part of this number established themselves in Swaziland between 1886 and 1889.[6]

Umbandine's requests for a British Resident and a British protectorate having led to no result owing to the reluctance of the British government to act and his own unwillingness to pay for a British official, the Swazi king was left to deal with the influx of Europeans on his own.[7] Towards the end of 1886, Theophilus (Offy) Shepstone, C.M.G., a son of Sir Theophilus Shepstone and a member of the Natal Legislative Council and of the Pietermaritzburg Bar

---

(4) See below, Chapter V (1).

(5) For example, Boyce, The Swaziland Concessions and their Political Consequences passim, Hailey (2), op.cit., pp.361ff.; Kuper, An African Aristocracy, pp.22ff.

(6) C 7212, p.142, Ripon's despatch to Loch , 1 Dec. 1892. See also C 6201, De Winton's report, pp.11, 13.
On the influx of Europeans into Swaziland, see Miller, Swaziland: The California of South Africa, pp.17-19; Miller, Swaziland (Royal Empire Society, Proceedings, 1900, pp.274-6); Penfold (1) (see bibliographical note), p.6, on the habit of Europeans from Barberton coming to Swaziland temporarily; Forbes, op.cit., pp.89, 109. C 6201, p.3, for De Winton's comment in 1890: "The mineral holders, miners, canteen and store keepers, missionaries and a few permanent farmers are the only permanent residents in the country".

(7) Forbes, op.cit., p.103. D.Forbes snr., whom Rutherford had reported as being the Swazi king's adviser in 1884, left Swaziland in 1886. He returned to Swaziland early in 1887 to find his place formally filled by Offy Shepstone, and new mineral concessions overlapping his original monopoly.

concluded an agreement with Umbandine to act as his adviser in matters concerning Europeans. In the following February, having returned to Natal for a short period, Shepstone was formally installed as Umbandine's "Resident, Adviser and Agent in all matters in which white people are concerned in and about our country".[8]

According to a minute written by his father in April 1889, Offy Shepstone was sent to Swaziland as a result of requests from Umbandine through messengers to Natal, to send up one of his sons to assist the king in his dealings with Europeans.[9] One son, Arthur Shepstone, had visited Swaziland in 1885, but had returned to Natal. Offy went up in the following year as the requests to Sir Theophilus had continued. Another account written by E.P.Mathers , a Natal journalist who visited Swaziland in 1887, purports to give Offy Shepstone's own version. It states that Offy went to Swaziland in 1886 on business connected with a concession which his brother had obtained and in order to acquire a concession himself, and that Umbandine's offer of the appointment came as a great surprise to him.[10] The main point is that Shepstone's appointment was a private or possibly a family affair. He certainly had no commission from the government of Natal.[11] Any aim he might have harboured to secure a British protectorate over Swaziland was thwarted by official British policy which was opposed to such a step. Before Shepstone took up his appointment Havelock and Robinson agreed that Umbandine should be informed that Shepstone was in no way accredited to the British government. After Swazi messengers to Natal in April 1887 had renewed Umbandine's requests for a British Resident and stated the king's preference for Shepstone, the Secretary of State, now Sir Henry Holland, informed Robinson that the British government was prepared neither to annex nor to proclaim a protectorate over Swaziland, nor to

---

(8) C 5089, p.36, proclamation of Shepstone's appointment by Umbandine and his council. For biographical information on Offy Shepstone, see Men of the Times (1905), p.332.

(9) C 6200, p.148, 20 April 1889; Honey, op.cit., p.122.

(10) Mathers, Golden South Africa, pp.225-6; also C 5089, p.58, extract from the Natal Witness, 7 May 1887.

(11) Rademeyer, Die Land Noord van die Limpopo in die Ekspansiebeleid van die Suid-Afrikaanse Republiek, p.189, refers to Shepstone as a sort of "diplomatic agent" of the Natal government (i.e., the British government, since Natal had not yet received responsible government). Leyds, op.cit., p.239, states that "Swaziland was to be made a "Shepstone Reserve", which might imply a policy on the part of Natal officials to promote a British annexation of Swaziland.

recognise Shepstone as "an official British representative".

The extent of Shepstone's influence in Swaziland is not easy to gauge. He had no control in purely native matters, although he has been given credit for limiting the amount of "killing-off" of recalcitrant Swazi councillors and opponents of the king, which, as one British official remarked, figured among "the ordinary incidents of native government".[13] Shepstone's position depended solely on the will of the Swazi king. Although the Swazi Council had endorsed his appointment, it is clear that Shepstone's advice even in matters concerning the Europeans, the issue of concessions and the imposition of taxes and licence duties had to be given within the rather prescribed bounds of what Umbandine regarded as desirable, in order for Shepstone to keep his position and the favour of the king. Had Shepstone attempted to prevent Umbandine from issuing further concessions, he would probably have been dismissed. His dismissal in February 1889 was apparently the result of his refusal to register a banking concession issued by the king and of which he disapproved, and of his objections to the king's habit of issuing concessions without consulting him.[14]

By drawing up a register of concessions, keeping accounts of the payments of rentals on them and introducing saving clauses securing the "sovereign rights" of Umbandine and the rights of the Swazi to their lands, Shepstone attempted to bring some precision and order into the king's concessions policy and to secure some protection for Swazi rights. On the other hand,

---

(12) C 5089, p.9. Telegrams between Robinson and Havelock, January 1887; p.50, Holland to Robinson, 19 May 1887. Holland's opinion of what Shepstone's status should be was shared by Robinson (p.44).
On Shepstone's arrival in Swaziland and his appointment, see also Boyce, op.cit., p.15; Hailey (II), op.cit., p.364; Kuper, op. cit., p.23, gives a fair account of Shepstone's status in Swaziland and the difficulties confronting him; Leyds, op.cit., pp.242-4; Penfold, op.cit. (2); Honey, op.cit., p.58.
According to Mathers (op.cit., p.245), Shepstone told him (in the second half of 1887) that he would not accept an official appointment as British Resident, if it were offered to him, despite Umbandine's preference for him (p.243).

(13) C 6200, p.200; C 7212, p.8, Martin's despatch, 6 Sept.1890; Griffiths, From Bedford Row to Swaziland, pp.43ff. Griffiths visited Swaziland some time in 1891 and was an admirer of Shepstone's influence with the Swazi.

(14) C 6200, p.149, Sir T.Shepstone's minute.

Shepstone had an agreement with the Swazi by which he was to receive one-half of the king's revenue. As the greater part of this was derived from down-payments and rentals on concessions, he had a pecuniary interest in granting as many concessions as possible.[15] The granting of "monopoly" concessions - those involving the alienation of other than straightforward land and mineral rights - began during his period of office.[16] He also obtained concessions for himself and was the attesting witness to other concessions. The evidence surrounding his dismissal in February 1889 suggests that Shepstone's objection to Umbandine's granting the banking monopoly owed less to his disapproval of the king's general concessions policy or even the nature of the particular concession in question, than to his own differences with the persons who had applied for the right.[17] In Shepstone's favour it must be pointed out that during the short term of office of his successor, A.M. Miller, as adviser to the king, the spate of monopoly concessions accelerated. Of the seven monopolies later acquired by the Republic, four were registered originally by Shepstone and three by Miller.[18]

Apart from accepting some responsibility for carrying out and organising Umbandine 's concessions policy, Shepstone had also to advise the king on how the Europeans in Swaziland were to be governed. In May 1887 he presided over a meeting of concession-holders which he had called earlier, with the intention of registering their concessions and securing the election of a committee to decide on regulations for the government of the Europeans.[19] A committee of 25 members was elected, but as the Boers present complained that they were not fully represented, it was decided that a new committee would be chosen at the end of July. At a meeting attended by about 70 concessionnaires on 30 July a committee of five representatives each for mineral concession-holders, grazing licences and residents was elected. At this meeting 40 additional Boers were present who refused to participate in the proceedings on the ground that the two governments were about to intervene. The meeting approved a number of regulations regarding the rights of concessionnaires and the fees

---

(15) Boyce, op.cit., p. 47; J.F. Rubie's report on the Swaziland Coal Concessions (1903) in Privy Council Proceedings, 158 of 1924, pp. 249-50; Shepstone's statement of his accounts with the Swazi in R.A. 3319/95 (4).
(16) Honey, op.cit., p. 122.
(17) Boyce, op.cit., p. 27; Forbes, op.cit., pp. 119-20.
(18) See below, Chapter V (i), for these concessions.
(19) C 5089, p. 68, extract from the Natal Mercury, 25 May 1887.

Author Garson N G (Noel George)
Name of thesis The Swaziland Question And A Road To The Sea 1887-1895. 1955

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2013

LEGAL NOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed, or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page) for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.